

PLAN 2025

April 2009

PLAN 2025 PHASE 3

ACTION PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS



April, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

PHASE THREE: ACTION PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. About Plan 2025 **9**
1. The Purpose of Plan 2025 9
2. The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) 9
3. The Recreation, Leisure And Library Facilities Policy (RLLF) 9

B. The Community Centre Model in Winnipeg **10**
1. Governance and Operation 10
2. Three Tiers of Community Centres 10
3. Community Centre Definition 10
4. Vision for Community Centres 11
5. Guiding Principles 12

C. The Planning Model **12**
1. Phase 1: Overview and Direction 12
2. Phase 2: District Plans 13
3. Phase 3: Action Plan and Recommendations 17

D. Current Conditions: Issues and Concerns **17**
1. Background 17
2. Common Themes 17
   a) Volunteer Recruitment and Retention 17
   b) Programming for the Entire Community 18
   c) Developing Suitable Facilities 18
3. Current Space to Population Ratio (SPR**)** 18

E. Assessing Future Needs **21**
1. A Growing Population 21
2. Shifting Recreation Trends 22
3. Developing More Contemporary Facilities 23

F. Action Plan: Goals and Strategies **24**
1. Addressing Volunteer/Staff Recruitment and Retention 24
2. Developing and Sustaining Programming for the Entire Community 25
3. Developing Contemporary Facilities While Optimizing Current Space 25

G. The Changing Landscape **26**

1. Early Successes 26
2. An Appropriate Mix 27
3. Plan 2025 Development Proposals 28

H. Moving Forward on Proposals **31**

Appendices

- Phase 1: Overview and Direction
- Phase 2: District 1: City Centre District Plan
- Phase 2: District 2: Assiniboia District Plan
- Phase 2: District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan District Plan
- Phase 2: District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona District Plan
- Phase 2: District 5: Riel District Plan

List of Maps

Map 1: Community Centre Districts 13

Map 2: District 1: City Centre Cluster Areas 14

Map 3: District 2: Assiniboia Cluster Areas 15

Map 4: District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan Cluster Areas 15

Map 5: District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona Cluster Areas 16

Map 6: District 5: Riel Cluster Areas 16

List of Tables

Table 1: Space to Population Ratios as of 2005 19

Table 2: 2005 Space to Population Ratios per Cluster 20

Table 3: Accommodating Population Growth to 2025 22

Table 4: Current and Projected Space to Population Ratios 28

Acknowledgements

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of the Planning Committees established by each of the Community Centre Boards.

Urban Edge Consulting Inc. was the prime consultant while KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
ACTION PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Summary

Plan 2025: Purpose and Background

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC). It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

for this, and the next, generation of users.

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (RLLF). Plan 2025 addresses the planned outcome of this policy, that is, a community empowered to reconfigure its recreation, leisure, and library facilities in a way that is more responsive to local needs, leading to a more contemporary and financially sustainable mix of facilities.

The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases. The RLLF Policy gives GCWCC the leadership mandate to strengthen and optimize the Community Centre. This encompasses the provision of long range planning – Plan 2025.

The year 2005 serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of space.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.

A three-phase approach was taken with the Plan 2025 planning process:

1. Phase 1: Overview and Direction – This document provided an overview of the task and direction for more detailed planning by district.

2. Phase 2: District Plans – Five District Plans were produced, one per each Community Centre District, under the guidance of volunteer planning committees who were appointed by each Community Centre District Board.
3. Phase 3: Action Plan and Recommendations - This document summarizes the findings of the five District Plans and provides recommendations that can be acted upon by the Community Centres themselves, the Community Centre District Boards, GCWCC, and the City of Winnipeg.

Current Conditions

People:

The Community Centre model in Winnipeg is unique from other Canadian cities in that they are not staffed by the municipality but governed and operated by a group of volunteers, with the Board of Directors being elected by the local community they serve. The ability of community centre volunteers to meet the increasingly complex needs of the community while dealing with increased maintenance and administrative duties has become increasingly difficult. Over the years, volunteer recruitment and retention has become more and more of an issue.

As demands on volunteers increase, access to qualified staff is becoming a necessity to encourage and sustain viable community centres; however, finding and retaining qualified staff is also a growing concern, often due to financial restrictions.

Programs:

Community Centres are mandated to provide a broad range of recreational and leisure activities that are suited to the needs of the residents living within their designated area. Community Centres require assistance in identifying demographic changes and emerging recreational trends so as to provide relevant programming for their community. Collaboration and cooperation with other service providers is a necessity; however, this has been hampered by most volunteers' difficulty in meeting during the day.

Facilities:

Community Centres receive an annual facility operating grant and second line maintenance support from the City of Winnipeg who own and insure the facilities. The Community Centres are responsible for first line maintenance and administration costs, including provision of programming and staffing (both paid and volunteer).

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are smaller centres that tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed centres that may serve up to 15,000 people.
- *District Community Centres* are very large centres that address the needs of structured sports. These centres tend to serve a large population of more than 15,000.

As the buildings age, maintenance and operating costs become more and more of a concern to both the City of Winnipeg and the Community Centre volunteers. Many factors, such as socio-economic needs or facility restrictions, affect a community centre's ability to generate revenue. There is recognition that better use must be made of existing facilities; however, many of these buildings are functionally obsolete. For example, even though sports like basketball, volleyball and indoor soccer have increased in popularity, few community centres have full size gyms. There is a need for contemporary space that provides the flexibility to deliver a wide range of programs.

Moving Forward

Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

People

Volunteers will always be a vital part of the community centre model. New volunteers can be approached by accessing new sources, such as senior centres, high school credit programs and other service providers. Defined roles and training will assist in attracting and retaining both volunteers and staff.

In areas where a volunteer Board is not sustainable, a staff-run model may need to be explored by GCWCC.

In almost all community centres, qualified staff is essential to support the volunteer Boards in ensuring the facilities are open, accessible and safe. Through collaboration and communication with other community centres, as well as other service providers, strategies for shared staff and volunteers can be explored.

In any case, increased financial support from the City is a crucial part of the equation, whether it is to address human resources, sustainable programming, or capital projects.

Programs

The population of Winnipeg will continue to grow and the demographic make-up will continue to change, with more New Canadians, more young aboriginals and more seniors. Community Centres must work together with other service providers, most importantly, the City of Winnipeg, to better understand the changing nature of the community and to program accordingly. This can be facilitated by an enhanced relationship with the area Community Resource Coordinator or by utilizing existing community centre staff to network during the day.

Community Centres may address new recreation trends, socio-economic needs and changes to demographics by employing “cluster programming” to ensure gaps are addressed and duplication is avoided. This will require improved communication at the District Board level and can be facilitated by GCWCC.

Facilities

GCWCC and Community Centres can undertake a District Utilization Plan to ensure optimum use of facilities. This could include introducing Shared Use Agreements between centres and/or exploring shared governance models.

The possibility of mergers needs to be fully explored as a strategy for introducing contemporary facilities. Although mergers may result in closures, they will only occur at the will of the community.

In many cases, population growth must be accommodated by expansions or additional new facilities. Full-size gyms, representing multi-purpose space, are a priority in every community centre district. GCWCC will continue to work with Community Centres and the City of Winnipeg to develop all facility proposals.

Capital Projects

Early Successes

Several new community centre projects are in various stages of completion across the City, attesting to the success of the District Planning Process in addressing the intent of the RLLF Policy. They include:

- The redevelopment of Valour Community Centre in District 1: City Centre
- The redevelopment of Sinclair Park Community Centre in District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan
- The replacement of Bronx Park Community Centre to accommodate both the community centre and Good Neighbours Senior Centre in District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona
- The redevelopment of the former Norberry Community Centre, to accommodate the amalgamation of two centres into Norberry-Glenlee Community Centre in District 5: Riel.

Plan 2025 Proposals for Development

While basic direction was provided by GCWCC, decisions made regarding the plans and recommendations were from the Community Centres themselves. Each of the five District Plans was vetted by each Community Centre within the respective District and was endorsed by the Community Centre District Board. Finally, the five District Plans were endorsed by GCWCC.

As per the RLLF Policy, the facility strategies are meant to address “sustaining existing, programmable recreation and leisure space while encouraging a reconfiguration of facilities over time.” The Policy also includes an allowance for expansion based on real population growth. As such, the Plan 2025 includes proposals for amalgamations, expansions and new facilities. These proposals will continue to be explored and developed to test their feasibility before bringing them forward to City Council as capital project recommendations.

Plan 2025: A Living Document

Plan 2025 is distinct in that it utilizes a grassroots planning approach, involving considerable consultation with community centre volunteers who shared their knowledge and expertise to develop strategies to strengthen and enhance the Community Centre model. Implementation of these strategies will begin immediately and will continue over time through continued and enhanced cooperation among the Community Centres, GCWCC, the City of Winnipeg, and related stakeholders.

Plan 2025 is a living document and as such it will be reviewed and amended on a regular basis.

GCWCC Plan 2025
ACTION PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ABOUT PLAN 2025

1. The Purpose of Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is unique in that it utilizes a grassroots planning approach, involving considerable consultation with community centre volunteers who shared their knowledge and experience to devise strategies to:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC)

The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) was established in 1971 to promote and encourage cooperation and communication among the community centres and city administration, and to provide a central council for the exchange of ideas and consideration of solutions to common problems. Over the past decade the GCWCC has experienced changes in its mandate and the responsibilities of the Council have increased substantially. Most recently, the GCWCC's mandate has been expanded through the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy to provide leadership in long range planning. In April 2008, GCWCC entered into a Management Agreement with the City of Winnipeg as related to the City of Winnipeg Community Centres with the purpose of facilitating a stronger, more sustainable community centre model in Winnipeg.

3. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. On May 18, 2005, City Council adopted this policy to provide direction for the provision and maintenance of recreation, leisure and library facilities owned by the City of Winnipeg (including Community Centres). The policy includes a facility hierarchy and guidelines for facility to population ratios; direction for existing facilities and the introduction of new facility types; a stronger leadership mandate for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres; a commitment to sustaining existing, programmable recreation and leisure square footage while encouraging reconfiguration of facilities over time; a commitment to "managed care" level of maintenance for new facilities and, where possible, existing facilities; and a reinvestment strategy.

B. THE COMMUNITY CENTRE MODEL IN WINNIPEG

1. Governance and Operation

The Community Centre model in Winnipeg is unique from other Canadian cities in that they are not staffed by the municipality but governed and operated by a group of volunteers, with the Board of Directors being elected by the local community they serve. Community Centres are mandated to provide a broad range of recreational and leisure activities that are suited to the needs of the residents living within their designated area. This could include cultural, educational, fitness and sports programs, as well as a multitude of leisure and drop-in activities.

Community Centres receive an annual facility operating grant and second line maintenance support from the City of Winnipeg who own and insure the facilities. The Community Centres are responsible for first-line maintenance and administration costs, including provision of programming and staffing (paid and/or volunteer). Although the Community Centre volunteers are autonomous in the management of the centre, there are accountability measures and reporting practices that must be adhered to by the Centre's Board of Directors in order to be eligible for funding.

2. Three Tiers of Community Centres

There are currently three tiers of community centres:

Local Community Centres

These centres are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

These centres are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.

District Community Centres

These centres address the needs of structured sports with amenities such as indoor rinks and indoor soccer pitches. As well, they accommodate many other uses with gyms and multi-purpose space. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

3. Community Centre Definition

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community and is the foundation from which the GCWCC Vision and Guiding Principles for Community Centres were derived.

"The City of Winnipeg is unique in many ways, and the existence of Community Centres is one of the many things that help us maintain that quality. In the search for the ideal

Community Centre, one finds that a great many things must be considered. To begin with, a Community Centre must truly serve the Community in which it is situated, within well-defined and recognizable boundaries. The Community Centre must be driven and completely led by a group of dedicated volunteers who understand and appreciate the needs and concerns of the community. In that way, the Community Centre chooses for itself what is best for the Community and both echoes and, indeed, becomes the pride of the Community. The Community Centre then becomes a focal point of the community; a meeting place which is a true centerpiece of the Community.

The Community Centre should provide an appropriate and diverse variety of programming in a safe and healthy environment. Programming should offer diverse recreational services with a mix of sports, leisure, cultural and social programming which responds to the needs of the Community. The Community and its programs should be both adaptable and accessible, whether physically, financially or demographically.

The facility itself must be well maintained, multi-seasonal, multi-purpose and programmable. It must be designed around programming, which in turn has been designed to meet the expressed needs of the Community. The facility must finally be owned as well as fully and adequately funded by the City of Winnipeg. Continued financial stability is an essential part to ensure the long-term viability and success of the Community Centre; however, there is also a requirement for adequate and appropriate human resources and equipment.

As a final note, the ideal Community Centre will have developed stable, long-lasting partnerships within the outside of the Community. Partners should include the Community itself; the men, women and children who live, work and play in the Community."

4. Vision for Community Centres

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

5. Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.
- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.
- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

The vision and guiding principles for community centres were the driving forces behind the development of five district plans. The vision and guiding principles allowed each community centre district to address the future provision of services while determining the appropriate mix of local, neighbourhood, and district facilities.

C. THE PLANNING MODEL

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.

The planning process has been divided into three phases:

1. Phase One: Overview and Direction

This document, prepared by GCWCC, provides an overview of the task and direction for more detailed planning by district. It provides background information, establishes parameters, and clarifies expectations for more detailed planning that follows in Phase Two. Phase 1 was embarked upon in 2007 and the final document was approved by the GCWCC membership at their 2008 Annual General Meeting.

The Phase 1: Overview and Direction can be found as an appendix to this document.

2. Phase Two: District Plans

During the development of Plan 2025, the greatest amount of time was spent on Phase Two. In January 2008, volunteer Planning Committees were appointed by each Community Centre District Board. The Planning Committees met simultaneously for more than a year, with the support of GCWCC and the City of Winnipeg Community Services Department, to develop their own unique District Plan.

Each District Plan includes a comprehensive review of the current situation within the district including an examination of the breadth of programs offered, an assessment of the volunteer base, and a facility review. The needs of the district to the year 2025 were determined and strategies were put in place for addressing these needs considering current service levels, anticipated growth, societal trends, and demographic changes.

Each District Plan concludes with recommendations for improved programming, volunteer recruitment and retention, and facility development, acknowledging current projects and initiatives while identifying new ones.

Each of the five District Plans (see Appendices) was vetted by each Community Centre within the respective District and was endorsed by the Community Centre Board of each District. Finally, the five District Plans were endorsed by the GCWCC**.** The five community centre districts are identified in the map below.

Map 1: COMMUNITY CENTRE DISTRICTS



As shown in **Map 1**, the boundaries of the Community Centre Districts (shown in colour) are quite closely aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political community boundaries

(outlined with black lines). It should be noted that there are large tracts of industrial and undeveloped lands within these boundaries that are not allocated to the districts. However, for the purposes of Plan 2025, the entire city is considered in order to properly consider growth over the next twenty years.

For planning purposes, each District has been split into areas called neighbourhood clusters (**see Maps 2 through 6**). These units are used because research information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster.

The Planning Committees had representation from each of the cluster areas within their District and were chaired by a District Board representative. The Planning Committees also included representation from the City of Winnipeg Community Services Dept. and GCWCC. The process was facilitated by Urban Edge Consulting, Inc.

The role of the Planning Committee was to:

- Oversee the development of the District Plan
- Provide insight and guidance into the planning process and plan content
- Help resolve issues that arose from the planning process

Maps 2 through 6 show the boundaries of each district together with the neighbourhood clusters in various shades. The coinciding community centres and city facilities are listed beside each map.

Map 2: District 1 City Centre: Cluster Areas



Downtown West:

- Valour CC– 3 sites, RA Steen
- Cindy Klassen Rec. Complex

Downtown East

- Magnus Elias Rec. Complex, Broadway Neighbourhood Centre

River Heights West:

- Sir John Franklin CC, River Heights CC, Crescentwood CC, Earl Grey CC

River Heights East

- River Osborne CC, Lord Roberts CC, Riverview CC
- Mayfair Rec. Centre, Block Parents, Fort Rouge Leisure Centre

Fort Garry North

- Victoria CC, Westridge CC, Fort Garry CC, Wildwood CC, Linden Woods CC, Whyte Ridge CC

Map 3: District 2: Assiniboia Cluster Areas



St. James Assiniboia West:

- Assiniboia West CC – 2 sites, Heritage Victoria CC, Kirkfield-Westwood CC – 2 sites
- St. James Centennial, St. James Cultural Centre

St. James Assiniboia East

- Sturgeon Creek CC, Silver Heights CC, Deer Lodge CC, Bourkevale CC, Bord-Aire CC, Woodhaven CC
- St. James Civic Centre, Bourkevale Leisure Centre

Assiniboia South

- Westdale CC – 2 sites, Roblin Park CC, Varsity View CC– 2 sites, Tuxedo CC
- Eric Coy Craft Centre/Rec. Centre

Map 4: District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan Cluster Areas



Point Douglas North

- Sinclair Park, Ralph Brown, Luxton CC
- St. John's Leisure Centre

Point Douglas South

- Burton Cummings, Central, Norquay CC
- Old Exhibition Rec. Centre, North End Seniors Centre, Strathcona Rec. Centre, Aberdeen Rec. Centre, Dufferin Seniors Centre, Turtle Island Rec. Centre, Freighthouse Rec. Centre

Inkster West

- Tyndall Park CC

Inkster East

- Weston CC, Northwood CC
- Brooklands Pioneer Seniors Centre

Seven Oaks West

- Maples CC – 2 sites

Seven Oaks East

- Garden City CC, Vince Leah CC, Red River CC, West Kildonan CC
    - Bleak House

Map 5: District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona Cluster Areas



River East West:

- Bronx Park CC, Melrose Park CC, North Kildonan CC
- Good Neighbours Senior Centre

River East East

- Gateway CC, Valley Gardens CC, Morse Place CC

River East South

- Chalmers CC, East Elmwood CC, Bronx Park CC satellite
- East Kildonan Seniors Centre, Elmwood Winter Club, East End Cultural and Leisure Centre

Transcona:

- Park City West CC, Oxford Heights CC, East End CC, South Transcona CC
- Arts Action Centre, Roland Michener Arena, Transcona Senior Centre, Transcona Scout Hall, Transcona Optimists

Map 6: District 5: Riel Cluster Areas



St. Boniface West:

- Notre Dame CC, Norwood CC, Champlain CC
- Club Eclipse `79 (Senior Centre)

St. Boniface East

- Archwood CC, Winakwa CC, Southdale CC

St. Vital North

- Glenwood CC, Windsor CC, Norberry-Glenlee CC (2 sites)

St. Vital South

- Greendell CC, Dakota CC

Fort Garry South

- Waverly Heights CC, Richmond Kings CC (2 sites), St. Norbert CC

Note: The list of City facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively consistent with what is provided by Community Centres. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas.

3. Phase Three: Action Plan and Recommendations

This document summarizes the findings of the five District Plans and provides recommendations that can be acted upon by the Community Centres themselves, the Community Centre District Boards, the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres and the City of Winnipeg.

D. CURRENT CONDITIONS: ISSUES AND CONCERNS

1. Background

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging, from sport to recreation, spanning all ages, including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listings and third party agreements. However, due to a variety of factors, there is inconsistency of programming among community centres.

There is a concern that the current community centre system may be unsustainable, especially without sufficient human resources and additional financial support. The Planning Committees worked to identify strategies to address these issues, recognizing that it is important to first establish a common understanding of the community centre movement – what it represents now and what it will represent in the future.

2. Common Themes

The Planning Committees undertook the task of identifying issues and concerns within their own district. The following three themes emerged in all five districts:

a) Volunteer Recruitment and Retention

Across the City, volunteer recruitment and retention is a primary concern. The ability of community centre volunteers to meet the increasingly complex needs of the community while dealing with increased maintenance and administrative duties has become progressively difficult.

Finding and retaining qualified staff is also a struggle, often due to insufficient funds. Access to qualified staff for facility maintenance, administration and program development/delivery is urgently needed.

b) Programming for the Entire Community

There is recognition that community centres must continue to work together to offer programs beyond organized sports, reaching out to non-traditional users while recognizing emerging recreation and leisure trends. Programming will need to evolve over time to meet the needs and pressures of a growing population together with the changing demographic make-up of the community, including the growing numbers of New Canadians, young aboriginals and seniors. Collaboration with other service providers, including the City of Winnipeg, will be a necessity in order to identify and sustain relevant programming. Sharing is essential to the future of the community centre movement and there needs to be understanding and support in the community to move beyond a parochial approach to one of cooperation.

c) Developing Suitable Facilities

There is a strong need for contemporary space, most notably, full-size gym space that provides the flexibility to deliver a wide variety of programs. It is understood that our existing community centres need to be used as efficiently as possible; however, even with considerable investment, many of today's community centres are functionally obsolete. The current needs of the community cannot be met with inadequate facilities that were originally designed to accommodate outdoor sports and modest meeting space.

While a more contemporary mix of facilities is proposed to meet current needs, it is also necessary to introduce new community centres in areas of greatest population growth, thus balancing the short-term crisis with long-term solutions.

For planning purposes, it must be recognized that each district is serviced by more than its community centres. The complementary facilities and programs run by the City of Winnipeg should be considered when planning for the long-term needs of the community. While Plan 2025 is intended to provide direction for community centres, proper planning requires that it do so in consideration of the use of the City managed space.

3. Current Space to Population Ratio (SPR)

In 2005, the population of Winnipeg was served by an average of 1.88 square feet of recreation space per person. The space to population ratio simply divides the amount of heated square footage by the population of the district. This includes the total heated square footage of community centre space plus the total square footage of City of Winnipeg recreation and leisure space and senior centres. This covers all of the facilities that are restricted by the RLLF policy. (This does not include such things as aquatic facilities, indoor ice surfaces, or indoor soccer pitches, although the change rooms and washrooms are included).

Table 1 shows the Space to Population Ratios (SPR) per District, based on figures from 2005. This is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amounted of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. This is a relative measure only.

Table 1: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS as of 2005							
DISTRICT	2005 Pop.	CC Space (sq ft)	CC SPR	City Space (sq ft)	City SPR	Total Space (sq ft)	Total SPR
D1: City Centre	149,600	204,208	1.37	56,631	0.38	260,839	1.74
D2: Assiniboia	95,125	165,969	1.74	63,997	0.67	229,966	2.42
D3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	136,125	180,813	1.33	55,949	0.41	236,762	1.74
D4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	165,067	1.44	65,243	0.57	230,310	2.01
D5: Riel	152,300	256,009	1.68	4,681	0.03	260,690	1.71
Totals	**647,600**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1,218,567**	**1.88**

Source: Derived from City of Winnipeg information

The RLLF Policy states that "Recreation and leisure space can be reconfigured to better serve the needs of the community, provided the amount of net square footage of space on a city-wide basis does not increase. The net square footage of recreation and leisure space will be increased only when there is real population growth and, then, in keeping with the facility to population ratios."

In other words, the 1.88 square feet per person of combined community centre, recreation and leisure centre, and senior centre space cannot increase over time.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system is unsustainable. The 2004 Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

The primary directive provided by the GCWCC as guidance for this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close as possible to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time.

The space to population ratio is *the* critical element in facility planning and serves to guide development decisions in each of the districts. The ratio reflects the amount of recreation space available per person, as of 2005. To plan appropriately, it is necessary to determine the relative level of service throughout the city. A fair evaluation must consider access to facilities regardless of who governs them. The SPR's in **Table 2** include all facilities governed by the RLLF Policy clause regarding restrictions to existing square footage.

Table 2 shows the current space to population ratio per Neighbourhood Cluster area, ranked from highest to lowest, in comparison to the City average.

Table 2: 2005 Space to Population Ratio per Cluster

District	**Cluster**	Square Feet per Person
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Point Douglas South	4.09
City Centre	River Heights East	3.31
Assiniboia	St. James Assiniboia East	3.25
East Kildonan/Transcona	River East South	3.09
Riel	St. Boniface West	2.84
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Inkster East	2.73
Assiniboia	St. James Assiniboia West	2.64
East Kildonan/Transcona	Transcona	2.61
City Centre	Downtown West	2.06
East Kildonan/Transcona	River East West	2.02
Riel	St. Vital North	2.01
City Centre	River Heights West	1.93
City Average		**1.88**
Riel	St. Vital South	1.84
Assiniboia	Assiniboine South	1.83
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Point Douglas North	1.67
Riel	Fort Garry South	1.65
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Seven Oaks East	1.62
East Kildonan/Transcona	River East East	1.39
City Centre	Fort Garry North	1.01
City Centre	Downtown East	0.95
Riel	St. Boniface East	0.84
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Seven Oaks West	0.73
Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan	Inkster West	0.63

E. ASSESSING FUTURE NEEDS

1. A Growing Population

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, specifically, 25.6 versus 39.2 as of 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500 will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5: Riel with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by District 2: Assiniboia with 20% and Districts 1: City Centre, 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan, and 4: East Kildonan/Transcona with 10% each.

Table 3 outlines where the predicted growth will occur across the City. The "Actual 06-07" column translates the Building Permits issued in 2006-2007 into population estimates. The next column provides an estimate of population growth in areas of the city currently designated for residential development. Draft estimates show the current amount of land designated for residential purposes could be depleted by the year 2020.

To address the remaining demand shortfall, two things can occur: a policy of intensification to encourage infill and higher density development in existing areas, and/or a re-designation of rural land for residential use. The table assumes that both would occur and shows a possible scenario in the column entitled 'Shortfall'.

The shortfall in demand has been allocated to areas not yet designated for residential development (Wilkes South, Old Kildonan/Murray, Transcona South and South St. Vital). This assumes a successful political process to re-designate these lands which could occur on its own or through the Plan Winnipeg review process.

Table 3 ACCOMMODATING POPULATION GROWTH TO 2025					
DISTRICT	Actual 06-07	Forecast to 2020	Shortfall	District Total	% of City
District 1: City Centre	650			**13,650**	**10%**
Fort Rouge Yards		700			
Pembina Corridor			2,300		
Inner City Intensification			10,000		
District 2: Assiniboia	700			**27,800**	**20%**
Kapyong Barracks		2,700			
Charleswood		2,400			
Ridgewood South		6,500			
Wilkes South			14,000		
Inner City Intensification			1,500		
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	2,300			**13,150**	**10%**
Meadows West		1,300			
Amber Trails/Leila North		1,550			
Old Kildonan/Murray			5,000		
Inner City Intensification			3,000		
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	1,600			**13,650**	**10%**
Regent West		6,900			
Canterbury Park		1,650			
Transcona South			2,500		
Inner City Intensification			1,000		
District 5: Riel	3,900			**69,250**	**50%**
Southland Park		2,400			
Sage Creek		10,350			
Royalwood		5,250			
Waverley West		24,350			
South St. Vital			20,000		
Pembina Corridor			1,000		
Inner City Intensification			2,000		
Totals	**9,150**	**66,050**	**59,300**	**137,500**	100%

Source: City of Winnipeg, Planning, Property and Development, 'Future Residential Growth Scenario 2008-2020' (DRAFT estimates) and the Conference Board of Canada, Long-Term Demographic and Economic Forecast for Winnipeg's Census Metropolitan Area, June 2007

2. Shifting Recreation Trends

The community centre should be a welcoming place for all. There is a need to understand the changing nature of the community – to recognize and respond to socio-demographic trends by reaching out to portions of the population that currently are not strongly attached to community centres and demonstrating that the community centre is there for them as well.

As demographics change, so do programming requirements. There is a need to ensure a broad range of programs, including more non-sport programming for children and youth. Fitness and social programs for adults and seniors could be programmed during the day. The need for gymnasium and multi-use space has become increasingly evident as recreation trends shift towards indoor fitness and recreation opportunities.

In all community centre activities, the reality of social issues will need to be addressed. While structured sport programs directed toward children and youth should continue to be a mainstay, they need to be complemented by non-traditional programs, particularly in areas of the City where children and youth find themselves at greater risk. Community centres should not only provide opportunities for recreation, they should provide a safe haven with positive role models. Consistent hours of operation and consistent staff are necessary to stimulate participation and to properly serve the citizens of Winnipeg.

Cooperation among community centres as well as cooperation between community centres and other service providers will build synergies that will address programming gaps and/or duplications, sharing of precious human resources (as well as scarce financial resources) and effective use of facilities.

3. Developing More Contemporary Facilities

There is a need to develop more flexible, multi-purpose space that is able to meet the changing needs of the community while ensuring optimal use of existing space. In regards to existing space, multiple uses should be explored for single-use facilities like arenas. Also, non-sport activities need not occupy gymnasium space if multi-purpose space is available. Some user groups may be more flexible and could be directed toward times when facilities are less busy.

This can be approached cluster-wide or district-wide, encouraging the shared use of facilities to ensure that, overall, residents of the District have access to all the space that is available.

Planning Limitations

When addressing facility development, it is important to consider the following planning limitations. Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. With this ratio and the goal of parity in mind, the district planning committees have considered a potential increase of approximately 258,000 square feet of recreation space (both Community Centre-run and City-run) to the year 2025.

The Planning Committees were faced with the challenge of developing facilities to meet the current and future needs of the City while making better use of existing facilities, recognizing that programming trends determine facility requirements. A key consideration in each District was the need for gymnasium and multi-use space.

F. ACTION PLAN: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the primary needs identified by the District Planning Committees. It is imperative that the City work together with GCWCC and the community centres to correct the current deficiencies not only through capital investment, but also through additional enhancements to address an improved system of program delivery.

1. Addressing Volunteer/Staff Recruitment and Retention

- Training: Community Centres must work together with GCWCC to provide proper training for those volunteers in key positions (e.g. how-to manuals; standardized job descriptions). Community Centres should consider overlapping terms of office for Board positions to address continuity in addition to taking advantage of Board Orientations offered by GCWCC.
- Governance review: Who governs and runs a particular facility is less important than ensuring the needs of the community are met. A staff-run model may be appropriate in some instances and should be reviewed by GCWCC on an ongoing basis.
- Access New Sources: Community Centres may access youth volunteers through high school credit programs. Working more closely with seniors organizations could also facilitate access to new volunteers. Community Centres may call upon their Community Resource Coordinator (CRC) to contact local Resident Associations and other service providers. Space can sometimes be provided in return for programming expertise and volunteers.
- Communication: Websites, newsletters, etc. can be used to enhance community awareness of the role and operation of community centres, including the benefits of volunteering and the benefit of Community Centres to the community.
- Collaboration: Share volunteers between community centres (e.g. sports convenors). Share staff between cc's (e.g. program developer, bookkeeper), enabling the creation of full-time positions with attractive salary and benefits. Offer access to training upgrades.
- Increased support: Increased financial support from the City of Winnipeg is required for community centre staffing. This could be addressed by GCWCC in the next Universal Funding Formula (UFF) Review.
- Learn from Merger Experience: Sharing/optimizing resources under a united Board can build upon strengths while addressing weaknesses of individual centres.

2. Developing and Sustaining Programming for the Entire Community

- Communications: Improved communications (website, newsletters) within the community will increase knowledge of existing programs and amenities. District Community Centre Board (CCB) meetings can be reconfigured to encourage greater collaboration among centres. Improved, interactive communication among Community Centres, GCWCC, and the City of Winnipeg must be pursued to ensure programming is community-responsive.
- Increased support: Increase financial and/or human resources support from the City to develop and sustain programming. GCWCC will explore ways to incorporate programming incentives into UFF.
- Networking: Community Centres must work with other service providers, the City of Winnipeg and GCWCC to identify programming opportunities and new sources of funding. Community network associations can be invited to meet at community centres to increase the centre's visibility in the neighbourhood. Networking could be facilitated by the Community Resource Coordinators and more strategic use of existing staff who are available to attend meetings during the day.
- Collaboration: "Cluster programming" –coordinate program delivery among community centres, city-run facilities and other service providers in a neighbourhood cluster to avoid duplication. Recognize that not every community centre can meet every need and that different centres can serve different needs.
- Sports Associations: The GCWCC Sports Committee must continue to work to develop an effective and mutually supportive relationship between community centres and sports associations, recognizing that grassroots organized sport for children and youth is one of the mainstays of community centres.
- Consistency/Safety: Consistent hours of operation, longer hours of operation and consistent staff and volunteers are essential to developing a sense of trust and dependability. Providing a safe environment is paramount to participation.
- High Needs: In high needs areas, more responsive strategies such as food provision and/or provision of transportation may need to be implemented to increase participation. Affordability and accessibility continue to be a primary directive across the City.

3. Developing More Contemporary Facilities while Optimizing Current Space

- Time Management: GCWCC, together with Community Centres, should undertake a District Utilization Plan to promote optimum utilization of facilities, matching users to time of day. In addition, Community Centres should consider alternative uses for traditionally single-use facilities (e.g. arenas).
- Shared Use: Shared use of amenities within a cluster could be negotiated through a shared use agreement between community centres. In the case of new District Centres, a new governance model could be considered, with representation from each community centre within the district, to ensure equitable use of specialized facilities.

- Outdoor Amenities: Community Centres, working together with GCWCC, should consider enhancing outdoor amenities to address new trends (e.g. sand volleyball, basketball). The City should consider developing new sports fields, noting the importance of maintaining existing green space (e.g. Lipsett Hall)
- Boundary Review: GCWCC should engage in a boundary review that could help optimize the use of facilities while addressing changes in population.
- Increased support: Upgrades, rather than expansions, are required in many cases requiring more financial support from City of Winnipeg. Increased maintenance support allows volunteers to put more focus on programming. In turn, community centres, with the help of the City of Winnipeg and GCWCC, should develop maintenance regimens/logs and budgets.
- Learn from Merger Experience: This can lead to a more contemporary facility that is better able to meet the needs of the community.
- Addressing Population Growth: In some cases, new Community Centres will need to be developed to address population growth. GCWCC must work closely with the City of Winnipeg to identify space for recreational development within areas of low space to population ratios.
- Access to School Gyms: Access to school gyms is becoming increasingly challenging due to school closures, inconsistent access policies and the over-demand for high school gyms. It would appear that there is little opportunity to increase access to school gyms; however, ongoing discussions between GCWCC and the school divisions are necessary to optimize opportunities that may arise.
- Develop full-size gyms and multi-use space to address the growing city-wide shortage and accommodate emerging sports e.g. volleyball, basketball, indoor soccer

G. THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE

1. Early Successes

Since 2005, there have been many changes to the Community Centre landscape, all of which were accounted for during the planning process. These projects highlight a few of the early successes resulting from the RLLF Policy and the District Planning Process.

<u>District 1: City Centre</u>

Valour Community Centre: The Valour CC Minto satellite has been declared surplus and the square footage transferred to their Isaac Brock site. Construction is underway for the addition of a full size gym and the complete renovation of the main floor. The Boards of Clifton, Isaac Brock, and Orioles have amalgamated under the name of Valour CC.

District 2: Assiniboia

District 2 has had no capital projects since 2005.

District 3 Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan

Sinclair Park Community Centre: The Sinclair Park Boyd Park satellite has been declared surplus and the Sinclair Park main site is being redeveloped to include the creation of a full-size gym. .

District 4: East Kildonan/ Transcona

Bronx Park Community Centre: Home of Good Neighbours Senior Centre: Construction is currently underway on a new 25,000 sq ft facility at Bronx Park. This includes a merger with the Good Neighbours Senior Centre.

District 5: Riel

Norberry/Glenlee Merger: Construction is currently underway on upgrades and expansion of the Norberry facility, to include a full-size gymnasium and a new multi-purpose room. Once complete, the Glenlee facility will be declared surplus to the community centre inventory.

2. An Appropriate Mix

Based on the Vision for Community Centres, each District determined the appropriate mix of local, neighbourhood and district facilities to accommodate growth and change while respecting the parameters of the RLLF Policy.

a) Amalgamations/ Collaborations:

One of the greatest successes of Plan 2025 has been the collaborative discussions among Community Centres, who, for the most part, have embraced the opportunity to plan for their own future while improving the community centre model. Much credit must be given to those community centres that have chosen to explore options for working together, amalgamating Boards, or amalgamating facilities. Ongoing discussions surrounding amalgamations, mergers, partnerships or collaborations will continue to be nurtured.

b) Closures:

Some Community Centre closures may result from amalgamations, but only at the wish of the community centres themselves and only after community consultation. In some cases, Community Centres have chosen to divest themselves of a satellite, citing the difficulty of operating multiple sites. In all cases, green space will remain unless the community chooses otherwise.

c) Renovations:

Renovations are necessary at many Community Centres; however, renovations have no RLLF Policy implications and could proceed pending feasibility and funding. All renovations should be coordinated with GCWCC and the City of Winnipeg.

d) Expansions:

Expansions of Community Centres and recreational facilities can be justified across the city due to both current and future Space to Population Ratio (SPR) disparities (see **Table 4)**. As many Districts are currently under-serviced, this situation will only worsen without the addition of new space.

Table 4: CURRENT AND PROJECTED SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS

	Community Centres		City-Run Facilities		Combined Facilities	
	SPR 2005	SPR 2025	SPR 2005	SPR 2025	SPR 2005	SPR 2025
District 1: City Centre	1.37	1.25	0.38	0.35	1.74	1.60
District 2: Assiniboia	1.74	1.35	0.67	0.52	2.42	1.87
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	1.33	1.21	0.41	0.37	1.74	1.59
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	1.44	1.29	0.57	0.51	2.01	1.80
District 5: Riel	1.68	1.16	0.03	0.02	1.71	1.18
	1.50	1.24	0.38	0.31	**1.88**	1.55

Source: Derived from previous tables.

In order to achieve parity across the City by the year 2025, (1.88 square feet of recreational space per person), the following space can be added to the five Community Centre Districts:

- District 1: City Centre: 46,000 sq. ft.
- District 2: Assiniboia: 1,500 sq. ft.
- District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan: 44,000 sq. ft.
- District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona: 10,500 sq. ft.
- District 5: Riel: 156,000 sq. ft.

e) New Facilities:

In some cases, adequate expansions cannot be accommodated at existing Community Centre sites. New Community Centres must be introduced in areas of the City that have experienced (and will continue to experience) high population growth. GCWCC will continue to work with the City of Winnipeg to plan for these new centres.

3. Plan 2025 Development Proposals:

While basic direction was provided by the GCWCC Board, decisions made regarding the strategies and proposals were from the Community Centres themselves. The District Planning Committees developed proposals that were endorsed by every Community Centre within their respective district, resulting in the following list. A more detailed description of each of the projects can be found in the individual District Plans (Appendix).

The following proposals are in no particular order other than being presented alphabetically within each district.

District 1: City Centre

- Downtown East: A specific development project has not been defined but there is a recognition that additional space should be provided by the City of Winnipeg to serve the residents in Downtown East.
- Fort Garry Review: A new model of operation may be developed for Victoria, Wildwood, Fort Garry, and Westridge, with the potential to redevelop/replace/expand one or more of the facilities to better meet community needs and to share governance and programming.
- Linden Woods CC: This project will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Whyte Ridge expansion to determine how best to introduce more multi-purpose space including the possible addition of a full-size gym.
- Mayfair: There is recognition that the city should provide additional space to serve the residents of this high needs area. It may be possible to have the facility operate as a satellite of the River Osborne CC.
- River Heights Review: A new model of operation may be developed for Sir John Franklin, River Heights, and Crescentwood, with the potential to redevelop/reconfigure one or more of the facilities and share governance and programming.
- Whyte Ridge CC: This project will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Linden Woods expansion to determine how best to introduce more multi-purpose space.

District 2: Assiniboia

- Kirkfield Westwood CC OR Heritage Victoria CC: Free up space among centres in the St. James Assiniboia West area in order to expand either the Kirkfield Westwood main site OR Heritage Victoria with the addition of a full-size gym.
- Silver Heights CC and Sturgeon Creek CC: Amalgamate the Silver Heights and Sturgeon Creek Community Centres into a single facility with the addition of a full-size gym. The Community Centres have proposed closing the Silver Heights facility together with the two outdoor rinks that lie south of Ness. Substantial revenue could be realized from the sale of the property and would be used to help finance the project.
- Varsity View CC – The Varsity View Board has discussed closing their Laxdal site in order to assist in the development of a large scale ‘District Community Centre’ at the Varsity View Sportsplex site. The programs run out of the Laxdal site could be relocated to the Sportsplex site, allowing the Laxdal site to be declared surplus. Proceeds from the sale of property could be directed toward the expansion of the Sportsplex site.

District 3: Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan

- Inkster West and Seven Oaks West Review: Develop a joint strategy among Maples CC, Northwood CC, and Tyndall Park CC to address the significant shortage of facility space in the Seven Oaks West and Inkster West areas.
- Luxton: Renovate Luxton CC to address serious concerns about accessibility to both the site and the bi-level building.
- Vince Leah and West Kildonan: Once the existing arena at West Kildonan has reached the end of its life cycle, explore adding a new arena at Vince Leah while redeveloping West Kildonan, including the possible addition of a full-size gym.
- Weston: Expand Weston Memorial CC to increase its programming space. Also, develop a long-term governance strategy.

District 4: East Kildonan/Transcona

- Chalmers CC and East Kildonan Seniors Centre: Conversation could take place between Chalmers CC and EK Senior Centre, who are currently occupying a city-leased facility. An amalgamation would make better use of existing space.
- East End CC: East End CC could implement Phase 2 of its development plan adding two floors adjoining their Rink 1 with new dressing rooms, a canteen, and additional support and programming space.
- Oxford Heights CC: Oxford Heights CC could be expanded to convert their small gym into a full-size gym to address a shortage of full-size gym space in Transcona.
- Park City West CC: Park City West CC could be expanded to accommodate an indoor arena and an Active Living Centre followed by the decommissioning of the Roland Michener Arena.
- South Transcona CC: South Transcona could eventually expand to meet the needs of the community should residential growth occur in this area.
- Valley Gardens CC and Morse Place CC: Valley Gardens CC and Morse Place CC could relocate to the Terry Sawchuk arena site, taking over management of the arena while adding new community centre space.

District 5: Riel

- Dakota CC: Dakota could be expanded to include the addition of an indoor arena and a multi-purpose gymnasium/fieldhouse.
- Notre Dame CC and Club Eclipse ‘79: Conversation could take place between Notre Dame CC and Club Eclipse ’79. Given the recent renovation of the Notre Dame facility, the seniors programming could be accommodated within the centre without the need for additional expansion.
- Radisson Healthy Living Centre: This scenario would see the development of a central site (possibly Maginot) into a district centre that could include 2 indoor

arenas, 2 indoor soccer pitches, 2 gyms, a running track, medical space, commercial space, and support space.

- Richmond Kings CC – Ryerson site: Declare the Ryerson satellite as surplus while moving the outdoor rinks to the main site.
- Sage Creek: GCWCC will continue to work with the City of Winnipeg to plan for a good-sized neighbourhood community centre in this new subdivision.
- South St. Vital: GCWCC will work with the City of Winnipeg to plan for a good-sized neighbourhood community centre in this area should long-range population growth predictions be realized.
- Southdale CC: Southdale could be expanded, focusing primarily on two priorities, the need for a second arena and a full size gymnasium.
- Waverly West: GCWCC will continue to work with the City of Winnipeg to plan for a District community centre in this new subdivision.
- Winakwa CC: Winakwa could be expanded to include a full-size gym, change rooms, and second floor hall/viewing area.

H. MOVING FORWARD ON SCENARIOS

All of the above proposals are important; however, some may move forward before others. The GCWCC Board of Directors has short-listed eleven proposals, recognizing that, although there are issues to be resolved within each, these issues could be addressed in a relatively short timeframe.

- Silver Heights CC/Sturgeon Creek CC amalgamation
- Winakwa CC Expansion
- Linden Woods CC Expansion
- Park City West CC Expansion
- Southdale CC Expansion
- Whyte Ridge CC Expansion
- Dakota CC Expansion
- Varsity View CC Consolidation and Expansion
- Weston Memorial CC Expansion
- Oxford Heights CC Expansion
- East End CC Expansion

It should be noted that GCWCC will continue to work with Community Centres to further develop and define the remaining proposals.

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested. This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases. GCWCC and the

City of Winnipeg will continue to work together with Community Centres to develop these proposals.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres. This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (e.g. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

Reviewing Boundaries

When any of the scenarios becomes a real project, it may be necessary for the GCWCC to undertake a boundary review in light of the changes to facilities (closures, mergers, expansions) or in response to population growth and the addition of a new facility.



Please see our website at www.gcwcc.mb.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 2

CITY CENTRE DISTRICT PLAN



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

FINAL - MARCH 11, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

CITY CENTRE DISTRICT PLAN

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. Direction and Parameters **7**
1. Plan 2025 7
2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy 7
3. The Starting Point 7
4. The Planning Model 8
5. People Overview 8
6. Programs Overview 8
7. Facilities Overview 9
8. The Vision 9
9. District Plans 9

B. Current Situation **10**
1. City Centre District and Neighbourhood Clusters 10
2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities 14
3. Demographic Make-up 16
4. Overview of Current Programs 19
5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers 21
6. Overview of Current Facilities 23
7. Current Issues and Concerns 26

C. Needs Assessment **29**
1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025 29
2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term 30
3. Assessing Future Needs 32

D. Moving Forward **33**
1. Defining Success 33
2. Planning Limitations 36
3. Planning Strategies 37
4. Past and Current Project Proposals 40
5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios 41
6. Moving Forward on Scenarios 45
7. Addressing Overall Priorities 46

Appendix **48**

List of Maps

Map 1:	District and Cluster Boundaries	10
Map 2:	Community Centres	11
Map 3:	City-Managed Facilities	12
Map 4:	Combined Community Centres and City-Managed Facilities	13
Map 5:	Growth Areas for the District	31
Map 6:	Potential Development Scenarios to 2025	43

List of Tables

Table 1:	All Recreation and Leisure Facilities (as of 2005)	14
Table 2:	Demographic Overview 2001 and 2006	16
Table 3:	Summary of Community Centre Programs	19
Table 4:	Summary of Community Centre Volunteers	21
Table 5:	Summary of Community Centre Staff	22
Table 6:	Facility Condition and Preservation Needs (as of 2004)	24
Table 7:	Summary of Community Centre Amenities	25
Table 8:	Space to Population Ratios	26
Table 9:	Estimated Growth to 2025 – All Districts	29
Table 10:	Amount of Space to Plan For to 2025 by District	36

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio
CCB – Community Centres Board

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of a Planning Committee established by the Community Centre Board for District 1: City Centre.

KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
CITY CENTRE DISTRICT PLAN

Executive Summary

Current Recreation Space

The City Centre District is served by 15 community centres, including one indoor arena. One of these centres also operates two satellite facilities. In total, there are 18 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As well, there are 6 city governed facilities that provide complementary services in the District.

In total, there is approximately 260,000 sq ft of recreation space to serve a population of nearly 150,000 which amounts to 1.74 sq ft per person. With the city average being 1.88 sq ft of recreation space per person, the City Centre District overall has access to less space than other areas of the city.

Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents in River Heights East have access to more space than do residents elsewhere in the District. Residents in Downtown East and Fort Garry North have the least amount of space, relative to other areas of the District.

Demographics

Generally, the District exhibits very different demographic characteristics for the area north of the Assiniboine River versus the area south of the Assiniboine. These differences would need to be reflected in the programs offered to those residents.

Within the District, Downtown East stands out as the area of greatest need with low education, high unemployment, low household income, and high lone parent families. It is served by two city-run facilities and no community centres.

All the older neighbourhoods (Downtown East and West and River Heights East and West) have experienced a population loss over the past two decades. Meanwhile, Fort Garry North, with its suburban neighbourhoods, has grown significantly.

Programs

The District overall appears to be considerably better programmed, in terms of hours of offerings, relative to the rest of the city. With 0.30 hours per capita, only River Heights East is below the city average of 0.33 and that cluster is supported by the Fort Rouge Leisure Centre (which is not included in the numbers).

Most centres strive to provide a range of programs offering something for all user groups. Overall, the District provides a better balance of programs compared to other Districts.

Staff and Volunteers

The District overall has the same level of volunteer support as the city average, however River Heights West and Downtown West are significantly higher than average and River Heights East is considerably lower.

From a staffing perspective, River Heights West dominates with a wide variety of full-time, part-time, casual, and seasonal staff. Overall, River Heights CC and Valour CC are the best supported centres in terms of staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest amount of programming hours. Two centres, Lord Roberts and Westridge, operate with no staff support at all.

Facilities

Overall, facilities in the City Centre District 1 are in about the same state of repair as the city average which means that approximately one third of the replacement value of the facilities needs to be invested to get them into decent condition.

There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District, however, Fort Garry North does not have a gym and all of its facilities are considerably smaller in size compared to those in the rest of the District. Downtown West appears to have the best balance and range of amenities.

Relative to other areas of the city, the City Centre District has less space per capita although, within the District, the highest needs area is relatively well served. There is a portion of the central population however that needs to be recognized and accommodated.

Growth and Its Impact

It is possible that City Centre could increase in population by more than 13,000 to the year 2025. The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.

The Kapyong Barracks redevelopment will provide the greatest single source of concentrated new growth which could result in close to 3,000 new residents in an area that straddles two Districts (City Centre and St. James Assiniboia).

The remaining anticipated growth is quite speculative and hinges more on public policy than population influx, that is, it hinges upon a commitment to inner city intensification and the introduction of rapid transit along Pembina Highway.

As the population grows and changes, it will be important to introduce programs for the whole community, programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community, recognizing that children and youth programming will remain the primary area of emphasis.

Having adequate resources is a prime driver for change, in terms of volunteers, staff, and funds for ongoing operations, maintenance, and program development.

Vision

The community centre model of the future should continue to have a combination of small local centres, mid-size neighbourhood centres, and large district centres. The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing.

It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space. Respecting this goal, plans for the City Centre District to 2025 can add space to correct current imbalances while also adding additional space to accommodate anticipated growth. This amounts to an additional 46,000 sq ft of new space.

Development Scenarios

Already approved or under way (since 2005)*:*

Valour Community Centre: Isaac Brock CC gave up its Minto satellite site and transferred the square footage to their main site. Construction is underway for the addition of a full size gym and the complete renovation of the main floor. Meanwhile, the Boards of Clifton, Isaac Brock, and Orioles have amalgamated under the name of Valour CC.

Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex: Construction began in 2007 on the Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex, an expansion of the former Sargent Park Recreation Complex. Once complete, the renovated complex will contain several building improvements including a running track and fitness centre, an addition to the existing indoor pool area, and a new West End Library.

Potential new developments*:*

Additional City-run Space in Downtown East: A specific development project has not been defined but there is a recognition that additional space should be provided by the City of Winnipeg to serve the residents in Downtown East.

River Heights Review: A new model of operation may be developed for Sir John Franklin, River Heights, and Crescentwood, with the potential to redevelop/reconfigure one or more of the facilities and to share governance and programming.

Fort Garry Review: A new model of operation may be developed for Victoria, Wildwood, Fort Garry, and Westridge, with the potential to redevelop/replace/expand one or more of the facilities to better meet community needs and to share governance and programming.

Mayfair Recreation Centre Expansion and Governance Review: There is a recognition that additional space should be provided to serve the residents of this high needs area. It may be possible to have the facility operate as a satellite of the River Osborne CC.

Linden Woods Expansion: This project will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Whyte Ridge expansion to determine how best to introduce more multi-purpose space including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

Whyte Ridge Expansion: This project will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Linden Woods expansion to determine how best to introduce more multi-purpose space including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

NOTE: The development scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.

GCWCC Plan 2025
CITY CENTRE DISTRICT PLAN

A. Direction and Parameters

This section generally repeats the Executive Summary of the Plan 2025 Phase 1 report. For a more detailed explanation of the Direction and Parameters provided to this plan, refer to the report. It can be found on the GCWCC web site at www.gcwcc.mb.ca.

1. Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system was unsustainable. The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

3. The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005. Therefore, 2005 serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of recreation space using the 'heated square footage' definition.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres, facilities which are very similar to community centres in terms of nature of programs delivered to the community. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of recreation space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

4. The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



5. People Overview

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, specifically, 25.6 versus 39.2 as of 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500 will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by District 2 with 20%, and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

6. Programs Overview

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging, from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listings and third party agreements.

7. Facilities Overview

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of fewer than 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

8. The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

9. District Plans

This District Plan contains:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC reflective of Phase One of Plan 2025.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, recreation programs offered, volunteer support provided, and community centre facilities.
- A summary of issues and concerns identified by community centre representatives.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- A series of strategies to address the needs over the long term.
- An overview of scenarios showing how changes could manifest themselves over time through possible expansions, mergers, closures, and the construction of new facilities.
- A short list of projects deemed to be of highest priority in meeting community needs.
- Selected strategies to address the most critical issues and concerns.
- An action plan to guide decision-making over the short term.

B. Current Situation

1. City Centre District and Neighbourhood Clusters

The City Centre District, or District 1, covers an area that straddles both sides of the Assiniboine River, west of the Red River. It is bounded roughly by Kenaston Boulevard (Route 90) to the west, Notre Dame to the north, the Red River to the east, and Bishop Grandin Boulevard to the south. The District is generally (but not exactly) aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political boundaries that make up the City Centre Community Committee.

The reason for the differences is that the Community Centre District must consider appropriate catchment areas around each of its community centres to ensure residents are well served while the political boundaries have more to do with the even distribution of population by ward. Even so, efforts have been made to keep the community centre boundaries as consistent as possible with political boundaries.

For research purposes the District has been split into five areas called neighbourhood clusters. These units are used because socio-economic information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster. The clusters include Downtown West and Downtown East, both situated north of the Assiniboine, River Heights West and River Heights East, both situated immediately south of the Assiniboine, and Fort Garry North which extends from Wilkes to Bishop Grandin.

It should be noted that only about one third of the Downtown East cluster falls within the City Centre District. Much of the remaining portion of the cluster falls within District 3, with a small portion of the cluster remaining unallocated. As well, a portion of the Downtown West cluster is allocated to District 3 as part of the catchment area for the Burton Cummings Community Centre.

Map 1 shows the boundaries of the District together with the neighbourhood cluster area.

Map 1: District Boundaries And Cluster Areas





Map 2 - District 1: City Centre
Community Centres - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- District 1 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 3 - District 1: City Centre
Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 1 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- Rivers

RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 4 - District 1: City Centre
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 1 - Community Centre Boundary
- Community Centre Catchment Boundary
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre
RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008

2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities

The previous **Maps 2, 3, and 4** show the distribution of Community Centres, the distribution of City-Managed Facilities, and the combined distribution of all facilities.

Table 1 provides the list of all facilities for the District by neighbourhood cluster as of 2005 (the starting point for the plan).

Table 1: ALLRECREATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (as of 2005)

Cluster	Type	Facility Name	Heated Sq Ft
Downtown West 2 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 31,868*	Community Centre	Isaac Brock ✦	12,537
	Satellite	Minto site ✦	2,141
	Community Centre	Clifton ✦	9,403
	Community Centre	Orioles ✦	14,033
	Community Centre	Robert A. Steen	20,566
		Total Community Centres	58,680
	Recreation Centre	Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex	7,136
		Total City-Managed Facilities	7,136
		Total for Cluster	**65,816**
Downtown East 0 community centres 2 recreation centres Pop: 21,025*		Total Community Centres	0
	Recreation Centre	Magnus Elias Recreation Complex	8,500
	Recreation Centre	Broadway Neighbourhood Centre	11,530
		Total City-Managed Facilities	20,030
		Total for Cluster	**20,030**
River Heights West 4 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop: 34,335	Community Centre	Sir John Franklin	14,290
	Community Centre	River Heights	15,647
	Arena	River Heights Arena	3,576
	Community Centre	Crescentwood	14,722
	Community Centre	Earl Grey	17,878
		Total Community Centres	66,113
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**66,113**
River Heights East 3 community centres 3 recreation centre Pop: 21,930	Community Centre	River Osborne	10,664
	Community Centre	Lord Roberts	16,513
	Community Centre	Riverview	15,970
		Total Community Centres	43,147
	Recreation Centre	Mayfair Recreation Centre	1,569
	Recreation Centre	Block Parents	2,281
	Recreation Centre	Fort Rouge Leisure Centre	25,615
		Total City-Managed Facilities	29,465
		Total for Cluster	**72,612**
Fort Garry North 6 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop: 35,930	Community Centre	Victoria-Linden Woods	8,756
	Satellite	Linden Woods site ✦	4,479
	Community Centre	Westridge	5,613
	Satellite	Whyteridge site ✦	4,834
	Community Centre	Fort Garry	8,376
	Community Centre	Wildwood	4,210
		Total Community Centres	36,268
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**36,268**
District 1 City Centre 15 community centres 6 recreation centres Pop: 149,600**	**19 cc facilities**	**District 1 Community Centre Sub-Total**	**204,208**
	6 city-run facilities	**District 1 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total**	**56,631**
	25 facilities	**DISTRICT 1 TOTAL**	**260,839**

Source: GCWCC and City of Winnipeg
** The pop of these clusters has been adjusted to reflect the portion of the cluster that lies within the District.*
*** The District population is different than the sum of each cluster because of an adjustment made based on the Census undercount as determined by Statistics Canada.*
✦ Facilities have changed since 2005. See Note on following page.

NOTE: The list of city-run facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively consistent with what is provided by community centres. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas. The combined list represents all those facilities that are subject to the restriction imposed by the RLLF policy.

NOTE: Table 1 lists all facilities as of 2005, the starting point for this plan because it was the point in time when the RLLF policy was adopted. Since that time, Clifton, Isaac Brock and Orioles Community Centres have chosen to merge their Boards to become Valour Community Centre. Their Minto satellite site has been declared surplus to the community centre inventory, allowing Isaac Brock to add on a regulation size gymnasium. There is no impact on the District's square footage total.

Also, since 2005, Victoria-Linden Woods CC has separated to become two distinct centres, Victoria CC and Linden Woods CC (no impact to square footage). Likewise, Westridge CC and its satellite Whyteridge have separated to become two distinct centres: Westridge CC and Whyteridge CC. (No impact on square footage.)

The Cindy Klassen Recreation Centre has also undergone an expansion since 2005. This project was approved prior to the RLLF policy so the resulting increase in square footage was not restricted.

As of 2005, City Centre was served by 15 community centres. Three of these centres also ran satellite facilities. Another centre operates an indoor arena. In total, there were 19 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As with other parts of the city, the District is also served through a number of city-run facilities that, for all intents and purposes, are similar to community centres in the services they provide, but for historical reasons have evolved through into a system of split jurisdiction. To properly plan for the needs of the District, these city-run facilities need to be considered alongside the community centres. There are 6 of these facilities in the District.

Table 1 shows the City Centre District is served by approximately 260,000 sq ft of combined recreation space. As shown in the first column of the table, the population as of 2005 is estimated to be 149,600 for the District with breakdowns by cluster. This translates into a ratio of combined recreation space per person or Space to Population Ratio (SPR) as follows:

Downtown West:	2.06 square feet per person
Downtown East:	0.95 square feet per person
River Heights West:	1.93 square feet per person
River Heights East:	3.31 square feet per person
Fort Garry North:	1.01 square feet per person
City Centre District:	**1.74 square feet per person**
City Average:	**1.88 square feet per person**

Main Points

- *Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of River Heights East have access to considerably more space than do residents elsewhere in the District with 3.31 sq ft per person.*

- *Downtown East, with but two City-run recreation centres and no community centres, is the least well served at 0.95 sq ft per person. While this is not a large geographical area, it is one of the most densely populated areas of the City. Fort Garry North, at 1.01 sq ft per person, is also well below the other clusters by a considerable margin. It is the cluster that has experienced the most growth over the past couple decades.*
- *With the city average being 1.88 square feet of combined recreation space per person, the City Centre District overall has access to somewhat less space than other areas of the city with 1.74 sq ft per person on average.*

3. Demographic Make-up

Table 2 provides an overview of the demographic make-up of the District using selected information from the 2001 Census as provided by the City of Winnipeg together with 2006 Census derived from Statistics Canada information currently available on their website.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW 2001 and 2006

2001 Census Info	Downtown West	Downtown East	River Heights West	River Heights East	Fort Garry North	CITY
Total Population	35,500	28,840	34,370	21,865	27,325	619,544
Population Change 86-01	-8.3%	-7.1%	-8.7%	-5.4%	+73.1%	+4.2%
Children 5-19	19.8%	13.8%	16.7%	11.2%	21.5%	19.8%
Seniors 55+	19.1%	20.7%	24.8%	23.9%	20.4%	22.1%
Aboriginal Identity	12.7%	22.5%	3.3%	7.3%	2.5%	8.6%
Immigrant	28.3%	28.9%	14.2%	15.2%	14.9%	17.3%
Married & Common Law	39.8%	23.3%	47.4%	31.6%	59.1%	48.8%
Hold University Degree	16.3%	15.5%	34.9%	29.6%	32.3%	18.3%
Unemployment	8.0%	10.6%	4.3%	6.3%	4.6%	5.7%
Low Income Households	30.3%	52.6%	15.3%	27.8%	8.9%	20.3%
Average Household Income	$39,757	$27,122	$62,196	$45,194	$73,528	$53,176
Household Size	2.4	1.7	2.2	1.8	2.6	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	57%-43%	13%-87%	68%-32%	39%-61%	78%-22%	64%-36%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	53.1%	33.7%	57.2%	43.8%	56.2%	57.7%

2006 Census Info	Downtown West	Downtown East	River Heights West	River Heights East	Fort Garry North	CITY
Total Population	35,110	29,390	34,335	21,930	35,930	633,451
Population Change 01-06	-1.1%	+1.9%	-0.1%	+0.3%	+31.5%	+2.2%
Children 5-19	18.9%	14.0%	16.3%	11.7%	21.7%	19.0%
Seniors 55+	21.3%	22.1%	28.2%	26.7%	22.1%	25.2%
Aboriginal Identity	13.5%	21.3%	4.7%	9.6%	3.2%	10.1%
Immigrant	27.9%	29.9%	15.0%	15.0%	19.3%	18.4%
Married & Common Law	38.3%	26.4%	44.2%	37.2%	50.2%	44.4%
Lone Parent Families	26.6%	35.6%	16.9%	22.6%	10.4%	19.5%
Household Size	2.4	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.7	2.4
Tenure – Own vs. Rent	61%-39%	13%-87%	64%-36%	41%-59%	79%-21%	65%-35%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	51.8%	31.2%	52.4%	43.8%	47.5%	55.2%

Source: City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada

From these data, a few observations can be made:

Population Change

Four of the clusters, Downtown East and West and River Heights East and West, experienced considerable population loss over the fifteen years from 1986-2001, roughly half a percent per year. However, the most recent 5 year period, from 2001-06, indicates that the population has generally stabilized. Meanwhile, Fort Garry North, which includes the suburban areas of Lindenwoods and Whyteridge, has shown a dramatically different trend with over 100% growth in the twenty year period from 86-06. Over that same 20 year period, the city overall grew by 6.6%. Both those neighbourhoods are now virtually built up so the pattern of rapid growth is likely over.

Children, Seniors, and Household Size

Looking at the 2006 information, the number of seniors (55+) is lower than the city average of 25.2% in the Downtown clusters and in Fort Garry North and slightly higher than average in both River Heights clusters. But all clusters show an increased number of seniors from 2001, following the aging trend for the city overall. The number of children aged 5-19 is close to the city average in Downtown West and above the city average in Fort Garry North. However, River Heights East at 11.7% and Downtown East at 14.0% show a significantly lower number of children than the city average of 19.0%. Fewer children in these areas are reflected as well in the household size which sits at 2.0 and 1.9 in Downtown East and River Heights East respectively as compared to 2.4 for the city. Fort Garry North, meanwhile, has the largest average household size at 2.7.

Aboriginals and Immigrants

Looking at the most recent data (2006), the Downtown East cluster shows double the city average for people of aboriginal identify (21.3% compared to 10.1%). Meanwhile, River Heights West and Fort Garry North, at 4.7% and 3.2% respectively, have the lowest aboriginal representation. The immigrant population is slightly above city average in Fort Garry North and considerably higher than average in Downtown East and West. The Downtown East cluster is the most diversified cluster with approximately half its population comprised of immigrants or aboriginals. River Heights West is the least diversified with less than 20% of its population from these two groups, a pattern that is consistent with what it was in 2001. In all clusters, the number of immigrants and aboriginals is higher than it was in 2001, reflecting a trend toward an increasingly diversified community. For Winnipeg, the combined number has increased from 25.9% in 2001 to 28.5% in 2006.

Education

While the 2006 figures for education were not yet available, the 2001 figures show a distinct pattern of lower than average education (that is, fewer numbers of people with university degrees) north of the river (16.3% for Downtown West and 15.5% for Downtown East) and higher than average education south of the river (34.9% for River Heights West, 29.6% in River Heights East, and 32.3% in Fort Garry North) when compared to the city overall at 18.3%.

Employment, Income, and Need

Again, using 2001 numbers because 2006 were not yet released, the two Downtown clusters are considerably higher than the city average in terms of unemployment (8.0% and 10.6% versus 5.7% for the city). The River Heights East cluster is also above the city average at 6.3% while the remaining two clusters are modestly below the city average. There is a large variation in household income across the District, ranging from a low of $27,122 in Downtown East to nearly triple that in Fort Garry North at $73,538. It is not surprising then, to see that over half of the households in Downtown East (52.6%) are identified as low income while Fort Garry North, at 8.9% of households, sits at less than half the city average of 20.3%.

Tenure and Mobility

Across the city, approximately two thirds of the population own their home while one third rent. Home ownership provides some insight into neighbourhood stability. The numbers overall have been quite consistent from 2001 to 2006. Fort Garry North has the greatest percentage of home owners at 79% while Downtown East, at 13%, has the fewest home owners by far. This pattern is reinforced by the number of people who have not moved in the past 5 years. The city average is 55% but only 31.2% of those on Downtown East did not move over the last 5 years. None of the clusters is above the city average, representing a considerably mobile population.

Main Points

- *Generally, the District exhibits very different demographic characteristics for the two clusters north of the Assiniboine versus the three clusters south of the Assiniboine. These differences would need to be reflected in the programs offered to those residents.*
- *Among clusters, Downtown East stands out as the area of greatest need with low education, high unemployment, low household income, and high lone parent families. It is served by two city-run facilities and no community centres (see Note below).*
- *All the older neighbourhoods (both Downtown clusters and both River Heights clusters) have experienced a population loss over the past two decades. Meanwhile, Fort Garry North with its suburban neighbourhoods has grown significantly.*
- *The distribution of aboriginals, new immigrants, children, and seniors varies considerably throughout the District. Each area, perhaps even each centre, may need to tailor its programs accordingly.*

NOTE:
The portion of the Downtown East cluster that lies within District 1 is served by two City-run facilities and has no community centres. Consequently, the remaining analysis will focus on the other four where information regarding community centres is available. Downtown East will nonetheless be considered later in the report in terms of future planning.

4. Overview of Current Programs

Table 3 provides a summary of programming hours and programs provided by each centre based upon information provided by the community centres themselves. [While efforts are made to ensure consistency in reporting, some discrepancies may still exist.]

Combined, the 15 community centres in the District provide 362 programs encompassing over 57,000 hours of recreation programming. This ranges widely from 197 programming hours provided through Wildwood Community Centre to 13,312 programming hours provided through the Valour Community Centre (including both its satellites).

In relation to population, the number of program hours per person works out to be:

Downtown West:	0.59 hours per person
River Heights West:	0.53 hours per person
River Heights East:	0.30 hours per person
Fort Garry North:	0.40 hours per person
City Centre District:	**0.45 hours per person**
City Average:	**0.33 hours per person**

Table 3: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAMS

Facility	Program Hours	No. of Programs	Breakdown of Programs: Pre-School	Children/ Youth	Adults	Seniors	Special Events And Services
Downtown West* Pop: 31,868							
Valour	13,312	29	2	16	5	1	5
Robert A. Steen	5,152	36	4	15	9	3	5
Total for Cluster	**18,464**	**65**	**6**	**31**	**14**	**4**	**10**
River Heights West Pop: 34,335							
Sir John Franklin	1,862	18	1	8	3	-	6
River Heights	8,360	31	4	17	2	6	2
Crescentwood	4,570	65	7	16	11	10	21
Earl Grey	3,459	41	5	24	3	4	5
Total for Cluster	**18,251**	**155**	**17**	**65**	**19**	**20**	**34**
River Heights East Pop: 21,930							
River Osborne	697	11	1	7	3	-	-
Lord Roberts	1,520	16	2	12	2	-	-
Riverview	4,269	21	1	8	4	1	7
Total for Cluster	**6,486**	**48**	**4**	**27**	**9**	**1**	**7**
Fort Garry North Pop: 35,930							
Linden Woods	4,693	18	2	8	5	1	2
Victoria	1,114	15	1	8	1	2	3
Westridge	5,357	20	1	10	6	-	3
Whyteridge*							
Fort Garry	2,855	29	1	14	7	3	4
Wildwood	197	12	1	4	1	-	6
Total for Cluster	**14,216**	**94**	**6**	**44**	**20**	**6**	**18**
District 1 City Centre Pop: 126,600**	**57,417**	**362**	33 9%	167 46%	62 17%	31 9%	69 19%

*Source: Community Centre Profiles * The figure for Whyteridge is included in Westridge. ** Does not include Downtown East population.*

It would appear that the District overall provides considerably more hours of programming per capita than the city average. However, among clusters, Downtown West and River Heights West provide considerably more programming than River Heights East and Fort Garry North. It is important to note that programs tend to be delivered based upon staff and financial resources and that facility limitations often hamper the delivery of specific programs.

Within the District, the greatest emphasis is on children and youth programming with 167 of the 362 programs (46%) dedicated to that age group. This is somewhat lower than other parts of the city which tend to direct 50-60% of programs toward children and youth. This would indicate a greater diversity of programs in this District. Sixty-two programs (17%) are directed toward adults while another 31 programs (9%) are available to seniors. Another 33 programs (10%) are for preschoolers. Almost one fifth (69 or 19%) are special events.

River Heights West offers the most number of programs (155) with good coverage across all user groups. River Heights East offers the least number of programs, 48, with but one directed toward seniors. However, the City-run Fort Rouge Leisure Centre sits in the middle of this cluster and offers a wide variety of programs to complement those run from community centres.

Looking more closely at individual centres, Crescentwood not only provides the most number of programs at 65, but provides a well balanced set of programs serving all user groups with multiple program opportunities. Valour CC reports the most programming hours (13,312); however their hours per facility (Clifton, Orioles and Isaac Brock) are in line with the other centres in District 1.

Many centres place considerable effort on the provision of special events. Special events can be important because they tend to attract a broader base of participants. In particular, having events for the entire family has a positive impact on the operations of the centres, facilitating the recruitment of volunteers among other benefits.

Among centres, Wildwood stands out – not so much because of the number of programs it offers (12) but because of the very small amount of overall programming (197 hours).

Main Points

- *The District overall appears to be considerably better programmed, in terms of hours of offerings, relative to the rest of the city. With 0.30 hours per capita, only River Heights East is below the city average of 0.33 and that cluster is supported by the Fort Rouge Leisure Centre.*
- *Most centres strive to provide a range of programs offering something for all user groups. Overall, the District provides a better balance of programs compared to other Districts.*
- *It would appear that Wildwood provides significantly less programming than other centres in the District.*

5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers

Table 4 provides an estimate of the number of volunteer hours and number of volunteers.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE VOLUNTEERS

Cluster	Facility Name	Volunteer Hours	Number of Volunteers
Downtown West 2 community centres population 31,868	Valour	15,000	
	Robert A. Steen	29,200	
	Total for Cluster	**44,200**	**360 (est.)**
River Heights West 4 community centres population 34,335	Sir John Franklin	21,900	
	River Heights	19,300	
	Crescentwood	24,000	
	Earl Grey	22,800	
	Total for Cluster	**88,000**	**720 (est.)**
River Heights East 3 community centres population 21,930	River Osborne	800	
	Lord Roberts	5,900	
	Riverview	8,500	
	Total for Cluster	**15,200**	**120 (est.)**
Fort Garry North 6 community centres population 35,930	Linden Woods	17,200	
	Victoria	4,400	
	Westridge	46,200	
	Whyte Ridge*	-	
	Fort Garry	20,600	
	Wildwood	1,600	
	Total for Cluster	**90,000**	**740 (est.)**
District 1 City Centre 15 community centres	**Population 126,600**	**237,400**	**1,940 (est.)**

Source: Community Centre Profiles and derivation from national averages on volunteerism.
** The figure for Whyteridge is included in Westridge.*

NOTE: The volunteer hours have been provided by the individual community centres and not all centres monitor this information with the same degree of accuracy. The number of volunteers is a rough estimate based upon the fact that, on average, each volunteer in Canada commits 122 hours of their time. Given the range of potential error, these figures should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude only.

It is estimated that the District overall is served by nearly 2,000 volunteers committing over 237,000 hours of time to the community centre system.

In relation to the resident population, the number of volunteer hours works out to be:

Downtown West:	1.4 hours per person
River Heights West:	2.6 hours per person
River Heights East:	0.7 hours per person
Fort Garry North:	2.5 hours per person
City Centre District:	**1.9 hours per person**
City Average:	**1.9 hours per capita**

The City Centre District is supported by approximately 1.9 volunteer hours per person which matches the community centre system city-wide. The pattern city-wide is one of higher support (approximately 2.3 hours per person) in the suburban areas versus

approximately 1.5 hours per person in the inner city. The City Centre District is reasonably consistent with this pattern.

Within the District, River Heights West and Fort Garry North appear to be well supported having the greatest number of volunteer hours in relation to the population they serve. Downtown West is less well served but not too far from the city average. River Heights East is the least well served. Volunteerism appears to be a challenge in this cluster. River Osborne CC, in particular, appears to have little volunteer support.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE STAFF

Cluster	Facility Name	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Green Team, etc	Seasonal
Downtown West 2 community centres population 31,868	Valour	2	19	-	2	-
	Robert A. Steen	1	2	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**3**	**21**	**0**	**2**	**0**
River Heights West 4 community centres population 34,335	Sir John Franklin	-	3	-	1	-
	River Heights	4	4	30	-	10
	Crescentwood	3	3	-	8	1
	Earl Grey	1	4	2	3	-
	Total for Cluster	**8**	**14**	**32**	**12**	**11**
River Heights East 3 community centres population 21,930	River Osborne	1	5	-	1	-
	Lord Roberts	-	-	-	-	-
	Riverview	1	1	5	2	-
	Total for Cluster	**2**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**0**
Fort Garry North 6 community centres population 35,930	Linden Woods	-	-	-	1	7
	Victoria	-	-	-	-	3
	Westridge	-	-	-	-	-
	Whyte Ridge	-	1	-	-	-
	Fort Garry	-	5	-	1	6
	Wildwood	-	-	-	1	1
	Total for Cluster	**0**	**6**	**0**	**3**	**17**
District 1 City Centre 15 community centres	**Population 126,600**	**13**	**47**	**37**	**20**	**28**

Source: Community Centre Profiles

As shown in **Table 5**, from a staffing perspective community centres in the River Heights West and Downtown West clusters have the largest and most comprehensive range of staff. This is consistent with these clusters offering the greatest amount of program hours. Fort Garry North, meanwhile, with its small facilities, has very few staff yet manages to deliver over 14,000 hours of programming. Westridge is entirely operated by volunteers as is Lord Roberts, although Lord Roberts lies within River Heights East where sustaining volunteers appears to be a significant challenge.

Main Points

- *The District overall has the same level of volunteer support as the city average, however River Heights West and Downtown West are significantly higher than average and River Heights East is considerably lower.*
- *From a staffing perspective, the River Heights West cluster dominates with a wide variety of full-time, part-time, casual, and seasonal staff.*

- *Overall, River Heights CC and Valour CC are the best supported centres in terms of staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest amount of programming hours.*
- *Two centres, Lord Roberts and Westridge, operate with no staff support at all.*

6. Overview of Current Facilities

In 2004, a comprehensive study of recreation facilities in Winnipeg evaluated each of the City's recreation facilities in terms of their overall condition using what was called a Facility Condition Index or FCI. The FCI represented the amount of money it would have taken to get the facility to an average level of upkeep. This amount was provided in relation to the replacement cost of the facility so the lower the number the better. An FCI of .50, then, meant that an investment of 50% of the replacement cost of the facility was needed at that time to get the facility into respectable condition. If that investment had been made, then an ongoing average maintenance program would have been able to keep it in that condition.

Table 6 shows the FCI rating for the District's facilities. It also translates the FCI into a dollar figure identified as the preservation need (as of 2004). The FCI of 0.34 indicates that the District's community centres overall are exactly on par with the city average for community centres which also sits at 0.34. The six City-run facilities are in somewhat worse shape, with an FCI of 0.43. As of 2004, the preservation funds needed were identified at nearly $10 M for both sets of facilities combined. Such an investment at that time would have brought the facilities up to reasonable condition.

Among the community centre facilities, one stands out. The Victoria Community Centre in the Fort Garry North cluster has a preservation need nearly equal to its replacement value. This suggests that it would almost be more cost effective to demolish and replace the facility rather than tend to the major repairs that are required.

With an average FCI of 0.49, the Fort Garry cluster, overall, appears to have the greatest need for investment with all six of its centres having an FCI over 0.30. This point appears to have been recognized. Since the time of PUFS, each of these facilities has experienced some measure of investment.

Among the centres in the other clusters, Clifton and Sir John Franklin stand out as having relatively high FCIs, both of which have also seen some improvement in recent years.

The city-managed facilities are also in considerable need of investment although it should be noted that a major renovation and expansion is currently underway at the Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex.

NOTE: The assessment provided in Table 6 is now 4 years old and was based upon information that was a few years old at the time. Given that few major capital investments have been made in recent years, there is still merit in the assessment although it is likely that many of the facilities are in worse shape today. Furthermore, the costs would be significantly higher than those presented. The Table should be used simply as representing an order of magnitude of the investment needed and the relative need

among centres and clusters. In some instances investment has taken place leading to an improved facility today. Those facilities have been flagged in Table 6.

Table 6: FACILITY CONDITION AND PRESERVATION NEEDS (as of 2004)

Facility Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	FCI	Preservation Needs ($)
Downtown West				
Community Centre	Valour – Isaac Brock	14,678	0*	0*
Satellite	Valour – Orioles	14,033	0.32	555,000
Satellite	✦Valour – Clifton	9,403	0.43	500,000
Community Centre	Robert A. Steen	20,566	0.17	415,000
Recreation Centre	Cindy Klassen Recreation Centre	7,136	0*	0*
	Total for Cluster	65,816	Avg 0.31	$1,470,000
Downtown East				
Recreation Centre	Magnus Eliason Recreation Centre	8,500	0.14	160,000
Recreation Centre	Broadway Neighbourhood Centre	11,530	0.35	515,000
	Total for Cluster	20,030	Avg. 0.25	$675,000
River Heights West				
Community Centre	✦Sir John Franklin	14,290	0.46	900,000
Community Centre	River Heights	15,647	0.12	275,000
Arena	River Heights Arena	3,576	0.23	700,000
Community Centre	✦Crescentwood	14,722	0.20	365,000
Community Centre	✦Earl Grey	17,878	0.25	415,000
	Total for Cluster	66,113	Avg. 0.25	$2,655,000
River Heights East				
Community Centre	River Osborne	10,664	0.20	265,000
Community Centre	✦Lord Roberts	16,513	0.28	510,000
Community Centre	Riverview	15,970	0.23	355,000
Recreation Centre	Mayfair Recreation Centre	1,569	0.69	137,000
Recreation Centre	Block Parents	2,281	-	-
Recreation Centre	Fort Rouge Leisure Centre	25,615	0.53	1,355,000
	Total for Cluster	72,612	Avg. 0.39	$2,622,000
Fort Garry North				
Community Centre	✦Linden Woods	4,479	0.39	210,000
Community Centre	✦Victoria	8,756	0.91	1,005,000
Community Centre	✦Westridge	5,613	0.44	215,000
Community Centre	✦Whyte Ridge	4,834	0.47	120,000
Community Centre	✦Fort Garry	8,376	0.31	345,000
Community Centre	✦Wildwood	4,210	0.39	215,000
	Total for Cluster	36,268	Avg. 0.49	$2,110,000
18 community centre facilities	District 1 Community Centre Facilities	204,208	Avg. 0.34	$7,365,000
6 city-run facilities	District 1 City-Run Facilities	56,631	Avg. 0.43	$2,167,000
Total: 24 facilities	**District 1 All Facilities**	**260,839**	**Avg. 0.36**	**$9,532,000**

Source: City of Winnipeg
** Facility is currently under renovation, expansion, or reconstruction.*
✦ Facilities where improvements have been made since 2004 which has had an impact on the FCI rating.

Table 7 itemizes the amenities that can be found in the District's community centres. This list makes clear some of the pressures they face. Fort Garry North's facilities, for example, are all well under 10,000 square feet and are therefore quite limited in the spaces available for programming. With no gyms at any of its facilities, the only alternative is to forge partnerships with the school division for gym access. It becomes evident that the larger facilities found in the other clusters are able to provide a greater range of amenities.

Downtown West, particularly the portion that lies north of Portage Avenue, serves a higher needs population and appears to be reasonably well equipped to do so with a considerable variety of amenities spread among their three facilities.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE AMENITIES

Facility Name	Board Room	Computer Rm / Office	Canteen	Kitchen	Nursery School Area	Games Room	Gym (cap)	Hall (cap)	MPR (cap)	Indoor Arena	Other
Downtown West											
Valour*	2	4	3	3	-	-	3	1	4	-	music room
Robert A. Steen	-	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	-	5 mtg rooms
Total for Cluster	**2**	**7**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**5**	**-**	
River Heights West											
Sir John Franklin	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
River Heights	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	
Crescentwood	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	
Earl Grey	1	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	1	-	1 mtg room
Total for Cluster	**4**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**1**	
River Heights East											
River Osborne	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	
Lord Roberts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	dance room youth lounge
Riverview	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	rifle range
Total for Cluster	**1**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**0**	
Fort Garry North											
Linden Woods	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
Victoria	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Westridge	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	
Whyte Ridge	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	
Fort Garry	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
Wildwood	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	
Total for Cluster	**1**	**3**	**6**	**5**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**5**	**0**	
Total for District	**8**	**18**	**17**	**17**	**6**	**8**	**7**	**10**	**17**	**1**	

Source: Community Centre Profiles
** Valour is currently under construction with a new regulation-size gym being added (included in the numbers)*

Shown in **Table 8** are the Space to Population Ratios (SPR). This is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amount of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. This is a relative measure only.

With just over 260,000 square feet of space for a population of nearly 150,000 people or 1.74 sq ft per person, District 1 has less recreation space per person than the city average of 1.88 square feet, a figure that includes both community centre space and city-run recreation facilities. Within the District, River Heights East at 3.31 has a considerably higher SPR than the other clusters although this includes the Fort Rouge Leisure Centre which due to its size and amenities, likely serves a broader population than the local neighbourhoods identified as comprising the cluster.

Downtown East at 0.95 square feet per person has the lowest SPR of the five clusters; however, this includes the population of Central Park and South Broadway. These two neighbourhoods are found in the centre of the Downtown East cluster. Neither neighbourhood is allocated within the community centre model, that is, the neighbourhoods lie between District 1 and District 3 yet are attached to neither. To properly account for the entire population they are considered in this plan to be affiliated with the portion of the Downtown East cluster that lies within District 1.

Fort Garry North at 1.01 also has a relatively low SPR. This cluster has captured the bulk of the District's growth over the past couple decades, growing by over 100% since 1986, and it would appear that the amount of recreation space has not kept pace with the population growth.

Table 8: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS

	Downtown West		Downtown East		River Heights West		River Heights East		Fort Garry North		District 1	
Population	31,868*		21,025*		34,335		21,930		35,930		149,600	
	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR
Community Centre Space	58,680	1.84	0	0.00	66,113	1.93	43,147	1.97	36,268	1.01	204,208	1.37
City-Run Space	7,136	0.22	20,030	0.95	0	0.00	29,465	1.34	0	0	56,631	0.38
Total Space	65,816	2.06	20,030	0.95	66,113	1.93	72,612	3.31	36,268	1.01	260,839	1.74

Source: Derived from previous information.
** Population adjusted to include the full Downtown East cluster population when added to the portion that lies within District 3.*

Main Points

- *Overall, facilities in District 1 are in about the same state of repair as the city average which means that approximately one third of the replacement value of the facilities needs to be invested to get them into decent condition.*
- *There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District with one exception: the Fort Garry North cluster does not have a gym and all of its facilities are considerably smaller in size compared to those in the rest of the District.*
- *Downtown West appears to have the best balance and range of amenities.*
- *Relative to other areas of the city, the City Centre District has less space per capita although, within the District, the highest needs area is relatively well served. There is a portion of the central population however that needs to be recognized and accommodated.*

7. Summary of Current Issues and Concerns

The planning model used in this exercise is one that examines the inter-relationship among people, programs, and facilities with the underlying assumption that one must understand the needs of the people in order to develop relevant programs and, in turn, it is the nature of the programs that will dictate the types of facilities needed. Issues and concerns were identified in all three areas.

***Primary Concern**: Sustainability of the system*

The primary concern overall is the sustainability of the system as a result of insufficient resources. Facilities require many millions of dollars of maintenance investment simply to get them into decent condition. Yet, even with such an investment they would remain functionally obsolete. Additional investment would be needed to convert them into a set of contemporary facilities able to meet the current and future needs of the community. By limiting facility growth, the City's RLLF policy is seen as an inhibitor to this evolution. With functionally obsolete facilities, programming remains stagnant. Furthermore, a lack of resources means that the burden of responsibility falls upon the shoulders of volunteers. Volunteers cannot be counted upon to undertake the program development work required. Access to qualified and skilled staff is needed. The City of Winnipeg must demonstrate leadership if the community centre movement is to progress over coming years.

People

#1: Meeting community needs

The highest priority issue with regard to people is the challenge of meeting community needs. The volunteer-driven model may need to be revisited. Developing and delivering the diversity of programs required by the community is too large a burden to place upon the shoulders of volunteers. And, with changing demographics, this will become more complex and demanding in the future. The demand placed on volunteers makes it difficult to recruit and retain them. What is needed is to have access to more administrative and professional staff either by supporting more paid positions or having greater support provided by City of Winnipeg staff. There may be different service delivery models in different areas.

Furthermore, collaboration between centres needs to be pursued together with a better understanding of, and cooperation with, other service providers. This is difficult for volunteers to do and provides additional reasons for increased staff.

#2: Evolution of the Community Centre movement

The introduction of the City of Winnipeg RLLF policy has placed increased responsibility on community centres to plan for the future. Demographic changes anticipated in the community (aging population, increased immigrants and aboriginals) will create programming challenges. The community centre movement will need to evolve correspondingly. Organizational development and role definition needs to be sorted out.

Programs

#1: Sustainability of programs

Apart from fees, programs are subject to the availability of resources, usually grants and other forms of subsidy that help develop new programs and help keep current programs affordable. These forms of support are often tenuous. Programs need to be addressed from a long-term sustainability perspective looking at ongoing forms of revenue. Funding

support provided by the GCWCC may need to be reviewed. The need to generate revenue through rentals sometimes results in a reduction of community programming.

#2: Increasing the number and accessibility of children's programs

There is a concern that not enough programming is available for children. Small, local centres provide good opportunities for drop-in and unstructured programming and there is value in maintaining a local presence in key areas. The cost of these programs is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Facilities

#1: Shortage of multi-purpose space, especially gyms

Current space is a concern. There is a shortage of multi-purpose space, especially gym space, that provides the flexibility to deliver a wide variety of programs. As well, there is a shortage of storage space and organizational space (board rooms). Investment is needed to develop more contemporary facilities.

#2: Balancing short-term crisis with long-term solutions

Many of the District's facilities are functionally obsolete and do not provide the type or quality of space required to deliver contemporary programs. There is a big challenge in balancing immediate and long-term needs – investing in repairs versus securing resources for reconstructions. Investing in facilities requires a strategic and equitable approach, undertaken with an understanding of the importance of providing preservation funding. With high FCIs, current facilities require many millions of dollars of maintenance investment, but such an investment would simply stop the bleeding, the facilities would still be as functionally obsolete as they are today.

Other concerns

All three levels of government need to be engaged in discussion regarding their support for community centres. More resources are needed in terms of capital costs, maintenance costs, operating costs, and program development costs. There needs to be strong advocacy on behalf of community centres.

Crime and safety are ongoing concerns. Graffiti and other forms of vandalism need to be addressed together with the overall security of buildings and property.

Aging infrastructure is an ongoing concern. Preventative maintenance is needed and there are serious health concerns such as mould associated with open soil conditions in some basements.

The role of community centres in relation to the sport associations needs to be reviewed and clarified. A new partnership and funding relationship may need to be forged.

Accessibility is a concern. On the one hand barrier-free access is a concern particularly in light of an aging society. But accessibility is also important from a convenience point of view. Local walk-up centres are important to encourage access, especially in higher needs areas. Issues of transportation may need to be addressed.

Communication protocols must also be addressed. Community residents can benefit from a better understanding of the community centre system and the important role of volunteers in sustaining the system.

Main Points

- *The community centre system is deemed to be in jeopardy. Sustainability of the system hinges upon increased investment to support program delivery and facility redevelopment. City leadership is necessary.*
- *The ability of community centres to meet the increasingly complex needs of the community through a system that is largely driven by volunteers is the highest priority issue for the District. The burden on volunteers needs to be lessened through the introduction of more paid staff.*
- *Resources to support programs are an ongoing and serious concern. For programs to be effectively developed and delivered, long-term funding needs to be secured.*
- *There is a strong need for contemporary space, in particular, for multi-purpose space, including gym space, that provides the flexibility to deliver a wide variety of programs.*

C. Needs Assessment

1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025

The Phase 1 Report that accompanies this study outlined in some detail the anticipated growth over the next twenty years and the impact of this growth on the City's demographic make-up. In short, Winnipeg is expected to experience significant growth averaging 1% per year after a period of near stagnation over the past decade.

Natural growth in population, that is, birth minus deaths, will account for very little of this growth. The bulk of the growth will be attributable to increases in net migration. It is anticipated that fewer people will leave Winnipeg for ex-urban areas, fewer people will leave the Province for other Provinces, and more international migrants will be coming to the Province, especially to Winnipeg. This latter point is the most significant and is the result of an aggressive campaign on the part of the provincial government to increase international immigration through its Nominee Program.

Table 9: ESTIMATED GROWTH to 2025 – ALL DISTRICTS

	Est. Pop. 2005	Growth Allocation	Est. Pop. Increase	Est. Pop. 2025
District 1: City Centre	149,600	10%	13,650	163,250
District 2: Assiniboia	95,125	20%	27,800	122,925
District 3: Lord Selkirk W Kildonan	136,125	10%	13,150	149,275
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	10%	13,650	128,100
District 5: Riel	152,300	50%	69,250	221,550
Winnipeg	647,600	100%	137,500	785,100

Source: Derived from Stats Can and City of Winnipeg information

As shown in **Table 9**, the population of Winnipeg is expected to grow by 137,500 by 2025. Given the areas in the city where growth can be accommodated, it is expected that approximately 10% of the growth will occur in District 1. This translates into a potential increase of nearly 14,000 people.

While the population is expected to grow significantly, there will also be a shift in demographic make-up. In particular, the seniors population will increase, especially the 'younger' seniors, aged 60-75. Where this group now comprises 17% of the population, that percentage will grow to 23% by the year 2025.

Additionally, the aboriginal population is expected to grow at a faster rate than the general population. While the city overall is expected to grow by 21% to the year 2025, the aboriginal population in itself could increase by over 60% if current growth rates hold true into the future. (See Phase 1 report for more detail.)

Main Points

- *Winnipeg is expected to grow by more than 20% to the year 2025, an increase in population of 137,500. It is possible that District 1 could increase in population by more than 13,000 over that period.*
- *The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.*

2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term

With significant growth anticipated for the city it is critical for the planning of programs and facilities to understand where that growth is likely to occur. **Map 5** identifies the potential areas of growth.

Growth is anticipated in the following areas:

1. Kapyong Barracks – conversion of this site for residential purposes is contingent upon the 'freeing' up of the land by the federal government. It is estimated that, should development proceed, a population of approximately 2,700 could be accommodated on this site. (The Kapyong site straddles District 1 and 2, and would affect the Sir John Franklin CC in District 1 and the Tuxedo CC in District 2. As a result it is identified in both plans.)
2. Inner City Intensification – it is anticipated that policies promoting residential intensification could result in additional infill development and higher density redevelopment of existing properties, particularly in areas closer to the downtown where a pattern of redevelopment and intensification has started to emerge.
3. University of Winnipeg – the University of Winnipeg continues a pattern of expansion that could reasonably be expected to include further redevelopment of underdeveloped properties for student use.
4. Fort Rouge Yards – consideration is being given to a proposal to redevelop the Fort Rouge Yards, located between Lord Roberts and Pembina Highway, which could result in an increase in population of 700 or more.

5. Pembina Corridor – there is the potential for increased high density residential development at various locations along Pembina Highway should a commitment be made to implementing a rapid transit system along the corridor.

Map 5: ANTICIPATED GROWTH AREAS FOR THE DISTRICT



It should be noted that population projections for District 1, more than any other District, are quite speculative. This is because the other four districts all have undeveloped tracts of land available for development, with much of it already planned in some degree of detail. However, when the total amount of growth projected for the city over the next twenty years is applied to the amount of land that can be developed for residential purposes, it becomes clear that there will be a shortage of land.

One response may be for the City of Winnipeg to place a greater emphasis on inner city intensification, that is, on creating higher density development where low density development currently exists, on infill development, and on conversion of non-residential lands into residential. It is assumed for this plan that policies of this nature will be implemented. This could have considerable impact on District 1.

Main Points

- *The Kapyong Barracks redevelopment will provide the greatest single source of concentrated new growth which could result in close to 3,000 new residents in an area that straddles two Districts (City Centre and Assiniboia).*
- *The remaining anticipated growth is quite speculative and hinges more on public policy than population influx, that is, it hinges upon a commitment to inner city intensification and the introduction of rapid transit along Pembina Highway.*

3. Assessing Future Needs

In light of current issues facing the community centre system in District 1 and in order to be well positioned to address forecasted population growth and anticipated changes in demographics, a number of needs have been identified which should be addressed over the coming years.

Emphasizing children and youth programming

It is recognized that there will always be competition for resources and that priorities need to be established. As a priority, the needs of children and youth represent the captive market and should be recognized as comprising the core mandate if there is a lack of resources. For this user group there is a need to provide open, safe space with opportunities for both structured and unstructured sport and recreation opportunities.

Addressing the broader needs of the community

While children and youth may be the highest priority, the broader needs of the community cannot be ignored. There is a need to maintain current programs as best as possible while expanding cautiously to ensure that children and youth programs are not jeopardized. There is capacity within the system. Existing space can be utilized more fully.

Working with other service providers

Community centres are not the sole providers of recreation programs. Many other programs are delivered by other agencies including the City of Winnipeg, churches, schools, not-for-profit agencies, private sector, etc. The community could be better served through a coordinated effort among service providers. Boundaries may need to be reviewed, not only those delineated for community centres by the GCWCC, but also those established by the sport associations. (This is the role of the Sports Committee.)

Building synergy

Synergy can be built through the differentiation of roles and the encouragement of cooperation among centres. Smaller local centres (with small catchment areas) could focus on drop-in and unstructured programs with a multi-purpose space as the main venue, perhaps operating as satellite sites. Larger neighbourhood centres could provide more structured programming with professional staff working through an allied governance relationship with other centres to coordinate programming, each focussing on a specialty area. Larger district centres could evolve as major sport centres for highly structured sport programming serving the broad community.

Addressing the challenge of resources

There is a need to identify and sustain ongoing reliable sources of revenue to support existing programming and the development of new programming. As well, there is a need to augment staff levels to address increasingly complex responsibilities that go beyond what can reasonably be expected from volunteers. Finally, there is the need to apply additional resources to facility maintenance and operations given the amount of investment needed to bring facilities to a reasonable level of repair. This is of paramount importance: as the owner of the facilities, the City of Winnipeg needs to commit strongly to an investment strategy that leads to greater resources for capital repairs and consistent, ongoing maintenance.

Main Points

The primary needs to be considered as plans evolve are:

- *Emphasizing children and youth programming*
- *Addressing the broader needs of the community*
- *Working with other service providers*
- *Building synergy*
- *Addressing the need for resources*

D. Moving Forward

1. Defining Success

The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base and high maintenance

needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by the City. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple amenities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the specialized services they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

In the case of all the above models, the District Planning Committee agrees that a successful community centre is one that provides relevant programming for all age groups, in a well-maintained, multi-functional space that is open to the public both day and evening.

Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.
- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.
- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

Defining Success

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community.

A successful community centre is deemed to have the following characteristics.

- The community centre is a focal point of the community.
- The community centre makes an important contribution to the quality of life of a neighbourhood or community.
- The community centre serves the immediate population of the neighbourhood.
- The community centre relies on, and benefits from, dedicated volunteers and staff.
- The community centre offers diverse programming and provides a good balance of sport and non-sport programs.
- The community centre has well-maintained facilities.
- The community centre builds partnerships that enhance the pursuit of its mandate.
- The community centre adheres to a sound governance model.

Main Points

- *The community centre model of the future must consider and respond to community needs at the local level, the neighbourhood level, and the district level.*
- *The community centre model of the future must reflect the guiding principles upon which the system was founded and must strive to achieve success as defined by the community.*

2. Planning Limitations

Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. To accommodate the projected growth, 258,000 square feet of additional space can be planned for.

However, there are current imbalances in the system with some areas of the city having a higher SPR than others. The primary directive imposed in this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time.

Table 10: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR TO 2025 BY DISTRICT

	Combined Space Allocation	Resulting SPR	Community Centre Component	City-Run Space Component
District 1: City Centre	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	258,000 sq ft	**1.88**	206,000 sq ft	52,000 sq ft

Source: Derived from previous tables.

Given that District 1 currently has an SPR less than the city average (as identified in Table 8), it has been granted the ability to add a significant amount of new space into the system that would address current imbalances as well as accommodate projected population growth for the District. **Table 10** shows the amount of space allocated to each district for planning purposes.

It has been calculated that District 1 could add 46,000 square feet of additional space. Should the population increase in the District by 13,650 people as projected, the District's SPR would rise from its current level of 1.74 to 1.88, the city average. The challenge for the District is to distribute the additional space over time to accommodate the variety of needs identified.

Main Points

- *It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space.*
- *Respecting the GCWCC's goal, plans for District 1 must accommodate a potential increase in population of 13,650 people to the year 2025 while adding but 46,000 sq ft of additional space into the system over time.*
- *The 46,000 sq ft of new space includes a potential 36,000 of community centre space together with a potential 10,000 sq ft of city-managed space. This breakdown*

can, and should, be discussed and negotiated with the City of Winnipeg because the critical point as determined by the policy is the total amount of space, not who governs its use.

3. Planning Strategies

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the needs of the District identified earlier.

Need: To emphasize children and youth programming

Strategies:

- Structured Sport: Discussions need to take place with the various sport associations to address the balance of responsibilities for the delivery of structured sports with the goal of having community centres assume greater control over children and youth sport programs.
- Unstructured Programs: Some community centres could offer more drop-in opportunities for children and youth to engage in unstructured sport or just 'hang out'.
- Flex Space: It may be possible to develop more flexible, multi-purpose space that is able to be used creatively for a variety of purposes as determined by the users. A youth lounge for example can provide a safe, secure, yet informal environment.
- Outdoor Amenities: The provision of unstructured programming and drop-in opportunities should include access to additional outdoor amenities such as basketball surfaces.
- Consistent Hours: While resources may be an issue, developing consistent hours of operation and extending hours later into the evening may assist in providing alternative activities for youth.
- Sport Fields: Additional sport fields should be provided. The fields associated with Lipsett Hall provide a great opportunity if they can be secured for the use of the community as part of the Kapyong Barracks redevelopment.

Need: To address the broader needs of the community

Strategies:

- Demographic Monitoring: It will be necessary to keep track of changing neighbourhood demographics (increasing seniors, immigrants, aboriginals, etc.) in order to anticipate programming needs. The City's Community Resource Coordinators can provide assistance in this regard while providing insight into the role of other service providers.
- Seniors Programming: In many centres it may be possible to accommodate more seniors programming during the day to enhance facility utilization while meeting the needs of a target group.

- New Programs: It may be necessary to introduce new sports that are in sync with the emerging interests of youth and that align as well with the cultures represented by new immigrants.
- Wellness and Active Living: The trend toward wellness and active living (adult and family oriented) can be supported through the conversion of spaces to meet these needs and/or through the establishment of strategic partnerships with other service providers.
- Accessibility: Issues of accessibility will need to be addressed from the broadest sense, including affordability, transportation, and barrier-free design to ensure that these factors do not inhibit access to a centre or its programs.
- Communication: The broad community needs to be made aware of the programs that are offered throughout the District. In particular, free programs need to be promoted widely.

Need: To work with other service providers

Strategies:

- Networks: The Community Resource Coordinators can assist in getting the community centre engaged with local service provider networks. Community network associations can be invited to meet at community centres in order to increase awareness of each other's roles.
- Outreach: Community centres can reach out to community agencies and create new partnerships in terms of offering programs. Consideration should be given to partnering with daycares, churches, schools, senior centres, and senior housing developments. City staff (CRCs) are well connected and can assist with networking. They can be invited to attend CCB meetings.
- Cultural Centres: Similarly, outreach to cultural centres can create new partnerships in terms of offering programs in areas that recognize the changing demographics of the community.
- Third Party Rentals: Providing space to other service providers helps meet the needs of the community while alleviating the burden of responsibility for program development and delivery. But there needs to be a balance between revenue-generation and programming.
- Communication: Communication between the various service providers and between service providers and the community needs to be improved to enhance understanding and encourage cooperation. This is particularly important as it relates to the City of Winnipeg because of the significant role that City-run programs play in meeting the needs of the community. There needs to be a better understanding of the programs that exist, where they are located, and when they are offered.

Need: To build synergy

Strategies:

- Internal Collaboration: CCB meetings can be reconfigured to encourage greater collaboration among centres including information sharing to help resolve common issues.
- Cluster Programming: Community centres can enhance their effectiveness by collaborating at a cluster level in the delivery of programs. Having each centre take 'ownership' of a given sport is an example that is currently being applied in some areas. Generally however, sport association boundaries need to be reviewed to encourage greater cooperation.
- Research: An ongoing program of research and analysis needs to be developed, one that monitors and updates information related to community centre programs, facilities, resources.
- Integrated Planning: Planning needs to take place in an integrated fashion – on a District-wide basis as well as within cluster areas and must consider other service providers. The momentum gained through this Plan 2025 should be built upon through ongoing planning work undertaken by the CCB and among smaller clusters of centres.
- Role Definition: It is important to recognize that not every community centre can meet every need. Role differentiation will be the key. For example, local centres might concentrate on drop-in and leisure activities while the larger centres could offer the traditional sports.
- Facility Rationalization: Over time, changes to the current inventory of facilities need to be pursued strategically, through closures, mergers, expansions, and new facilities. Collectively, these changes can lead to a more sustainable set of facilities.

Need: To address the challenge of resources

Strategies:

- UFF Review: The GCWCC can be approached to incorporate a programming component into its funding formula, although there is a significant challenge in quantifying programming in a manner that is fair and consistent.
- Shared Staff: Funding challenges can be alleviated with shared staff (eg. managers, bookkeepers, program directors). Creating full-time positions to serve a number of centres may be an option. Partnering with other service providers and taking advantage of their staff is another option. In particular, it may be necessary to solicit greater staff support form the City in high needs areas.
- Maintenance: Efficiencies can be gained through the use of qualified staff, a maintenance regimen, and a targeted maintenance budget that can be coordinated among centres and with the City of Winnipeg.

- Buying Power: Collectively, community centres have significant purchasing power which can help reduce costs, especially for large equipment. A district-wide purchasing strategy for both goods and services can be developed.
- New Programs: Funding solicitation may need to be program specific. Grants or sponsorships may be available for the development of new, innovative programs that address the needs of specific target groups such as at-risk youth, new immigrants, seniors, etc.
- Volunteerism: A Volunteer Management Plan/Program coordinated with the GCWCC and the City of Winnipeg could help address recruitment and retention of volunteers. For example, the Plan could promote volunteerism in high schools through the existing program that provides school credits for community service.
- Increased Support: The ultimate responsibility for recreation services and facilities rests with the City of Winnipeg. Greater investment by the City either through the provision of greater staff support, enhanced maintenance support, or increased funding is greatly needed.

4. Past and Current Project Proposals

Synopsis

District 1 is a dynamic community with three very different geographic characteristics. The north part of the District, Downtown East and West, is separated from the rest by the Assiniboine River. It includes a series of older neighbourhoods including Wolseley, Minto, St. Mathews, Daniel MacIntyre, Spence, West Broadway, and Armstrong Point. Within this northern segment there are great dichotomies. Some of these areas represent affluent, rejuvenated neighbourhoods while others exhibit more challenging characteristics with low education, low income households, and more lone parent families.

The south part of the District, located south of the Assiniboine River, has a northern strata that, in some ways, mirrors the characteristics north of the river with a combination of affluent, rejuvenated older neighbourhoods such as River Heights, Wellington Crescent, and Riverview together with higher needs areas such as Lord Roberts and River Osborne. However, there is also an east-west dynamic at work in this strata with a high level of programming and volunteer support to the west with much lower level programming and volunteers support in the east.

The southern portion of the District lying south of the CNR mainline is divorced from the northern strata as a result of rail line. Yet, it is similarly complicated with an east-west dynamic working in this strata as well. The eastern side comprises older, well established neighbourhoods strung along the Pembina corridor. The western half is characteristically suburban with a series of new neighbourhoods and affluent families. The two halves are separated geographically by industrial yards and major arterial streets.

Project Proposals

The 2006 GCWCC report entitled “Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement” identified a number of proposals as candidates for funding. Five projects from District 1 were considered. One received funding support, the Isaac Brock Community Centre (now called Valour) expansion, which is currently underway.

UPDATE: Valour Community Centre – Isaac Brock Site

Isaac Brock CC has given up its Minto satellite site and transferred the square footage to their main site on Telfer Street N. Funding has been approved for the addition of a full size gym and the complete renovation of the main floor. Completion date is April, 2009. Since the time the project was approved, the Boards of Clifton, Isaac Brock, and Orioles have amalgamated, taking advantage of shared volunteers and staff to provide improved programming at all three sites.

The four remaining proposals from the 2006 report have either been incorporated into the Scenarios that follow in section 5 or are deemed to be no longer relevant.

Additionally, the City of Winnipeg has since moved forward with plans to expand the Sargent Park Recreation Complex, now called the Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex.

UPDATE: Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex

Construction began in 2007 on the Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex, an expansion of the former Sargent Park Recreation Complex. Once complete, the renovated complex will contain several building improvements, including a second storey running track and fitness centre, an addition to the existing indoor pool area, an enhanced lobby, more program space, and upgraded air conditioning and light control systems. Furthermore, a new West End Library is being added to the complex.

5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios

Map 6 identifies a number of possible scenarios that could be pursued. These scenarios are intended to provide reconfiguration options that would assist in meeting the District’s needs. For planning purposes, some clusters have been amalgamated. Downtown East and West are combined on Map 6 as are River Heights East and West.

NOTE:
The following scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus to do so. In all cases there is a commitment to undergo community consultation before any plans are finalized.

NOTE: Not all centres are, or need be, included in the scenarios. It was contemplated that those centres not specifically identified for possible change would carry on as status quo. However, some of these centres may still be involved in collaborative programming and governance reviews.

NOTE: The scenarios have not been prioritized.

Scenario: Additional City-run Space in Downtown East

What: A specific project has not been defined but there is a recognition that additional space should be provided by the City to serve the residents in Downtown East. The City should undertake a needs assessment for the community in light of the programs and services currently being provided in order to identify gaps in program and service delivery and the corresponding need for additional space.

Why: There is a significant population in the downtown that remains unallocated within the community centre system. When that population is considered, the space to population ratio for the Downtown East cluster (that is, the portion of Downtown East that does not lie within District 3) is about half the city average. This area does not have a community centre. It is served by two city-run facilities, Magnus Elias Recreation Centre north of Portage and Broadway Neighbourhood Centre south of Portage, both of which serve high needs areas. Additional space is deemed necessary in the area south of Portage to better meet local needs.

How: The City of Winnipeg would have to take the lead to define this initiative.

Scenario: River Heights Review

What: Define a new model of operation for Sir John Franklin, River Heights, and Crescentwood, with the potential to redevelop/reconfigure one or more of the facilities to better meet community needs and to share governance and programming.

Why: These three centres are in relatively close proximity to one another along the ‘Corydon Corridor’. Combined they represent close to 50,000 sq ft of heated square footage. The goal may be to address improvements in sport fields and to determine the feasibility of adding a new full-size gymnasium.

How: The centres along the ‘Corydon Corridor’ are committed to working together for the benefit of all residents in the catchment areas of the three centres. Preliminary discussions have taken place. A joint committee may be struck to establish Terms of Reference for this review which may include areas of board governance, management governance, programming, and facilities.



Legend

- Community Centres
- Recreation Facilities
- Increase in Facility Size
- Decrease in Facility Size
- Facility Closure
- Proposed Grouping of Facilities
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary

Map 6 - District 1: City Centre
Proposed Development Scenarios

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

March 6, 2009

Scenario: Fort Garry Review

What: Define a new model of operation for Victoria, Wildwood, Fort Garry, and Westridge, with the potential to redevelop/replace/expand one or more of the facilities to better meet community needs and to share governance and programming.

Why: These four centres are in relatively close proximity to one another and have a combined catchment of less than 13,000 people. The centres are also relatively small in comparison to others in the District and lack significant amenity space which restricts their ability to meet the programming needs of the community. They also have high FCIs.

How: The four centres are working together to develop a proposal for consideration. The proposal will be based upon a common vision that recognizes and responds to the needs of the entire area and can consider an increase in overall square footage based upon an allocation of the space identified for planning purposes. Community consultation will be undertaken to help define the vision and shape the proposal.

Scenario: Mayfair Recreation Expansion and Governance Review

What: The Mayfair Recreation Centre could be expanded. A specific project is not yet defined but there is a recognition that additional space should be provided to serve the residents of this area. It may be possible to have the facility operate as a satellite of the River Osborne CC.

Why: The Mayfair RC is a City facility that serves a higher needs area. It is a 1,500 sq ft facility with a high FCI indicative of the need for significant maintenance work. A renovation/expansion would allow it to better meet the needs of local residents. River Osborne CC has assumed responsibility for programming, an arrangement which suggests the need for a governance review possibly leading to the formal transfer of this facility to the River Osborne CC. [In the past, Mayfair operated as a satellite of River Osborne.]

How: Planning space could be allocated to this initiative and the feasibility of expanding on the current site would need to be explored. An alternative location may need to be considered. However, the City of Winnipeg would have to be a partner in this exploration.

Scenario: Linden Woods CC Expansion

What: Expand Linden Woods CC to increase its programmable space. The previous proposal to expand Linden Woods will provide the starting point for this project. It will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Whyte Ridge expansion in order to determine a complementary strategy for the development of more multi-purpose space, including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

Why: The Fort Garry North cluster has a very low SPR of 1.01 versus the city average of 1.88. It has experienced significant growth over the past couple decades, particularly in the south-west corner of the District, and the amount of recreation space has not kept pace. While it has 6 community centres to serve the population, none of them are over 10,000 square feet in size. In fact, these six centres are the six smallest in the District overall. Linden Woods itself is under 5,000 sq ft which limits its ability to offer a variety of programming. Until recently, it operated as a satellite but it is now a community centre unto itself.

How: Plans are underway and some pre-design work has been undertaken. Consultations with Whyteridge will follow together with the preparation of terms of reference, a business plan, and a fundraising plan. Some of the planning space could be allocated to this initiative.

Scenario: Whyte Ridge CC Expansion

What: Expand Whyte Ridge CC to increase its programmable space. This project will be undertaken in consultation and cooperation with the Linden Woods expansion in order to determine a complementary strategy for the development of more multi-purpose space, including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

Why: The Fort Garry North cluster has a very low SPR of 1.01 versus the city average of 1.88. It has experienced significant growth over the past couple decades, particularly in the south-west corner of the District, and the amount of recreation space has not kept pace. While it has 6 community centres to serve the population, none of them are over 10,000 square feet in size. In fact, these six centres are the six smallest in the District overall. Whyte Ridge itself is under 5,000 sq ft which limits its ability to offer a variety of programming. Until recently, it operated as a satellite but it is now a community centre unto itself.

How: A committee has been struck and plans are underway. Consultations with the community and with Linden Woods will follow. Some of the planning space could be allocated to this initiative.

6. Moving Forward on Scenarios

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested. This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres.

This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (eg. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

7. Addressing Overall Priorities

OVER-RIDING PRIORITY

The primary concern overall is the sustainability of the system as a result of insufficient resources. Facilities require a large commitment to maintenance improvement as well as investment to convert them into a set of contemporary facilities able to meet the current and future needs of the community. Furthermore, access to qualified and skilled staff is needed. The City of Winnipeg must demonstrate leadership if the community centre movement is to progress over coming years.

It is critical that the City provide greater investment in the community centre system through the provision of greater staff support, enhanced facility maintenance, and increased capital investment.

Additionally, these priorities have been identified.

Priority No.1: The challenge of meeting community needs

The volunteer-driven model will need to be revisited and changed. Greater involvement by the City in program development would ease the burden placed on volunteers as would the pursuit of shared staff to assist with programming needs. Staff sharing between centres and other service providers could also be pursued. It is possible that the development of newer, more contemporary facilities could facilitate volunteer and staff recruitment.

Meanwhile, a greater emphasis will be placed on what is deemed to be the core responsibility, providing recreational opportunities for children and youth by looking at ways to enhance structured sport programs and a variety of unstructured programs. Where possible, the needs of the broader community will be addressed with an emphasis on overall wellness and active living opportunities for both adults and seniors.

Priority No. 2: The challenge of sustaining programs

From a funding perspective, efforts can focus on enhanced fundraising that is coordinated either at the cluster level or District level. Foundations, corporations, and governments can be targeted to support the development and delivery of new programs that are aligned with their mandates. Resources can also be secured for program development and delivery through savings elsewhere. This can occur through greater cooperation among centres and between centres and the GCWCC in areas such as bulk purchasing for goods and services. Furthermore, the GCWCC can be encouraged to review the funding model in order to recognize not just space and population but levels of programming.

Perhaps most importantly, the challenge of sustaining programs can be met through partnerships, i.e. working with other service providers. There are networks that can be

tapped into to share knowledge and coordinate activities thus increasing opportunities to provide programs to residents through third party arrangements.

Priority No.3: The need for more multi-purpose space, especially gyms

While it is recognized that facilities, generally, are in need of repair and enhancement, one of the single most critical areas of concern is the lack of flexible programmable space, especially multi-purpose rooms and full-size gyms. This is particularly evident in Fort Garry North. Most of the development scenarios outlined in the previous section address the need for enhanced facilities to one degree or another.

Construction at the Valour CC-Isaac Brock site is underway, resulting in a full-size gym in a high needs area. Scenarios 1 and 4 further address high needs areas and are directly related to City-run facilities that could be enhanced. Scenarios 5 and 6 (Linden Woods and Whyte Ridge) would address this priority directly adding programmable space to two small facilities. Scenarios 2 and 3 are more complicated but could have a similar outcome.

APPENDIX

Summary of Other Service Providers

Downtown E/W

- Lighthouse Programs – Broadway Neighbourhood Centre; Central Park Lodge; Magnus Eliason Recreation Centre
- Needs (Newcomer Employment & Educational Services – War Affected) –
- Spence Neighbourhood Association (MERC)
- Boys and Girls Club – Sister MacNamara Club
- West Broadway Outreach – Children and Youth
- West Central Community Program – John M. King School and Wellington School
- West End Cultural Centre
- Art City – 616 Broadway – Drop In Studios
- Public Libraries – West End (to be located at Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex), Millennium Library
- Daniel McIntyre St. Mathews Community Association (Valour Community Centre Sites)
- West Central Network
- West Broadway Inter Agency
- West Broadway Development Corporation
- Downtown Coalition – operates a variety of children's programs
- Stradbrook Seniors Centre
- West End Seniors Centre
- Fort Rouge Resource Centre
- West Central Women's Resource Centre
- Winnipeg School Division
- Numerous Church/Synagogues Groups

River Heights E/W

- Neighbourhood Resource Networks – Fort Rouge River Heights NRN
- Fort Rouge/River Heights Families Forward Parent Child Coalition
- South Winnipeg Resource Council
- Seniors groups: Earl Grey; Golden Rules Seniors; Manitoba Deaf Senior's Club; Rockwood Seniors; Royal Canadian Legion 65+ Club; Rupert's Land Seniors Supper Club; Shaarey Zedek
- Adult Leisure Club; Villa Cabrini Community Program; Stay Young Club (Rady Jewish Centre), Stradbrook Senior Club,
- Resource Centres: Fort Rouge Resource Centre; Military Family Resource Centre
- Winnipeg School Division
- Numerous Churches/Synagogues Groups
- Lighthouse Programs: Fort Rouge School
- Public Libraries: Fort Rouge Leisure Centre; River Heights;
- Winnipeg Winter Club
- Several Fitness, Yoga and Pilates Studios

Fort Garry North

- Fort Garry Network
- Fort Garry Parent Child Coalition
- Fort Garry Senior Resource Council
- Seniors Clubs: Victoria CC Seniors Club
- Winnipeg School Division and Pembina Trails School Division
- Lighthouse Program: General Byng School
- Public Libraries: Pembina Trails
- Taylor Tennis Club
- Several fitness, yoga and pilates studios
- Numerous Churches/Synagogues Groups

URBANEDGE
consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 2

ASSINIBOIA DISTRICT PLAN



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

FINAL - MAR 4, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

ASSINIBOIA DISTRICT PLAN

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. Direction and Parameters **7**
1. Plan 2025 7
2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy 7
3. The Starting Point 7
4. The Planning Model 8
5. People Overview 8
6. Programs Overview 8
7. Facilities Overview 9
8. The Vision 9
9. District Plans 9

B. Current Situation **10**
1. Assiniboia District and Neighbourhood Clusters 10
2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities 11
3. Demographic Make-up 15
4. Overview of Current Programs 17
5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers 19
6. Overview of Current Facilities 21
7. Current Issues and Concerns 24

C. Needs Assessment **26**
1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025 26
2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term 28
3. Assessing Future Needs 29

D. Moving Forward **31**
1. Defining Success 31
2. Planning Limitations 34
3. Planning Strategies 35
4. Possible Development Scenarios 38
5. Moving Forward on Scenarios 42
6. Addressing Overall Priorities 43

Appendix **45**
Summary of Other Service Providers 45

List of Maps

Map 1: District and Cluster Boundaries 10
Map 2: Community Centres 12
Map 3: City-Managed Facilities 13
Map 4: Combined Community Centres and City-Managed Facilities 14
Map 5: Anticipated Growth Areas for the District 28
Map 6: Potential Development Scenarios to 2025 39

List of Tables

Table 1: All Recreation and Leisure Facilities (as of 2005) 11
Table 2: Demographic Overview 2001 and 2006 16
Table 3: Summary of Community Centre Programs 18
Table 4: Summary of Community Centre Volunteers 20
Table 5: Summary of Community Centre Staff 21
Table 6: Facility Condition and Preservation Needs (as of 2004) 22
Table 7: Summary of Community Centre Amenities 23
Table 8: Space to Population Ratios 24
Table 9: Estimated Growth to 2025 – All Districts 27
Table 10: Amount of Space to Plan For to 2025 by District 34

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
StatsCan – Statistics Canada
MBS – Manitoba Bureau of Statistics
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
L/S-W/K – Lord Selkirk West Kildonan
E/K-T – East Kildonan Transcona
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of a Planning Committee established by the Community Centre Board for District 2 Assiniboia.

KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
ASSINIBOIA DISTRICT PLAN

Executive Summary

Current Recreation Space

The Assiniboia District is served by 13 community centres, including two indoor arenas. Four of these centres also run satellite facilities. In total, there are 19 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As well, there are 5 city governed facilities that provide complementary services in the District.

There is 230,000 sq ft of recreation space to serve a population of 95,000, or 2.42 sq ft per person. With the city average being 1.88 sq ft of recreation space per person, the Assiniboia District overall is relatively better served than other areas of the city.

Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of St. James West and East have access to considerably more space than do residents south of the Assiniboine River.

Demographics

Generally, the District overall is older than the rest of the city (a greater number of people 55+), more homogenous (fewer immigrants and aboriginals), and somewhat more affluent (fewer low income households and higher rate of home ownership).

Within the District, Assiniboine South is considerably different than the area north of the river having experienced a modest population growth over recent years compared to a loss in population and having higher education and greater household income.

Programs

While there is a significant difference between the amount of programming undertaken by St. James Assiniboia West versus St. James Assiniboia East (0.39 hours per capita versus 0.28 hours per capita), the amount of programming undertaken by the District overall is consistent with other areas of the city (0.32 hours per capita).

The District appears to provide a wide range of programs but its main emphasis tends to be on the provision of sport programs. Children's and youth programs are the mainstay. This is consistent with other areas of the city.

St. James Assiniboia West would appear to have the broadest range of programs. Although Assiniboine South has half that number of programs, it has virtually the same amount of program hours. This would indicate less variety but greater participation.

Staff and Volunteers

While the District overall has a volunteer base consistent with the rest of the city (2.1 hours committed per capita), there are significant discrepancies within the District with a large volunteer base in St. James Assiniboia (East and West) versus a much smaller

support base in Assiniboine South, although Assiniboine South is relatively better served with staff than the other two areas.

Facilities

Relative to other areas of the city, St. James Assiniboia East and West have considerably more recreation space per capita while Assiniboine South has about the same as the city average. While most centres have halls and multi-purpose areas that can accommodate a variety of programming, there is a lack of gym space and games areas.

Overall, facilities in District 2 could benefit from increased investment in facility maintenance and capital improvements. This is consistent with the challenge faced in all areas of the City - how to work with the City of Winnipeg to address concerns related to long term sustainability.

Primary Issues and Concerns

Priority 1: With the closure of a large number of schools over the years, access to full-size gymnasiums has become very restrictive and is seen as the highest priority overall for this District. An indoor soccer facility is also lacking in this part of the city.

Volunteer recruitment and retention is a high priority for the District overall and will require inventive solutions considering the aging demographic and concerns about volunteer burn-out.

A broader range of programs needs to be offered, particularly those directed toward teens (non-sport alternatives) and seniors. The challenge is to determine what to offer and how to offer it.

Growth and Its Impact

It is possible that District 2 could increase in population by as much as 25,000 to the year 2025. The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.

Virtually all the growth anticipated for the District will find its way south of the River into Assiniboine South. As the population grows in Assiniboine South, there will be increased pressure on existing facilities and the current imbalance in distribution of space will be more pronounced.

It will be important in the future to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community and to ensure that barriers are not inhibiting access to programs. Skilled, professional program developers may be needed.

More contemporary and flexible facilities will be needed in the future and inventive solutions will be needed to ensure that existing facilities are used as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Community centres will need to work more collaboratively in terms of program delivery, communications, and resource sharing as well as in areas of retention and recruitment of volunteers and staff.

Vision

The community centre of the future should continue to have a combination of small local centres, mid-size neighbourhood centres, and large district centres. The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing. However, there are many community centres that are flourishing with a strong volunteer base and strong programming and may not be facing the same pressures to evolve.

It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space. Respecting this goal, plans for District 2 must accommodate a potential increase in population of 27,800 people to the year 2025 while adding no more than 1,500 square feet of additional space. A thoughtful redistribution of existing space will be the key to providing more contemporary facilities while addressing the issues and concerns identified for the District.

Possible Development Scenarios

To address current issues and accommodate growth (particularly the need for access to full-size gyms) while respecting the direction provided by the GCWCC and the City's RLLF policy, three development scenarios have been proposed.

Scenario 1: Amalgamate Silver Heights and Sturgeon Creek

Amalgamate the Silver Heights and Sturgeon Creek Community Centres into a single facility with the addition of a full-size gym. It may be possible to close the Silver Heights facility together with the two outdoor rinks that lie south of Ness. (The military fields north of Ness would continue to be used.) If that was the case, substantial revenue could be realized from the sale of the property. The proceeds could help finance the project.

Scenario 2: Add a Gym to Kirkfield Westwood OR Heritage Victoria

Free up space among centres in the St. James Assiniboia West area in order to expand either the Kirkfield Westwood main site OR the Heritage Victoria Community Centre with the addition of a full-size gym. A feasibility study would need to be conducted to determine the more appropriate location for expansion, looking at site limitations, parking accommodation, and the structural integrity of the existing buildings.

Scenario 3: Expand Varsity View Sportsplex

Close the Varsity View Community Centre Laxdal site in order to assist in the development of a large scale 'District Community Centre' at the Varsity View Sportsplex site. The programs run out of the Varsity View CC Laxdal site could be relocated to the Sportsplex site, allowing the Laxdal site to be declared surplus. Proceeds from the sale of property could be directed toward the expansion of the Sportsplex site.

NOTE: The development scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.

GCWCC Plan 2025
ASSINIBOIA DISTRICT PLAN

A. Direction and Parameters

This section generally repeats the Executive Summary of the Plan 2025 Phase 1 report. For a more detailed explanation of the Direction and Parameters provided to this plan, refer to the report. It can be found on the GCWCC web site at www.gcwcc.mb.ca.

1. Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system was unsustainable. The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

3. The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005. Therefore, 2005 serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of recreation space using the 'heated square footage' definition.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres, facilities which are very similar to community centres in terms of nature of programs delivered to the community. This amounts to an additional

246,501 square feet of recreation space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

4. The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



5. People Overview

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, specifically, 25.6 versus 39.2 as of 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500 will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by District 2 with 20%, and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

6. Programs Overview

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging,

from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from “cradle to grave”, including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listings and third party agreements.

7. Facilities Overview

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

8. The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

9. District Plans

This District Plan contains:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC reflective of Phase One of Plan 2025.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, recreation programs offered, volunteer support provided, and community centre facilities.
- A summary of issues and concerns identified by community centre representatives.
- Needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- A series of strategies to address the needs over the long term.
- An overview of scenarios showing how changes could manifest themselves over time through possible expansions, mergers, closures, and the construction of new facilities.
- A short list of projects deemed to be of highest priority in meeting the needs of the community.
- Selected strategies to address the most critical issues and concerns.
- An action plan to guide decision-making over the short term.

B. Current Situation

1. Assiniboia District and Neighbourhood Clusters

The Assiniboia District, or District 2, covers the western end of Winnipeg, roughly from Kenaston Boulevard (Route 90) to the Perimeter, both north and south of the Assiniboine River. The District is generally (but not exactly) aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political boundaries that make up the Assiniboia Community Committee.

The reason for the differences is that the Community Centre District must consider appropriate catchment areas around each of its community centres to ensure residents are well served while the political boundaries have more to do with the even distribution of population by ward. Even so, efforts have been made to keep the community centre boundaries as consistent as possible with political boundaries.

For planning purposes the District has been split into three areas called neighbourhood clusters. These units are used because research information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster. The clusters are generally (but not exactly) aligned with the three political wards: St. Charles, St. James-Brooklands, and Charleswood-Tuxedo. Because they are somewhat different than wards, the neighbourhood clusters have different names. They are called St. James Assiniboia West, St. James Assiniboia East, and Assiniboine South.

Map 1 shows the boundaries of the District in black outline together with the neighbourhood cluster areas in various shades.



Map 1: District Boundaries and Cluster Areas

2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities

As shown on **Map 2**, the Assiniboia District is served by 13 community centres, including two indoor arenas. Four of these centres also run satellite facilities. In total, there are 19 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system.

The District is also served through city-run facilities that are similar to community centres but for historical reasons have evolved through into a system of split jurisdiction. Generally, these are recreation centres and senior centres. To properly plan for the needs of the district, these city-run facilities must be considered alongside the community centres. As shown on **Map 3**, there are 5 of these facilities in the District.

Table 1 provides the list of all facilities for the district by neighbourhood cluster. As well, this combined view of community centres and city-run facilities is shown on **Map 4**.

Table 1: ALLRECREATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (as of 2005)

Cluster	Type	Facility Name	Heated Sq Ft
St. James Assiniboia West 3 community centres 2 recreation centres Pop: 31,305	Community Centre	Assiniboine West	8,293
	Satellite	Assiniboine West - Morgan	7,877
	Community Centre	Heritage-Victoria	13,469
	Community Centre	Kirkfield-Westwood	16,162
	Satellite	Kirkfield-Westwood - McBey	4,551
	Arena	Kirkfield-Westwood - Arena	1,007
		Total Community Centres	51,359
	Recreation Centre	St James Centennial	28,936
	Recreation Centre	St James Cultural Centre	2,480
		Total City-Managed Facilities	31,416
		Total for Cluster	**82,775**
St. James Assiniboia East 6 community centres 2 recreation centres Pop: 25,585	Community Centre	Sturgeon Creek	9,859
	Community Centre	Silver Heights	9,416
	Community Centre	Deer Lodge	13,591
	Community Centre	Bourkevale	7,268
	Community Centre	Bord-Aire	9,970
	Community Centre	Woodhaven	4,392
		Total Community Centres	54,496
	Recreation Centre	St James Civic Centre	20,029
	Recreation Centre	Bourkevale Leisure Centre	8,585
		Total City-Managed Facilities	28,614
		Total for Cluster	**83,110**
Assiniboine South 4 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 35,035	Community Centre	Westdale	13,890
	Satellite	Westdale - Pembina Trails	2,931
	Community Centre	Roblin Park	11,228
	Community Centre	Varsity View	11,090
	Satellite/Arena	Varsity View Sportsplex	11,570
	Community Centre	Tuxedo	9,405
		Total Community Centres	60,114
	Recreation Centre	Eric Coy Craft Centre/Rec Centre	3,967
		Total City-Managed Facilities	3,967
		Total for Cluster	**64,081**
District 2 Assiniboia 13 community centres 5 recreation centres Pop: 95,125*	**19 cc facilities**	**District 2 Community Centre Sub-Total**	**165,969**
	5 city-run facilities	**District 2 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total**	**63,997**
	24 facilities	**DISTRICT 2 TOTAL**	**229,966**

Source: GCWCC and City of Winnipeg
** The District population is more than the sum of each cluster because it includes an adjustment based on the Census undercount as determined by Statistics Canada.*



Map 2 - District 2: Assiniboia Community Centres - 2005

Legend

CC - Community Centre

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- District 2 - Community Centre Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- Rivers

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 3 - District 2: Assiniboia
Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 2 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 4 - District 2: Assiniboia
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 2 - Community Centre Boundary
- Community Centre Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre
RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008

NOTE: The list of city-run facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively consistent with what is provided by community centres. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas. The combined list represents all those facilities that are subject to the restriction imposed by the RLLF policy.

Table 1 shows the Assiniboia District is served by approximately 230,000 sq ft of combined recreation space. As shown in the first column of the Table, the population as of 2006 is estimated to be 95,125 for the District with 31,305 in St. James Assiniboia West, 25,585 in St. James Assiniboia East, and 35,455 in Assiniboine South. This translates into a ratio of combined recreation space per person or Space to Population Ratio (SPR) as follows:

St. James Assiniboia West:	2.64 square feet per person
St. James Assiniboia East	3.25 square feet per person
Assiniboine South	1.83 square feet per person
Assiniboia District	**2.42 square feet per person**
City Average	**1.88 square feet per person**

Main Points

- *Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of St. James West and East have access to considerably more space than do residents south of the Assiniboine River.*
- *With the city average being 1.88 square feet of combined recreation space per person, the Assiniboia District overall is relatively better served than other areas of the city.*

3. Demographic Make-up

Table 2 provides an overview of the demographic make-up of the District using selected information from the 2001 Census as provided by the City of Winnipeg together with 2006 Census derived from Statistics Canada information currently available on their website.

From these data, a few observations can be made:

Population Change

The population south of the river has increased by a very modest amount over the past 20 years (+3.3%) but this is considerably better than the two clusters north of the river which have lost population over that same time frame (-13.7% for St. James Assiniboia West and -14.2% for St. James Assiniboia East). St. James Assiniboia East appears to be losing more people in recent years, almost 1 percent per year over the past 5 years. Over that same 20 year period, the city overall grew by 6.6%.

Children, Seniors, and Household Size

The District overall is considerably older than the rest of the city population. Looking at the 2006 information, the number of seniors is higher than the city average in all three

neighbourhood clusters (31.8%, 29.2%, and 30.2% versus 25.2% for the city) and this represents an increase from the number of seniors in 2001 – a definitive aging trend. Yet, the number of children aged 5-19 is close to the city average in St. James Assiniboia West and Assiniboine South, though it is lower in St. James Assiniboia East.

Fewer children in St. James Assiniboia East are reflected as well in the household size which sits at 2.1, less than the city average of 2.4. Of note is the considerable reduction in household size in St. James Assiniboia West, going from 2.8 in 2001 to 2.4 in 2006. This appears to reflect the increase in seniors population over that period of time.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW 2001 and 2006

2001 Census Info	St.J/A West	St.J/A East	Assin. South	CITY
Total Population	31,715	26,875	35,035	619,544
Population Change 86-01	-12.4%	-9.4%	+2.3%	+4.2%
Children 5-19	18.6%	16.5%	22.4%	19.8%
Seniors 55+	28.4%	27.4%	23.0%	22.1%
Aboriginal Identity	5.4%	5.5%	2.9%	8.6%
Immigrant	10.6%	9.4%	12.6%	17.3%
Married & Common Law	56.0%	46.6%	59.0%	48.8%
Hold University Degree	14.6%	15.1%	28.3%	18.3%
Unemployment	4.5%	5.1%	3.9%	5.7%
Low Income Households	13.8%	16.5%	9.7%	20.3%
Average Household Income	$59,036	$50,653	$87,445	$53,176
Household Size	2.8	2.2	2.7	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	73%-27%	60%-40%	82%-18%	64%-36%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	62.7%	54.6%	63.6%	57.7%

2006 Census Info	St.J/A West	St.J/A East	Assin. South	CITY
Total Population	31,305	25,585	35,455	633,451
Population Change 01-06	-1.3%	-4.8%	+1.2%	+2.2%
Children 5-19	18.3%	15.6%	19.6%	19.0%
Seniors 55+	31.8%	29.2%	30.2%	25.2%
Aboriginal Identity	7.5%	8.0%	3.6%	10.1%
Immigrant	10.8%	10.8%	12.9%	18.4%
Married & Common Law	49.6%	44.7%	51.5%	44.4%
Lone Parent Families	17.4%	18.4%	12.0%	19.5%
Household Size	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	72%-28%	61%-39%	84%-16%	65%-35%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	60.3%	54.0%	64.6%	55.2%

Source: City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada

Aboriginals and Immigrants

The District overall appears to be quite homogenous with a smaller than average number of aboriginals and immigrants in all three clusters when compared to the city average, a

pattern that is consistent with what it was in 2001. Yet, in all three clusters the numbers are growing, though at a lesser rate than the city. While the two clusters north of the river are quite similar, the Assiniboine South cluster shows the lowest number of aboriginals and highest numbers of immigrants for the District.

Education

While the 2006 figures for education were not yet available, the 2001 figures show a pattern of lower than average education (that is, fewer numbers of people with university degrees) north of the river (14.6% for St. James Assiniboia West and 15.1% for St. James Assiniboia East) and higher than average education south of the river (28.3% for Assiniboine South) when compared to the city overall at 18.3%.

Employment, Income, and Need

Again using 2001 numbers because 2006 were not yet released, the two clusters north of the river are relatively close to the city average in terms of unemployment (4.5% and 5.1% versus 5.7% for the city) while the Assiniboine South cluster is considerably lower at 3.9%. Assiniboine South is clearly more affluent with an average household income of over $87,000 compared to the city average of just over $53,000. St. James Assiniboia East is less affluent at approximately $50,000 with St. James Assiniboia West somewhat better off at $59,000. While all three clusters fare better than the city average in terms of the number of low income households, Assiniboine South has the lowest number.

Tenure and Mobility

Across the city, approximately two thirds of the population own their home while one third rent. Home ownership provides some insight into neighbourhood stability. The numbers overall have been quite consistent from 2001 to 2006. Assiniboine South has the greatest percentage of home owners at 84% while St. James Assiniboia East has the lowest at 61%, a reflection of the large number of apartment blocks in the area. This pattern is reinforced by the number of people who have not moved in the past 5 years. The city average is 55%, essentially the same as what is seen in St. James Assiniboia East. It is nearly 65% in Assiniboine South.

Main Points

- *Generally, the District overall is older than the rest of the city (a greater number of people 55+), more homogenous (fewer immigrants and aboriginals), and somewhat more affluent (fewer low income households and higher rate of home ownership).*
- *Within the District, the Assiniboine South cluster is considerably different than the two clusters north of the river having experienced a modest population growth over recent years compared to a loss in population and having higher education and greater household income.*

4. Overview of Current Programs

Table 3 provides a summary of programming hours and programs offered by each centre and by each cluster based upon information provided by the centres themselves. The 13

community centres together offer 164 programs accounting for nearly 30,000 hours of recreation programming. This ranges from an estimated 702 programming hours provided through Bord-Aire Community Centre to an estimated 6,802 programming hours provided through the Kirkfield-Westwood Community Centre.

In relation to population, the number of program hours per person works out to be:

St. James Assiniboia West:	0.39 hours per person
St. James Assiniboia East:	0.28 hours per person
Assiniboine South:	0.32 hours per person
Assiniboia District:	**0.32 hours per person**
City Average:	**0.33 hours per person**

Table 3: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAMS

Facility	Program Hours	No. of Programs	Breakdown of Programs: Pre-School	Children/ Youth	Adults	Seniors	Special Events
St. James Assiniboia West Pop: 31,305							
Assiniboine West	2,870	17	2	7	2	-	6
Heritage-Victoria	2,678	14	2	7	1	1	3
Kirkfield-Westwood	6,802	25	4	13	3	1	4
Total for Cluster	**12,350**	**56**	**8**	**27**	**6**	**2**	**13**
St. James Assiniboia East Pop: 25,585							
Sturgeon Creek	1,048	18	2	11	4	-	1
Silver Heights	908	11	-	8	-	1	2
Deer Lodge	1,857	10	-	7	-	1	2
Bourkevale	1,048	11	1	4	3	-	3
Bord-Aire	702	10	-	5	2	-	3
Woodhaven	1,571	13	1	4	2	-	6
Total for Cluster	**7,134**	**73**	**4**	**39**	**11**	**2**	**17**
Assiniboine South Pop: 35,455							
Westdale	1,576	5	-	3	1	1	-
Roblin Park	3,554	15	1	10	3	-	1
Varsity View	3,473	6	1	3	1	-	1
Tuxedo	2,752	9	1	8	-	-	-
Total for Cluster	**11,355**	**35**	**3**	**24**	**5**	**1**	**2**
District 2 Assiniboia Pop: 95,125	**30,839**	**164**	**15** 9%	**90** 55%	**22** 13%	**5** 3%	**32** 20%

Source: Community Centre Profiles

Within the District, the greatest emphasis is on children and youth programming with 90 of the 164 programs (55%) dedicated to that group. Only 5 programs or 3% of the total is directed toward seniors. This pattern is even more pronounced in the Assiniboine South cluster where nearly 70% of the programs are directed toward children and youth with only 1 program available for seniors. It is important to note that programs tend to be delivered based upon volunteer and financial resources and that facility limitations often hamper the delivery of specific programs.

St. James Assiniboia West offers the best balance of programs to its different user groups. It places considerable effort (almost 25%) on the provision of special events. Special events are important because they tend to attract a broader base of participants.

Having events for the entire family has a positive impact on the operations of the centres, facilitating the recruitment of volunteers among other benefits.

Looking more closely at individual centres, Kirkfield-Westwood is the dominant facility in St. James Assiniboia West offering 6,800 program hours spanning 25 programs. This is consistent with its size. As shown in Table 1, the centre includes two sites and an arena with a combined capacity of nearly 22,000 heated square feet. Heritage-Victoria, meanwhile, offers a balanced set of programs but has the lowest number of program hours relative to the size of its facility.

In St. James Assiniboia East, Deer Lodge is the largest facility with over 13,500 square feet of heated space and offers the greatest number of hours of programming. Bord-Aire offers the fewest number of program hours.

South of the river, Westdale offers the fewest number of programs (5) although it operates a main facility and a satellite with a combined capacity of nearly 17,000 heated square feet. Meanwhile, Varsity View which also operates two facilities, including an indoor arena, with a combined capacity of over 22,000 heated square feet of space, offers the second fewest number of programs at 6.

Main Points

- *While there is a significant difference between the amount of programming undertaken by St. James Assiniboia West versus St. James Assiniboia East, the amount of programming undertaken by the District overall is consistent with other areas of the city.*
- *The District appears to provide a wide range of programs but its main emphasis tends to be on the provision of sport programs. Children's and youth programs are the mainstay.*
- *Considering the demographic makeup of the community, there would appear to be a shortage of seniors programming, however there are a number of senior program agencies in the District that may be serving this demographic. Partnering with these agencies will help to identify programming gaps.*
- *St. James Assiniboia West would appear to have the broadest range of programs. Although Assiniboine South has half that number of programs, it has virtually the same amount of program hours. This would indicate less variety but greater participation.*

5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers

Table 4 provides an estimate of the number of volunteer hours and number of volunteers.

NOTE: The volunteer hours have been provided by the individual community centres and not all centres monitor this information with the same degree of accuracy. The number of volunteers is a rough estimate based upon the fact that, on average, each volunteer in Canada commits 122 hours of their time. Given the range of potential error, these figures should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude only.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE VOLUNTEERS			
Cluster	Facility Name	Volunteer Hours	Number of Volunteers
St. James Assiniboia West 3 community centres Pop: 31,305	Assiniboine West	21,100	
	Heritage-Victoria	16,600	
	Kirkfield-Westwood	37,300	
	Total for Cluster	**75,000**	**610 (est)**
St. James Assiniboia East 6 community centres Pop: 25,585	Sturgeon Creek	13,500	
	Silver Heights	10,000	
	Deer Lodge	19,000	
	Bourkevale	15,600	
	Bord-Aire	9,000	
	Woodhaven	13,000	
	Total for Cluster	**80,100**	**660 (est)**
Assiniboine South 4 community centres Pop: 35,455	Westdale	10,000	
	Roblin Park	13,300	
	Varsity View	15,300	
	Tuxedo	16,100	
	Total for Cluster	**54,700**	**450 (est)**
District 2 Assiniboia 13 community centres	**Population 95,138**	**209,800**	**1,720 (estimate)**

Source: Community Centre Profiles and derivation from national averages on volunteerism

It is estimated that the District overall is served by over 1,700 volunteers committing over 200,000 hours of time to the community centre system.

In relation to population, the number of volunteer hours works out to be:

St. James Assiniboia West:	2.4 hours per person
St. James Assiniboia East:	3.1 hours per person
Assiniboine South:	1.5 hours per person
Assiniboia District:	**2.2 hours per person**
City Average:	**1.9 hours per person**

The community centre system city-wide is supported by approximately 1.9 volunteer hours per person. The pattern is one of higher support (approximately 2.3 hours per person) in the suburban areas versus approximately 1.5 hours per person in the inner city. Therefore, overall, the Assiniboia District is consistent with other suburban areas of the city in terms of volunteer support, given that it is generally suburban in character.

Within the District, St. James Assiniboia West appears to be well supported having the greatest number of volunteer hours to serve the 3 community centres. The Assiniboine South area is not nearly as well served with approximately 1.5 volunteer hours committed per person to the community centre system.

As shown in **Table 5**, the District's 13 community centres are operated on a day-to-day basis through a combined 17 full-time staff and an additional 55 or so part-time, casual, and seasonal staff. The two largest centres in the District, Kirkfield-Westwood and Varsity View (with indoor arenas), have the greatest number of full-time staff at four each. Of note, Woodhaven, by far the smallest centre in the District (apart from satellite

facilities) operates with no staff at all, placing the burden of responsibility on volunteer support. Bourkevale is not much different; it operates with the help of only one part-time staff.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE STAFF

Cluster	Facility Name	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Green Team, etc	Seasonal
St. James Assiniboia West 4 community centres population 31,305	Assiniboine West	2	-	-	2	-
	Heritage-Victoria	1*	5	-	1	1
	Kirkfield-Westwood	4*	4	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**7**	**9**	**0**	**3**	**1**
St. James Assiniboia East 5 community centres population 25,585	Sturgeon Creek	1*	1	1	1.5	-
	Silver Heights	1	1	-	-	-
	Deer Lodge	1	2	-	1	-
	Bourkevale	-	1	-	1	-
	Bord-Aire	1	-	-	-	-
	Woodhaven	-	1	-	-	5
	Total for Cluster	**4**	**6**	**1**	**3.5**	**5**
Assiniboine South 4 community centres population 35,455	Westdale	1*	-	7	-	1
	Roblin Park	-	3	1	1	-
	Varsity View	4	2	-	3	6
	Tuxedo	1	1	-	-	2
	Total for Cluster	**6**	**6**	**8**	**4**	**9**
District 2 Assiniboia 13 community centres	**Population 95,138**	**17**	**21**	**9**	**10.5**	**15**

Source: Community Centre Profiles ** includes the General Manager*

Main Points

- *While the District overall has a volunteer base consistent with the rest of the city, there are significant discrepancies within the District with a large volunteer base in St. James Assiniboia versus a much smaller support base in Assiniboine South.*
- *One of the likely reasons Assiniboine South has less volunteer support is that it is relatively better served with staff than the other two cluster areas.*
- *From a staffing perspective, community centres in the St. James Assiniboia West and Assiniboine South clusters have the largest and most comprehensive range of staff. This is consistent with these clusters offering the greatest number of program hours.*

6. Overview of Current Facilities

In 2004, a comprehensive study of recreation facilities in Winnipeg evaluated each of the City's recreation facilities in terms of their overall condition using what was called a Facility Condition Index or FCI. The FCI represents the amount of money it would take to get the facility to an average level of upkeep. This amount is provided in relation to the replacement cost of the facility so the lower the number the better. An FCI of .50, then, means that an investment of 50% of the replacement cost of the facility is needed at present to get the facility into respectable condition. If that investment was made, then an ongoing average maintenance program would be able to keep it in that condition.

Table 6 shows the FCI rating for the District's facilities. It also translates the FCI into a dollar figure identified as the preservation need. The FCI indicates that the District's community centres are in relatively poorer shape in relation to the city average of 0.41. As of 2004, the preservation funds needed were identified as nearly $9 M. Such an investment at that time would have brought the facilities up to reasonable condition.

Among the facilities, two stand out. Woodhaven Community Centre and the St. James Cultural Center have preservation needs greater than the replacement value of the facility. This suggests that it would be more cost effective to demolish and replace the facilities rather than tend to the major repairs that are required. Apart from these two facilities, the Assiniboine West Community Centre and its satellite would appear to have the greatest need for repair.

Table 6: FACILITY CONDITION AND PRESERVATION NEEDS (as of 2004)

Facility Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	FCI	Preservation Needs ($)
St. James Assiniboia West				
Community Centre	✦Assiniboine West	8,293	0.74	1,010,000
Satellite	Assiniboine West - Morgan	7,877	0.82	536,000
Community Centre	Heritage Victoria	13,469	0.14	230,000
Community Centre	✦Kirkfield-Westwood*	16,162	0.19	389,000
Satellite	Kirkfield-Westwood - McBey	4,551	0.31	115,000
Arena	Kirkfield-Westwood - Arena	1,007	0.14	400,000
Recreation Centre	St. James Centennial	28,936	0.00	0
Recreation Centre	St. James Cultural Centre	2,480	1.00+	375,000
	Total for Cluster	82,775	Avg 0.52	$3,055,000
St. James Assiniboia East				
Community Centre	✦Bord-Aire	9,970	0.36	485,000
Community Centre	Bourkevale	7,268	0.50	415,000
Community Centre	Deer Lodge	13,591	0.20	336,000
Community Centre	Silver Heights	9,416	0.47	525,000
Community Centre	Sturgeon Creek	9,859	0.36	405,000
Community Centre	Woodhaven	4,392	1.00+	660,000
Recreation Centre	St. James Civic Centre	20,029	0.10	900,000
Recreation Centre	Bourkevale Leisure Centre	8,585	0.18	200,000
	Total for Cluster	83,110	Avg. 0.57	$3,926,000
Assiniboine South				
Community Centre	✦Roblin Park	11,228	0.32	433,000
Community Centre	Tuxedo	9,405	0.13/0.30	335,000
Community Centre	✦Varsity View	11,090	0.66	515,000
Satellite/Arena	Varsity View Sportsplex	11,570	0.11	400,000
Community Centre	Westdale	13,890	0.36	330,000
Satellite	Westdale - Pembina Trails	2,931	0.51	195,000
Recreation Centre	Eric Coy Craft Centre/Rec Centre	3,967	n/a	n/a
	Total for Cluster	64,081	Avg. 0.36	$2,208,000
19 community centre facilities	District 2 Community Centre Facilities	165,969	Avg. 0.49	$9,189,000
5 city-run facilities	District 2 City-Run Facilities	63,997	Avg. 0.53	$1,280,000
Total: 24 facilities	**District 2 All Facilities**	**229,966**	**Avg. 0.50**	**$9,849,000**

Source: Public Use Facilities Study, City of Winnipeg, 2004

NOTE: The assessment provided in Table 6 is now 4 years old and was based upon information that was a few years old at the time. Given that few major capital investments

have been made in recent years, there is still merit in the assessment although it is likely that many of the facilities are in worse shape today. Furthermore, the costs would be significantly higher than those presented. The Table should be used simply as representing an order of magnitude of the investment needed and the relative need among centres and clusters.

✦ *NOTE: In a few instances, significant investment has taken place since 2004 leading to an improved facility today. Those facilities have been flagged in the Table.*

NOTE: The FCI numbers in Table 6 were derived through the Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS, 2004) based upon maintenance requirements determined by the City of Winnipeg. It should be noted that some Community Centres did not agree with the condition rating and subsequent level of investment determined through this study.

Within the St. James Assiniboia West cluster, Assiniboine West and its satellite stand out as requiring significant investment. In St. James Assiniboia East, Bourkevale and Silver Heights are in greatest need after Woodhaven. In Assiniboine South, Tuxedo CC and the Varsity View Sportsplex are in relatively good condition with all other facilities requiring significant attention. The Varsity View main site and the Westdale satellite at Pembina Trails stand out as having the greatest need in this cluster.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE AMENITIES

Facility Name	Board Room	Computer Rm / Office	Canteen	Kitchen	Nursery School Area	Games Room	Gym (cap)	Hall (cap)	MPR (cap)	Indoor Arena	Other
St. James Assiniboia W											
Assiniboine West	1	-	1/1	1/1	-	-	-	1/1	-	-	
Heritage-Victoria	1	2	2	1	1	-	-	1	2	-	
Kirkfield-Westwood	1	3	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	Skate shop
Total for Cluster	**3**	**5**	**6**	**4**	**2**	**-**	**-**	**4**	**2**	**1**	
St. James Assiniboia E											
Sturgeon Creek	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Silver Heights	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	
Deer Lodge	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
Bourkevale	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Bord-Aire	1	1	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	
Woodhaven	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
Total for Cluster	**4**	**5**	**6**	**5**	**-**	**1**	**-**	**6**	**4**	**-**	
Assiniboine South											
Westdale	1	-	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	
Roblin Park	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	
Varsity View	1	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	
Tuxedo	1	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	
Total for Cluster	**3**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**4**	**-**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**1**	
Total for District	**10**	**11**	**18**	**13**	**6**	**1**	**1**	**13**	**7**	**2**	

Source: Community Centres

Table 7 itemizes the amenities that can be found in the District's community centres. This list makes clear some of the pressures they face. Among 13 community centres and 4 satellites, there is but one gym and one games room, and the gym is small, suitable for use by children only. As a result, the District must seek partnerships with school divisions to share gym use or face limitations in programs that can be offered.

Shown in **Table 8** is the Space to Population Ratio (SPR). This is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amount of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. This is a relative measure only.

Table 8: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS

	St.J/A West		St.J/A East		Assin. South		District 2		CITY	
Population	31,305		25,585		35,455		95,125		647,600	
	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR	Space	SPR
Community Centre Space	51,359	1.64	54,496	2.13	60,114	1.70	165,969	1.74	972,066	1.50
City-Run Space	31,416	1.00	28,614	1.12	3,967	0.11	63,997	0.67	246,501	0.38
Total Space	82,775	2.64	83,110	3.25	64,081	1.81	229,966	2.42	1,218,567	1.88

Source: Derived from previous tables

Relative to the rest of the city, District 2 is the best served with nearly 230,000 square feet of space for a population of approximately 95,000 people. Within the District, St. James Assiniboia West at 2.64 and St. James Assiniboia East at 3.25 have considerably higher SPRs than Assiniboine South at 1.81. The city average is 1.88 square feet of space per person.

Main Points

- *Overall, facilities in District 2 could benefit from increased investment in facility maintenance and capital improvements. This is consistent with the challenge faced in all areas of the City, i.e., how to work with the City of Winnipeg to address concerns related to long term sustainability.*
- *While most centres have halls and multi-purpose areas that can accommodate a variety of programming, there is a lack of gym space and games areas.*
- *Relative to other areas of the city, St. James Assiniboia East and West have considerably more recreation space per capita while Assiniboine South has about the same as the city average.*

7. Current Issues and Concerns

The planning model used in this exercise is one that examines the inter-relationship among people, programs, and facilities with the underlying assumption that one must understand the needs of the people in order to develop relevant programs and, in turn, it

is the nature of the programs that will dictate the types of facilities needed. Issues and concerns were identified in all three areas.

People

Volunteer recruitment and retention is a high priority issue. While volunteerism is relatively consistent with other areas of the city at this point, recruiting volunteers in the future is likely to become an increasing challenge given that society overall is aging and that volunteers tend to be parents with young children. This is particularly significant given that the District already has a large number of seniors, who typically have not been heavily involved at community centres. Furthermore, volunteer burnout is a contributing factor in the efforts to keep the community centre movement sustainable.

An additional challenge is recruiting and retaining qualified staff for the centres. It is particularly challenging given the nature of the community centre operations and required skills. In an attempt to address this challenge, community centre boards are reviewing the possibility of sharing staff so as to be a more attractive employer.

Programs

Programming for seniors is a challenge. With a number of well-established organizations offering programs for seniors, the role of community centres in this regard needs to be assessed in light of any programming gaps that may exist. Building partnerships and relationships with other community agencies may be the key. Many community centres are available during the day to accommodate seniors programming, however, professional assistance may be required to get programs in place.

Further, teen population programming is a challenge. There is a requirement for more than sport programming to attract the youth of the community to be involved in the community centre movement. As well, through teen participation in the centre, there are more opportunities to recruit teens for volunteer and employment positions. While there are a number of children's programs, more can be done in support of youth development.

While professional and volunteer assistance is needed to enhance programming for teens and seniors, obtaining funds for non-sport activities remains a significant challenge as well. The ability of a community centre to generate revenue through facility rentals, fundraising, establishing partnerships, etc. will continue to be essential to the implementation of new programming.

The need for qualified leadership to operate programs is becoming more of a challenge. As addressed in the people component above, community centres partnering on programs and operations as a means to provide viable employment is a potential solution.

Facilities

The District has not experienced population growth for many years, and existing facilities have been in a stagnant position with few new facilities and expansions. Despite budget limitations, there are ongoing efforts to keep the facilities well maintained. While there is a

need for more contemporary facilities that meet legislated safety standards, community centres have limited ability to upgrade their centres, particularly in light of rising construction and maintenance costs. It should also be noted that the school divisions, seeing a decrease in population, have closed many facilities (16 schools have closed in the past 25 years). This has increased the need for access to gyms (the greatest priority overall). Historically, high school gyms have been inaccessible to the community, as they are required by the schools themselves; therefore the need for regulation sized gyms to accommodate youth sports has been identified by the community centres.

Indoor soccer is a growing sport. The RLLF Policy states that there should be one indoor soccer facility for every 50,000 people, yet there is but one privately run indoor soccer facility in this part of the city at the Canlan Ice Centre (Highlander) on Ellice.

Vandalism and an overall need to address crime prevention is a significant concern. Naturally, vandalism and crime prevention programs are tied together and this issue needs to be addressed from a broad perspective, not just a facility perspective, that is, there is a social component to crime that can be addressed through recreational programming.

Safety standards for the operation of programs and facilities have become a significant factor for community centres. Additional legislation puts the onus on Community Centre Boards to ensure that all appropriate safety guidelines and operations are respected by all Community Centre volunteers and staff. This additional responsibility has had a significant impact on the operations of Community Centres.

Main Points

- *Volunteer recruitment and retention is a high priority for the District overall and will require inventive solutions considering the aging demographic and concerns about volunteer burn-out.*
- *Staff sharing is seen as a strategy that can allow more centres to have access to staffing resources (programmers, bookkeepers, etc.).*
- *A broader range of programs needs to be offered, particularly those directed toward teens (non-sport alternatives) and seniors. The challenge is to determine what to offer and how to offer it.*
- *With the closure of a large number of schools over the years, access to full-size gymnasiums has become very restrictive and is seen as the highest priority overall for this District. An indoor soccer facility is also lacking in this part of the city.*

C. Needs Assessment

1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025

The Phase 1 Report that accompanies this study outlined in some detail the anticipated growth over the next twenty years and the impact of this growth on the City's demographic make-up. In short, Winnipeg is expected to experience significant growth

averaging approximately 1% per year after a period of near stagnation over the past decade.

Natural growth in population, that is, birth minus deaths, will account for very little of this growth. The bulk of the growth will be attributable to increases in net migration. It is anticipated that fewer people will leave Winnipeg for ex-urban areas, fewer people will leave the Province for other Provinces, and more international migrants will be coming to the Province, especially to Winnipeg. This latter point is the most significant and is the result of an aggressive campaign on the part of the provincial government to increase international immigration through its Nominee Program.

As shown in **Table 9**, the population of Winnipeg is expected to grow by 137,500 by 2025. Given the areas in the city where growth can be accommodated, it is expected that as much as 20% of the growth could occur in District 2. This translates into a potential increase of over 25,000 people. This assumes a major population infusion into the area south of Wilkes.

Table 9: ESTIMATED GROWTH to 2025 – ALL DISTRICTS

	Est. Pop. 2005	Growth Allocation	Est. Pop. Increase	Est. Pop. 2025
District 1: City Centre	149,600	10%	13,650	163,250
District 2: Assiniboia	95,125	20%	27,800	122,925
District 3: Lord Selkirk W Kildonan	136,125	10%	13,150	149,275
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	10%	13,650	128,100
District 5: Riel	152,300	50%	69,250	221,550
Winnipeg	647,600	100%	137,500	785,100

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada and City of Winnipeg information

While the population may grow significantly, there will also be a shift in demographic make-up. In particular, the seniors population will increase, especially the 'younger' seniors, aged 60-75. Where this group now comprises 17% of the population, that percentage will grow to 23% by the year 2025.

Additionally, the aboriginal population is expected to grow at a faster rate than the general population. While the city overall is expected to grow by 21% to the year 2025, the aboriginal population in itself could increase by over 60% if current growth rates hold true into the future. (See Phase 1 report for more detail.)

Main Points

- *Winnipeg is expected to grow by more than 20% to the year 2025, an increase in population of 137,500. It is possible that District 2 could increase in population by as much as 25,000 over that period, almost entirely in Assiniboine South.*
- *The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.*

2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term

With significant growth anticipated for the city it is critical for the planning of programs and facilities to understand where that growth is likely to occur. **Map 5** identifies the potential areas of growth.

Map 5: ANTICIPATED GROWTH AREAS FOR DISTRICT 2



Areas identified as 1 to 5 are those areas where growth is more likely to occur in the shorter term, that is, over the next 10 years, perhaps 15 years. These 'shorter-term' growth areas include:

1. Portage Avenue West – there is a small amount of land available for development in this area.

2. Haney Street – the removal of the Charleswood Golf Course has opened up some opportunities for a modest amount of residential development in this area.
3. Kapyong Barracks – development of this site is contingent upon the 'freeing' up of the land by the federal government. It is estimated that, should development proceed, a population of approximately 2,700 could be accommodated on this site. (While a portion of the Kapyong site is located outside the District boundary, its impact would be felt by the Tuxedo CC which is why it is addressed here.)
4. Charleswood – there remains considerable underdeveloped land in Charleswood South and it is anticipated that the population could grow by approximately 2,400.
5. Ridgewood South – there are significant challenges to overcome in the provision of infrastructure to this area but it is anticipated that these can be addressed in the relatively near future and that the site could accommodate approximately 6,500 residents.

While there are many factors that could influence the timing of these developments, they are, generally speaking, reasonably likely to occur over the twenty year period anticipated in this plan. Should these proposed developments come to fruition, they would account for an increase in population of approximately 12,000 people.

6. Wilkes South – should the long-term projections hold true, there will be additional pressure for residential accommodation which could trigger development south of Wilkes. This area is very large and could easily accommodate the additional 15,000 people identified in the projections. However, the possibility of this occurring within the planning horizon is remote.

Additionally, it is anticipated that policies promoting residential intensification could result in additional infill development and higher density redevelopment of existing properties throughout the District, particularly in areas such as Portage Avenue where a pattern of intense development already exists.

Main Points

- *Given the population projections, it is expected that there will be very little growth north of the Assiniboine River. It can reasonably be assumed that the modest growth can be absorbed by the existing facilities in the St. James Assiniboia West and St. James Assiniboia East cluster areas.*
- *Virtually all the growth anticipated for the District will find its way south of the River into the Assiniboine South cluster. This will put increasing pressure on existing facilities and create a further imbalance in the Space to Population Ratios identified in Table 8.There will be pressure to increase facility space in Assiniboine South over time.*

3. Assessing Future Needs

In light of current issues facing the community centre system in District 2 and in order to be well positioned to address forecasted population growth and anticipated changes in

demographics, a number of needs have been identified which should be addressed over the coming years.

Meeting the changing programming needs of the community

There is a need for a more diverse set of programs that span age groups and to introduce new programs that bring a better balance of traditional sport programming and non-sport programming. However, experience has shown a resistance to change. Traditional programming often wins the day because it is easier to do and volunteers often do not have the time or skill to create new initiatives and programs.

Addressing changing demographics

It will be important to better understand the program requirements of youth, seniors, and minority groups. As the face of the community changes, it may be necessary to address issues such as affordability, mobility, language, and culture in order to ensure that barriers such as these do not inhibit access to community centre programs.

Matching space to programs

There is a need to enhance facilities to meet the changing programming needs. It is clear that current facilities are not conducive to some programs and many new and innovative programs cannot be pursued because existing facilities cannot accommodate them. Over time, a more contemporary set of facilities and amenities that are multi-purpose and flexible in nature will be needed in order to meet the diverse needs of the community while accommodating new and growing sports such as indoor soccer and beach volleyball. A major regional facility with a more diversified set of amenities may be required. However, casual, drop-in access must be supported as well.

Optimizing use of existing space

With scarce resources there is pressure to ensure better utilization of existing facilities. For example, arenas could be more broadly used for programs other than ice sports. Inventive use of space will be the key. Furthermore, most centres are not used to capacity, especially during daytime.

Sustaining volunteer support

Recruitment efforts need to be enhanced to ensure an ongoing commitment to volunteerism by all members of the community including parents, seniors, youth, and minority groups. There is a need to ensure the sustainability of community centre boards with committed volunteers acting in leadership roles. As well, certain key volunteers will need to be well trained for specific programming purposes as well as for legal liability and workplace health requirements.

Attracting and retaining staff

There will be continued pressure to attract and retain qualified staff both in terms of technical staff such as arena operators and program staff such as recreation technicians. As employers, community centres will need to ensure that salaries and benefits are

competitive with similar organizations and agencies to support the long-term development needs of staff through education and training.

Applying a district perspective

The benefit of sharing resources and coordinating activities among community centres is becoming more apparent. There is a need to facilitate meaningful discussion and strategic planning among community centres in order to deliver coordinated programming to the community. To start, there is a need to enhance communications in order to increase awareness of the programs offered at community centres. As well, there is a need to unravel the sometimes complex and cumbersome program registration process.

Main Points

- *It will be important in the future to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community and to ensure that barriers are not inhibiting access to programs. Skilled, professional program developers may be needed.*
- *More contemporary and flexible facilities will be needed in the future and inventive solutions will be needed to ensure that existing facilities are used as effectively and efficiently as possible.*
- *Recruitment and retention efforts geared toward both volunteer and staff will have to be become more sophisticated in light of greater competition for both.*
- *Community centres will need to work more collaboratively in terms of program delivery, communications, and resource sharing.*

D. Moving Forward

1. Defining Success

NOTE: The following vision, principles, and success indicators were developed as part of the Plan 2025 Phase One report which was adopted by the membership at the 2008 GCWCC Annual General Meeting.

"The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base and high maintenance needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by the City. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple amenities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the specialized services they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

In the case of all the above models, the District Planning Committee agrees that a successful community centre is one that provides relevant programming for all age groups, in a well-maintained, multi-functional space that is open to the public both day and evening.

Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.
- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.
- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

Defining Success

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community.

A successful community centre is deemed to have the following characteristics.

- The community centre is a focal point of the community.
- The community centre makes an important contribution to the quality of life of a neighbourhood or community.
- The community centre serves the immediate population of the neighbourhood.
- The community centre relies on, and benefits from, dedicated volunteers and staff.
- The community centre offer diverse programming and provides a good balance of sport and non-sport programs.
- The community centre has well-maintained facilities.

- The community centre builds partnerships that enhance the pursuit of its mandate."

Main Points

- *The community centre model of the future must consider and respond to community needs at the local level, the neighbourhood level, and the district level.*
- *The community centre model of the future must reflect the guiding principles upon which the system was founded and must strive to achieve success as defined by the community.*
- *The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing. However, there are many community centres that are flourishing with a strong volunteer base and strong programming and may not be facing the same pressures to evolve.*

2. Planning Limitations

Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. To accommodate the projected growth, 258,000 square feet of additional space can be planned for city-wide.

However, there are current imbalances in the system with some areas of the city having a higher SPR than others. The primary directive provided by the GCWCC as guidance for this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close as possible to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time.

Given that District 2 currently enjoys the highest SPR, it has the greatest limitation in its ability to add new space into the system in spite of the projected population growth for the District. **Table 11** shows the amount of space allocated to each district for planning purposes. If the population projections hold true, this would get all Districts to the same Space to Population Ratio.

Table 11: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR TO 2025 BY DISTRICT

	Combined Space Allocation	Resulting SPR	Community Centre Component	City-Run Space Component
District 1: City Centre	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	258,000 sq ft	**1.88**	206,000 sq ft	52,000 sq ft

Source: From Phase 1 report.

District 2 has been allocated a modest 1,500 square feet of additional space for which to plan for. Should the population increase in the District by 27,800 people as projected, the

District's SPR would drop from its current city-high of 2.42 to 1.88, the city average. The challenge for the District is to redistribute its existing space over time to accommodate the anticipated growth while adding no more than 1,500 square feet of additional space.

Main Points

- *It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space.*
- *Respecting the GCWCC's goal, plans for District 2 must accommodate a potential increase in population of 27,800 people to the year 2025 while adding no more than 1,500 square feet of additional space. Redistribution of existing space will be key to providing more contemporary facilities.*

3. Strategies

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the needs of the District identified earlier.

Need: To meet the changing programming needs of the community

Strategies:

- Shared Staff: New, innovative programs are difficult to introduce however the challenges can be overcome by working together and sharing resources among community centres to get new programs developed and operational. It may be possible to hire 'floating' program staff dedicated to the development and implementation of new programs while working for the District overall or for a cluster within the District.
- City Assistance: The City of Winnipeg is considering a new model of service delivery. It may be possible to acquire greater assistance in the future to develop and support the delivery of new programs through a collaborative working arrangement among City staff and other service providers.
- Partnerships: Community centres may be able to develop partnerships with existing agencies (such as Age and Opportunity Centres) to provide additional programs for seniors. Space can be provided in exchange for programming expertise. Furthermore, the effort to provide and maintain grass roots sport programming for children should be regarded as a core responsibility of the community centre.
- Collaboration: The District has a number of City of Winnipeg facilities that should be taken into account in striving to meet program requirements and avoid duplication. Through collaborative efforts with the City facilities such as the St. James-Assiniboia Centennial Recreation Centre and the St. James Civic Centre, complementary programs can be provided by community centres.

- Network: The District can become involved in community network organizations identified by City staff in order to benefit from collective program funding opportunities and to promote the availability of community centre facilities. This could be a forum for promotion of the community centre movement.

Need: To address changing demographics

Strategies:

- Research: Demographic research, public polling, and community consultation processes can be undertaken to better understand the program requirements of youth, adults, seniors, and minority groups and to ensure that issues such as affordability, mobility, language, and culture do not inhibit access to community centre programs. It may be possible to obtain grants (eg. the Winnipeg Foundation) to undertake this work.

Need: To optimize use of space

Strategies:

- Utilization Plan: There is capacity for enhanced program operations at a majority of community centres. A district-wide utilization plan can be developed to promote the optimum utilization matching users to times of day. The plan can include the exploration of alternative uses for traditionally single use facilities such as arenas.
- Renovation: In cases where existing facilities are inadequate to meet program needs, it may be possible to reconfigure existing space to make it more suitable for contemporary use. Such proposals can be brought forward by individual centres and considered among the list of other potential projects.
- Strategic Mergers: Merging two or more community centres can be a challenging proposition but can lead to a more contemporary facility better able to meet the needs of the community if one facility is closed in order to accommodate an expansion of the other. Mergers can also be considered between community centres and City-run facilities if this assists in achieving the broader goals of the community.

Need: To match space to programs

Strategies:

- Gym Access: With the closure of many schools in the District over recent years and the potential closure of more, access to full-size school gymnasiums is becoming more and more of a challenge. Discussions with School Divisions should continue to ensure efficient use is being made of existing school gyms. This strategy should be coupled with the pursuit of the most feasible option for adding a full-size gymnasium to an existing centre.
- Emerging Sports: Through a review of existing facilities, identify how and where new recreation options can be accommodated in areas of emerging and growing sports such as indoor soccer and beach volleyball.

- Drop-in: Casual drop-in use of facilities should be accommodated and promoted broadly to establish the connection between the community centre and its community in a way that is clearly outside the realm of structured sport.

Need: To sustain volunteer support

Strategies:

- Support Services: To encourage ongoing commitment from volunteers a support structure should be established to ensure that volunteers in key positions have access to the training they require, that legal liability and workplace health requirements are looked after, and that proper recognition is given to the valuable contribution they make.
- Credit Program: Volunteer recruitment from the youth sector is critically important to sustain the community centre movement into the future and could be pursued by working with School Division officials to take advantage of the school credit program for volunteerism.
- Senior Recruitment: The District has a substantial seniors population that could be tapped into for volunteerism. Accessing this population through a number of existing community agencies such as Age and Opportunity could be a viable recruitment strategy for community centres to pursue. Another option is to seek volunteer support among grandparents of youth program participants.
- Promotion: Sustaining volunteers at a Board level and general operational program leadership level is a key priority and may be best pursued through an intense promotion of the benefits of community centres to the general population in order to enhance awareness and encourage participation. A District-wide strategy could be developed and pursued.

Need: To attract and retain staff

Strategies:

- Remuneration: To ensure that salaries and benefits are competitive with similar organizations and agencies it may be necessary to undertake an industry review or to seek out existing information of that nature.
- Support Structure: As with the work of volunteers, a support structure should be established to ensure that permanent staff have access to the education and training they require, that workplace issues are addressed, and that proper recognition is given to the contribution they make.
- Staff Sharing: Sharing of staff among community centres may be a solution as there would be sufficient work to support competitive and attractive salary and benefits. Pooling the resources used for part-time staff can translate into full-time positions which are often more desirable for the most qualified employees.

Need: To apply a district perspective

Strategies:

- Common Agenda: The District-wide Community Centres Board meets regularly. Its agenda could be reconfigured to encourage more discussion among centres about issues of common concern.
- Communications: Communications can be enhanced on a district-wide basis in order to increase awareness of the programs offered at community centres while promoting the benefit of volunteering and identifying opportunities for volunteering. A joint newsletter would be beneficial especially if done in cluster areas with coordinated programming. As well, community centres could enhance their respective websites and make use of the GCWCC website so as to promote their programs, services, and facilities.
- Programming: Scarce resources can be optimized if community centres shared the responsibility for program operations and delivered them by cluster. Strategic planning by cluster or district-wide can be undertaken regularly to develop and deliver coordinated programming to the community.
- Registration: An on-line registration system could be developed to provide greater ease in registration as well as better access to programs. As well, establishing a common registration location would help build unity and facilitate volunteer recruitment. This must be approached with a note of caution, as losing physical contact with one's home community centre can have adverse effects on volunteerism.
- Boundary Review: A Community Centre catchment boundary review should be undertaken by the GCWCC to address changes in the community centre landscape. Small catchment areas coincide with a small volunteer base.

Main Points

- *A number of strategies have been identified which could address current issues and future needs. These are the starting points for action and should be built upon over time.*
- *The District's overall priorities remain: access to full-size gym space, volunteer recruitment and retention, and programming for seniors and youth.*

4. Possible Development Scenarios

Map 6 identifies a number of possible scenarios that could be pursued. These scenarios are intended to provide reconfiguration options that would assist in meeting the District's needs.

NOTE: The following scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.



Map 6 - District 2: Assiniboia
Proposed Development Scenarios

Legend

- Community Centres
- Recreation Facilities
- Increase in Facility Size
- Decrease in Facility Size
- Facility Closures
- Proposed Grouping of Facilities
- Community Centre Catchment Boundary

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

February 23, 2009

NOTE: Not all centres are, or need be, included in the scenarios. It was contemplated that those centres not specifically identified for possible change would carry on as status quo.

Scenario 1: *Amalgamate Silver Heights and Sturgeon Creek*

What: Amalgamate the Silver Heights and Sturgeon Creek Community Centres into a single facility with the addition of a full-size gym.

Why: Sturgeon Creek has been challenged with an inadequate facility resulting in a significant limitation to the number of programs it can offer. Silver Heights struggles with the same limitations with the added challenges of a relatively low number of volunteers, dropping participation rates, and a close proximity to the St. James Civic Centre. Both facilities are in need of considerable maintenance, although several centres in the district have bigger challenges. Amalgamation would allow for the addition of a full-size gym. The merged facility would result in an expansion of the Sturgeon Creek site because Sturgeon Creek is recognized as being in a prime location, easily accessible by public transit and accessible from Assiniboine South via Moray Bridge. The new centre would be more energy efficient and less costly to maintain and would provide a more contemporary facility to meet the changing needs of the community. As well, volunteer sustainability and programming breadth would be expanded due to increased geographic boundaries.

How: The merger may result in a reduction to the overall amount of square footage based upon the creation of a mid-sized neighbourhood community centre of approximately 15,000-20,000 sq. ft. In this scenario, it may be possible to close the Silver Heights facility together with the two outdoor rinks that lie south of Ness. (The military fields north of Ness would continue to be used.) If that was the case, substantial revenue could be realized from the sale of the property.

Should the Silver Heights site be declared surplus and sold, proceeds from the sale of property would be directed toward the Community Centre redevelopment at the Sturgeon Creek site (this provision is in the RLLF policy).

In addition, an access use agreement would need to be formalized among the community centres in the cluster area, ensuring equitable access to new gym space.

Scenario 2: *Add a Gym to Kirkfield Westwood OR Heritage Victoria*

What: Free up space among centres in order to expand either the Kirkfield Westwood main site OR the Heritage Victoria Community Centre with the addition of a full-size gym.

Why: The highest priority for the District overall is to provide access to full-size gymnasiums. With a large number of school closures in the District, school gyms are becoming less accessible to community centres. The development of new gyms is needed. This scenario would allow for the addition of a full-size gym to

serve the needs of St. James Assiniboia West. Both Heritage Victoria and the Kirkfield Westwood main site have room to expand. An expansion of the Kirkfield Westwood main site could provide space for their active basketball program but it may be more feasible to expand Heritage Victoria. Adding a gym to either facility would create a facility in the 20-25,000 square foot range, resulting in large neighbourhood community centre while freeing up a modest amount of space to be used elsewhere in the District.

How: A feasibility study would need to be conducted to determine the more appropriate location for expansion, looking at site limitations, parking accommodation, and the structural integrity of the existing buildings. To minimize the amount of additional square footage added to the system, it may be possible to expand current hall space. To address the limitations of the RLLF policy, discussions would need to take place among Assiniboine West, Heritage Victoria, and Kirkfield Westwood to rationalize current space. Areas to explore include:

- Possibly closing the main hall at the Morgan satellite site (provided the programs and community events were retained and the fields and rinks would remain) while reconfiguring space at both the Morgan and Buchanan sites.
- Possibly reducing the size of the facility at the McBey site while retaining a field house capable of supporting the field use.
- Entering into discussions with the City of Winnipeg to possibly close the St. James Cultural Centre while moving the programming to one of the neighbouring community centres.

In any case, the addition of a full-size gym to the cluster would be accompanied by an access/use agreement to ensure all community centres in the cluster have equitable access to the facility.

Should any Community Centre inventory be declared surplus and sold, proceeds from the sale of property would be directed toward the expansion of the agreed upon site (this provision is in the RLLF policy).

Scenario 3: *Expand Varsity View Sportsplex*

What: Close the Varsity View Community Centre Laxdal site in order to assist in the development of a large scale ‘District Community Centre’ at the Varsity View Sportsplex site.

Why: Virtually all of the growth projected for the District will occur in the southern portion of the Assiniboine South cluster – in Charleswood, Ridgewood South, and, eventually, Wilkes South. To accommodate this growth, a restructuring of existing centres could be contemplated. A large scale district centre at the Varsity View Sportsplex site, complete with a full size gymnasium, multi-use space, and an indoor soccer facility, is reasonable since the current facility is perfectly situated to serve all of these neighbourhoods. At 0.66, the Varsity View

Community Centre at Laxdal has a high FCI and focuses almost exclusively on daycare programming.

How: The programs run out of the Varsity View – Laxdal could be relocated to the Sportsplex site, allowing the Laxdal site to be declared surplus. A large scale facility could be created over time at the Sportsplex site using the Laxdal space together with the possible re-allocation of a modest amount of space freed up from Scenarios 1 and 2.

Should the Laxdal site be declared surplus and sold, proceeds from the sale of property would be directed toward the expansion of the Sportsplex site (this provision is in the RLLF policy).

NOTE: The RLLF policy acknowledges the need for additional indoor soccer facilities and, with the exception of change rooms, washrooms, and viewing space, the additional square footage is outside the restriction imposed by the policy.

NOTE: The development of a District Community Centre could be accompanied by a new district-wide governance model to ensure equitable access to the district facility. Through this, an access/use agreement among centres would be formalized.

Main Points

- *Three scenarios have been presented that would address the need to increase access to gym space by expanding a facility and building a new full-size gymnasium in each of the District's three cluster areas. These scenarios are also intended to address current issues or emerging needs related to programming, staffing, and volunteer recruitment.*
- *A scenario has been presented that would address the demands of population growth in the Assiniboine South cluster. This contemplates an expansion of programming to meet the increased needs of the community.*
- *Given the City of Winnipeg's significant role in providing recreation services, particularly in St. James Assiniboia East and West, it may be possible to collaborate with the City in reconfiguring space to better meet the needs of the District.*
- *All three scenarios are speculative at this point. None are confirmed. All require further exploration to assess their merit and feasibility and would require the support of the community.*

5. Moving Forward on Scenarios

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested.

This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres. This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (eg. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

6. Addressing Overall Priorities

Synopsis

District 2 is a stable community with two very different dynamics at work. North of the river, the St. James Assiniboia West and St. James Assiniboia East clusters are quite stable with an aging population and very little growth projected over the next 20 years. Both clusters are well served at present in terms of the SPR relative to other parts of the city and relative to the third cluster in the District, yet there are a number of issues and concerns that need to be addressed. Chief among the issues is the need to ensure access to a full-size gym. This challenge has continued to grow over the years as more and more schools have been closed. With an aging population, this trend is likely to continue.

South of the River, the Assiniboine South cluster is characterized by a more affluent, younger, and growing population. Should population growth projections hold true, there will be significant demand for additional facilities, particularly if residential development expands into the Wilkes South neighbourhood. Assiniboine South has a much lower SPR in relation to the two clusters north of the river but the District overall has a relatively high SPR in relation to the city-wide average. As a result the District has virtually no new space to plan for. As the population grows in Assiniboine South, there will be increased pressure to add recreation space which can only occur through a reconfiguration of existing space.

Priority No.1: Provide access to full-size gym space

There could be a two-pronged approach to this priority:

- With the closure of many schools in the District, access to school gyms has become increasingly difficult to the point of impossibility. Efforts over recent years have not proven successful and this is not expected to change in the future although efforts will continue.
- Even if the dialogue with the School Division leads to greater access, the case for new full-size gymnasiums remains strong. All three development proposals address that need. The development scenarios lead to the following project priorities:
  - Scenario 1 is recognized as the highest priority development project.
  - Scenarios 2 and 3 should be pursued with equal, secondary priority.

Priority No. 2: Enhance volunteer recruitment and retention

Because the needs are different, there could be a cluster by cluster approach to this challenge.

- St. James Assiniboia West appears to have a strong volunteer base at present. Efforts could focus on retention and succession, ensuring that volunteers maintain their commitment and replace themselves when their commitment ends.
- St. James Assiniboia East has a different challenge with an effort on recruitment to build their volunteer base. The seniors population could be a target for recruitment efforts working through established seniors organizations to gain access to this population.
- In Assiniboine South, the relatively younger population may require a push toward more youth involvement with existing volunteers encouraging their children to assist and with schools being approached to support volunteerism through credit programs.
- Overall, it would be beneficial for the GCWCC to offer “How to Recruit a Volunteer” seminars. As well, greater involvement by the City in program development would ease the burden placed on volunteers as would the pursuit of shared staff to assist with programming needs. It is possible that the development of newer more contemporary facilities could facilitate volunteer recruitment.

Priority No. 3: Broaden senior and youth programming

The approach could be to pool resources on a district-wide basis to engage the services of a full-time qualified program development officer(s) that can lay the groundwork for more expansive programming in these areas to the point where volunteers can then deliver the programs. The planning work could be extensive, involving consultation with community groups, demographic research, and marketing. Providing drop-in sport programming for youth could be an option.

APPENDIX

Summary of Other Service Providers

Assiniboine South

- Assiniboine South Early years Coalition – Funding for program development
- In-Motion Committee – Through Healthy Schools and In – Motion Initiatives in Assiniboine South area – active living programming.
- Charleswood Senior Centre – comprehensive seniors programs
- Military Family Resource Centre – Youth Programs
- Rady Jewish Community Centre – comprehensive family programming

St. James – Assiniboia

- YM/YWCA of West Winnipeg
- Military Resource Centre
- Westwood Community Church
- St.James Anglican Church – East St. James Lighthouse programs
- Hedges Hut Youth Drop-In Programs
- St. James Assiniboia Seniors Centre
- St. James Assiniboia School Division Continuing Education
- St. James Assiniboia Parent Child Coalition
- Diversity Working Group – Youth Programming
- Kirkfield Steamliners Seniors Fitness Program – Hedges School
- St. Andrews Anglican Church – Thai Chi Program

URBANEDGE
consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 2

LORD SELKIRK WEST
KILDONAN DISTRICT PLAN



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

FINAL - MARCH 10, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

LORD SELKIRK WEST KILDONAN DISTRICT PLAN

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. Direction and Parameters **7**
1. Plan 2025 7
2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy 7
3. The Starting Point 7
4. The Planning Model 8
5. People Overview 8
6. Programs Overview 8
7. Facilities Overview 9
8. The Vision 9
9. District Plans 9

B. Current Situation **10**
1. LSWK District and Neighbourhood Clusters 10
2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities 14
3. Demographic Make-up 16
4. Overview of Current Programs 19
5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers 21
6. Overview of Current Facilities 23
7. Current Issues and Concerns 27

C. Needs Assessment **29**
1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025 29
2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term 30
3. Assessing Future Needs 32

D. Moving Forward **33**
1. Defining Success 33
2. Planning Limitations 35
3. Planning Strategies 37
4. Development Scenarios for Consideration 40
5. Moving Forward on Scenarios 44
6. Addressing Overall Priorities 45

Appendix **47**

List of Maps

Map 1: District and Cluster Boundaries 10
Map 2: Community Centres 11
Map 3: City-Managed Facilities 12
Map 4: Combined Community Centres and City-Managed Facilities 13
Map 5: Growth Areas for the District 31
Map 6: Potential Development Scenarios to 2025 43

List of Tables

Table 1: All Recreation and Leisure Facilities (as of 2005) 15
Table 2: Demographic Overview 2001 and 2006 17
Table 3: Summary of Community Centre Programs 20
Table 4: Summary of Community Centre Volunteers 21
Table 5: Summary of Community Centre Staff 22
Table 6: Facility Condition and Preservation Needs (as of 2004) 24
Table 7: Summary of Community Centre Amenities 25
Table 8: Space to Population Ratios 26
Table 9: Estimated Growth to 2025 – All Districts 29
Table 10: Amount of Space to Plan For to 2025 by District 36

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
LSWK – Lord Selkirk West Kildonan District
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio
CCB – Community Centres Board
CRC – Community Resource Coordinator

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development, contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of a Planning Committee established by the Community Centre Board for District 3 Lord Selkirk West Kildonan.

KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
LORD SELKIRK WEST KILDONAN DISTRICT PLAN

Executive Summary

Current Recreation Space

As of 2005, the Lord Selkirk West Kildonan District was served by 15 community centres, as well as four satellite sites, two indoor arenas, and one indoor soccer pitch. In total, there were 24 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As well, there were 10 city-run or leased facilities that provide complementary services in the District.

In total, there is 235,000 sq ft of recreation space to serve a population of 136,000, or 1.74 sq ft per person. With the city average being 1.88 sq ft of recreation space per person, the LSWK District overall has access to less space than other areas of the city.

Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents in South Point Douglas have access to considerably more space than do residents elsewhere in the District (4.09 sf per person). The western portion of the District (Inkster West and Seven Oaks West) has access to a lot less space (0.69 sf per person).

Demographics

Generally, the District exhibits different demographic characteristics for the inner city versus the more suburban areas. This which would need to be reflected in the programs offered to those residents. South Point Douglas stands out as the area of greatest need with low education, high unemployment, low household income, and high lone parent families. Yet it may have turned a corner because some of the figures are better today in 2006 than they were in 2001.

The distribution of aboriginals and new immigrants varies considerably throughout the District. Each area, perhaps even each centre, may need to tailor its programs accordingly.

Programs

The District overall appears to be considerably less well programmed, in terms of hours of offerings, relative to the rest of the city. All areas are below the city average of 0.33 but are relatively consistent with one another.

Although a few centres provide a wide range of programs offering something for all user groups, they are the exception. Overall, the District is inconsistent in providing a balance of programs.

An emphasis on the provision of programs directed toward children and youth may be appropriate in areas of greater need where the emphasis may be on addressing the needs of at-risk youth.

Staff and Volunteers

While the District overall has considerably fewer volunteers than the rest of the city, much of the District includes areas of higher need. Committing to volunteerism is difficult when faced with the challenge of poverty. The Seven Oaks area would appear to have the greatest amount of support with the highest number of volunteers and staff.

From a staffing perspective, Ralph Brown is clearly a dominant community centre with 2 full-time and 25 casual staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest number of programs. This level of staffing is necessary for Ralph Brown to deliver its current breadth of programming, as they cannot depend upon sufficient volunteer support in an area of considerable need.

Facilities

Overall, facilities in LSWK are in considerably poorer state of repair than the city average. Four facilities have an FCI over 1.00 which means it would be more economical to rebuild than to repair them. (One of these – Tyndall Park Manitoba site – has closed.)

There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District with a couple of exceptions: the Tyndall Park area does not have a gym or a multi-purpose room (although it has limited access to a school gym and multi-purpose room) and the Inkster cluster overall does not have access to a games room or nursery school space.

Primary Issues and Concerns

Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is the highest priority for the District overall and one that may require inventive solutions given that social issues over-ride the ability for some residents to provide volunteer support.

Programming will need to evolve over time to meet the needs and pressures of a changing population in terms of demographic make-up (new Canadians, visible minorities, seniors). In all community centre activities, the reality of social issues will need to be addressed.

Costs are a significant issue in terms of facility maintenance, ongoing operating costs, and program registration fees. The unique needs of this District may warrant special consideration from the GCWCC, which will continue to advocate on the centres' behalf.

Growth and Its Impact

It is possible that LSWK could increase in population by more than 13,000 to the year 2025. The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.

In the nearer term, growth will be concentrated in the Meadows West, Amber Trails, and Leila North areas. Longer term, residential development may be directed toward the north-eastern quadrant in Old Kildonan-Murray.

District 3 will have to pay particular attention in the future to the social as well as recreational needs of the community, including addressing the needs of at-risk youth and ensuring that barriers are not inhibiting access to programs.

While children and youth are the mainstay, all segments of the population must see the community centre as offering something for them. It will be important to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community, particularly in terms of a growing aboriginal community and new immigrants. Adequacy of resources will need to be addressed, in terms of volunteers, staff, and funds for ongoing operations, maintenance, and program development.

Vision

The community centre model of the future should continue to have a combination of small local centres, mid-size neighbourhood centres, and large district centres. The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing.

It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space. Respecting this goal, plans for the LSWK District can add space to address current imbalances while also planning for an increase in population to the year 2025. This translates into 35,000 sq ft of additional community centre space with the potential for an additional 9,000 sq ft of city space.

Development Scenarios

Already approved or under way (since 2005)*:*

The Redevelopment of Sinclair Park Community Centre: The Sinclair Park Boyd Park satellite has been declared surplus and the Sinclair Park main site is being redeveloped to include the creation of a full-size gym.

Closures: Both the Tyndall Park satellite at Manitoba and Brooklands CC have been closed.

Potential new developments*:*

Increase Facility Space in Inkster West and Seven Oaks West: Develop a joint strategy among Maples CC, Northwood CC, and Tyndall Park CC to address the significant shortage of facility space in the Seven Oaks West and Inkster west areas.

Renovate Luxton CC: Renovate Luxton CC to address serious concerns about accessibility to the site through site acquisition and within the building by renovating to remove the bi-level floor.

Expand Vince Leah CC and Redevelop West Kildonan CC: Once the existing arena at West Kildonan has reached the end of its life cycle, consider adding a new arena at Vince Leah while redeveloping West Kildonan, including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

Expand Weston Memorial: Expand Weston Memorial CC to increase its programming space. Also, develop a long-term governance strategy.

NOTE: **The development scenarios are by no means certainties.** Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.

GCWCC Plan 2025

LORD SELKIRK WEST KILDONAN DISTRICT PLAN

A. Direction and Parameters

This section generally repeats the Executive Summary of the Plan 2025 Phase 1 report. For a more detailed explanation of the Direction and Parameters provided to this plan, refer to the report. It can be found on the GCWCC web site at www.gcwcc.mb.ca.

1. Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system was unsustainable. The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

3. The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005. Therefore, 2005 serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of recreation space using the 'heated square footage' definition.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres, facilities which are very similar to community centres in terms of nature of programs delivered to the community. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of recreation space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

4. The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



5. People Overview

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, specifically, 25.6 versus 39.2 as of 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500 will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by Districts 2 with 20% and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

6. Programs Overview

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging, from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listings and third party agreements.

7. Facilities Overview

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of fewer than 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

8. The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

9. District Plans

This District Plan contains:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC reflective of Phase One of Plan 2025.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, recreation programs offered, volunteer support provided, and community centre facilities.
- A summary of issues and concerns identified by community centre representatives.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- A series of strategies to address the needs over the long term.
- An overview of scenarios showing how changes could manifest themselves over time through possible expansions, mergers, closures, and the construction of new facilities.
- A short list of projects deemed to be of highest priority in meeting community needs.
- Selected strategies to address the most critical issues and concerns.
- An action plan to guide decision-making over the short term.

B. Current Situation

1. LSWK District and Neighbourhood Clusters

The LSWK District, or District 3, covers the north-west end of Winnipeg. It is bounded to the east by the Red River, to the north and west by the City of Winnipeg limits, namely Emes Road, Mollard Road, and Brookside Boulevard, and to the south by Notre Dame Avenue (generally).

The District is approximately (but not exactly) aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political boundaries that make up the LSWK Community Committee area. The reason for the differences is that the Community Centre District must consider appropriate catchment areas around each of its community centres to ensure residents are well served while the political boundaries have more to do with the even distribution of population by ward. Even so, efforts have been made to keep the community centre boundaries as consistent as possible with political boundaries.

For planning purposes the District has been split into six areas called neighbourhood clusters. These units are used because research information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster. The clusters include Point Douglas North, Point Douglas South, Inkster West, Inkster East, Seven Oaks West, and Seven Oaks East.

NOTE: A portion of the Downtown East cluster also lies within the District but is included with South Point Douglas throughout this plan.

Map 1 shows the boundaries of the District in black outline together with the six neighbourhood clusters in various shades.



Map 1: District Boundaries and Cluster Areas



Map 2 - District 3: Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan
Community Centres - 2005

LEGEND

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- District 3 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 3 - District 3: Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan
Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 3 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre
SC - Senior Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 4 - District 3: Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 3 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre
RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre
SC - Senior Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008

2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities

Maps 2, 3, and 4 show the distribution of Community Centres, the distribution of City-Managed Facilities, and the combined distribution of all facilities.

As of 2005, the LSWK District was served by 15 community centres with four of these centres also operating satellite facilities (two of these with two satellites each). Furthermore, two community centres operate an indoor arena and one operates an indoor soccer complex. In total, there were 24 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. Since 2005, however, one community centre (Brooklands) and two satellites (Boyd Park and Manitoba) have closed resulting in a combined reduction of 14,056 sq ft of space and bringing the total number of facilities down to 21.

NOTE: Brooklands CC used to lie within the boundaries of District 2 (St. James Assiniboia). Following closure, its population has been served by the Weston Memorial CC. Consequently, the reduction in square footage is accounted for as part of District 3.

Throughout the city, residents are also served through a number of city-run facilities that, for all intents and purposes, are the same as community centres in the services they provide, but for historical reasons have evolved into a system of split jurisdiction. To properly plan for the needs of the District, these city-run facilities need to be considered alongside the community centres. There are 10 of these facilities in the District including six recreation/leisure centres and four senior centres.

NOTE: The list of city-run facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively consistent with what is provided by community centres. In this case, it includes 10 facilities. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas. The combined list represents all those facilities that are subject to the space restriction imposed by the RLLF policy which strengthens the argument for joint planning.

*NOTE: Table 1 lists all facilities **as of 2005** (the starting point for this plan) because it was the point in time when the RLLF policy was adopted. From that point forward the allocation of space needed to be accounted for.*

Table 1 shows the LSWK District is served by over 235,000 sq ft of combined recreation space. As shown in the first column of the Table, the population as of 2005 is estimated to be 136,125 for the District with breakdowns by cluster area. This translates into a ratio of combined recreation space per person or Space to Population Ration (SPR) as follows:

Point Douglas North:	1.67 square feet per person
Point Douglas South:	4.09 square feet per person
Inkster West:	0.63 square feet per person
Inkster East:	2.73 square feet per person
Seven Oaks West:	0.73 square feet per person
Seven Oaks East:	1.62 square feet per person
LSWK District	**1.74 square feet per person**
City Average	**1.88 square feet per person**

Table 1: ALLRECREATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (as of 2005)			
Cluster	Type	Facility Name	Heated Sq Ft
Point Douglas North 3 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 25,150	Community Centre	Sinclair Park	13,618
	Satellite	✦Sinclair Park – Boyd Park	4,904
	Satellite	Sinclair Park – Robertson	1,344
	Community Centre	Ralph Brown	3,703
	Community Centre	Luxton	8,162
		Total Community Centres	31,731
	Recreation Centre	St. John's Leisure Centre	10,369
		Total City-Managed Facilities	10,369
		Total for Cluster	**42,100**
Point Douglas South 3 community centres 7 recreation centre Pop: 21,400	Community Centre	Burton Cummings	10,459
	Community Centre	Central	20,294
	Community Centre	Norquay (includes Beaconsfield facility)	10,619
		Total Community Centres	41,372
	Recreation Centre	Old Exhibition Recreation Centre	3,300
	Senior Centre	North End Seniors Centre	2,528
	Recreation Centre	Strathcona Recreation Centre	1,728
	Recreation Centre	Aberdeen Recreation Centre	1,876
	Senior Centre	Dufferin Seniors Centre	1,500
	Recreation Centre	Turtle Island Recreation Centre	12,771
	Recreation Centre	Freighthouse Recreation Centre	14,263
		Total City-Managed Facilities	37,966
		Total for Cluster	**79,338**
Inkster West 1 community centre 0 recreation centres Pop: 16,000	Community Centre	Tyndall Park	6,470
	Satellite	Tyndall Park – Garden Grove	1,771
	Satellite	✦Tyndall Park – Manitoba	1,839
		Total Community Centres	10,080
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**10,080**
Inkster East 3 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 13,140	Community Centre	✦Brooklands	7,313
	Community Centre	Weston Memorial	12,725
	Community Centre	Northwood	10,339
	Satellite	Northwood – Frank Whyte	1,835
		Total Community Centres	32,212
	Senior Centre	Brooklands Pioneer Senior Citizens	3,614
		Total City-Managed Facilities	3,614
		Total for Cluster	**35,826**
Seven Oaks West 1 community centre 0 recreation centre Pop: 21,850	Community Centre	Maples	9,199
	Arena	Maples Arena – Multiplex	4,557
	Satellite	Maples - Elwick	2,266
		Total Community Centres	16,022
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**16,022**
Seven Oaks East 4 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 32,940	Community Centre	Garden City	10,785
	Soccer	Garden City – Soccer Complex	6,687
	Community Centre	West Kildonan	4,885
	Arena	West Kildonan Arena	3,574
	Community Centre	Vince Leah	12,195
	Community Centre	Red River	11,270
		Total Community Centres	49,396
	Senior Centre	Bleak House	4,000
		Total City-Managed Facilities	4,000
		Total for Cluster	**53,396**
District 3: LSWK 15 community centres 10 recreation/senior centres Pop: 136,125*	**24 cc facilities**	**District 3 Community Centre Sub-Total**	**180,813**
	10 city-run facility	**District 3 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total**	**55,949**
	34 facilities	**DISTRICT 3 TOTAL**	**236,762**

Source: GCWCC and City of Winnipeg
** The District population is different than the sum of each cluster because of an adjustment made based on the Census undercount as determined by Statistics Canada.* ✦ *Facility has closed since 2005.*

Main Points

- *Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of Point Douglas South and Inkster East have access to considerably more space than do residents elsewhere in the District with 4.09 sq ft and 2.76 sq ft per person respectively. This would indicate that some attention has been paid to meeting the higher needs of the inner city.*
- *Inkster West, with but one small community centre and two very small satellites, is the least well served at 0.63 sq ft per person. This has become more pronounced with the recent closing of one of the satellites. Seven Oaks West at 0.73 sq ft per person, is also well below the other clusters by a considerable margin.*
- *With the city average being 1.88 square feet of combined recreation space per person, the LSWK District overall has access to somewhat less space than other areas of the city with 1.74 sq ft per person on average.*

3. Demographic Make-up

Table 2 provides an overview of the demographic make-up of the District using selected information from the 2001 Census as provided by the City of Winnipeg together with 2006 Census derived from Statistics Canada information currently available on their website.

From these data, a few observations can be made:

Population Change

Point Douglas North, Point Douglas South and Inkster East exhibit the tell-tale signs of older, inner city neighbourhoods with a population loss over the past two decades: over 20% loss for Point Douglas South from 1986 to 2006 and over 6% and 7% loss over the same time period for Point Douglas North and Inkster East (although all three clusters appear to have stemmed their losses in the past five years). Meanwhile, the other three clusters, Inkster West, Seven Oaks West, and Seven Oaks East, have gone in the opposite direction, capturing a significant portion of the city's growth over that period. Inkster West, in particular, grew by over 40% from 1986 to 2001, although it shows a modest population loss in recent years. Over that same 20 year period, the city overall grew by 6.6%. Seven Oaks West appears to be the cluster still experiencing significant growth, with a rise of more than 10% from 2001-06.

Children, Seniors, and Household Size

The District overall is somewhat younger than the rest of the city with more children aged 5-19, on average, and fewer seniors aged 55+. The most noticeable area is Inkster West with over 24% children and fewer than 18% seniors. In 2001 this was even more pronounced with almost 27% children and fewer than 12% seniors. The exception is found in Seven Oaks East where there are slightly fewer children than the city average (18% versus 19%) and more seniors over 55 (29% versus 25%). All clusters show an aging pattern over time with an increased number of seniors from 2001. This pattern is reflected in the household size as well, with most clusters having larger than average households. The exception again is Seven Oaks East with a household size of 2.3 versus

the city average of 2.4. This is consistent with a higher than average number of seniors. Point Douglas South, at 2.3, has a slightly smaller than average household size even though it has the highest number of children. This is because it has a very high number of lone parent families at 42%, more than double the city average.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW 2001 and 2006

2001 Census Info	P/D North	P/D South	Inkster W	Inkster E	S/O West	S/O East	CITY
Total Population	25,075	11,350*	16,380	13,155	19,810	31,640	619,544
Population Change 86-01	-6.6%	-23.2%	+41.0%	-7.1%	+13.0%	+21.9%	+4.2%
Children 5-19	21.8%	23.7%	26.8%	22.6%	23.8%	18.2%	19.8%
Seniors 55+	22.1%	20.8%	11.8%	19.8%	17.1%	27.2%	22.1%
Aboriginals	18.9%	41.5%	7.0%	22.8%	7.8%	5.8%	8.6%
Immigrants	21.1%	18.0%	33.5%	20.5%	35.8%	21.5%	17.3%
Married & Common Law	40.4%	26.8%	58.6%	39.5%	55.8%	51.7%	48.8%
Hold University Degree	7.5%	4.7%	10.7%	4.6%	12.1%	13.6%	18.3%
Unemployment	7.6%	16.8%	4.4%	8.7%	6.0%	4.8%	5.7%
Low Income Households	33.5%	58.4%	12.9%	34.3%	17.5%	16.2%	20.3%
Avg Household Income	$37,766	$25,489	$61,677	$36,870	$57,457	$51,719	$53,176
Household Size	2.5	2.3	3.5	2.5	3.2	2.4	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	67%-33%	33%-67%	88%-12%	60%-40%	71%-29%	73%-27%	64%-36%
Did Not Move Last 5 Yrs	56%	46.2%	71.7%	57.2%	64.6%	65.7%	57.7%

2006 Census Info	P/D North	P/D South	Inkster W	Inkster E	S/O West	S/O East	CITY
Total Population	25,150	11,600*	16,000	13,140	21,850	32,940	633,451
Population Change 01-06	+0.3%	+2.2%	-2.3%	-0.1%	+10.3%	+4.1%	+2.2%
Children 5-19	20.6%	23.6%	24.1%	23.8%	20.8%	17.9%	19.0%
Seniors 55+	23.1%	22.2%	17.6%	20.5%	24.1%	28.6%	25.2%
Aboriginal Identity	16.6%	38.6%	10.2%	24.7%	8.1%	8.3%	10.1%
Immigrant	21.4%	19.1%	34.8%	23.3%	36.3%	22.3%	18.4%
Married & Common Law	40.0%	28.4%	46.7%	34.2%	47.0%	46.8%	44.4%
Lone Parent Families	27.4%	42.1%	17.7%	35.4%	19.0%	19.0%	19.5%
Household Size	2.5	2.3	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.3	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	78%-22%	43%-57%	84%-16%	53%-47%	73%-27%	73%-27%	65%-35%
Did Not Move Last 5 Yrs	58.0%	41.8%	67.4%	50.7%	55.7%	59.6%	55.2%

Source: City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada
** The population figures used here differ from those in Table 1. In Table 1, the population figure of 21,400 included a portion of the Downtown East cluster. Refer to Map 1 for greater clarity.*

Aboriginals and Immigrants

The District overall has large fluctuations in aboriginal population and strong but less dramatic variations in numbers of immigrants. Point Douglas South has nearly 40% of its population with aboriginal identity and Inkster East has a quarter of its population identified as aboriginal. Meanwhile, Seven Oaks East and Seven Oaks West have less than 8%. The city average is 10%. While all clusters have an above average number of immigrants, the west side of the District, reflected in Inkster West and Seven Oaks West,

is home to the largest concentration of immigrant families. More than a third of these populations are immigrants, about double the city average. In all clusters, the percentages of aboriginals and immigrants are relatively consistent with 2001 figures.

Education and Marital Status

The 2001 figures (2006 not yet available) show all clusters with lower than average education (that is, fewer numbers of people with university degrees) with numbers ranging from less than 5% in Point Douglas South to just under 14% in Seven Oaks East compared to the city overall at 18.3%. While nearly 50% of the city's population is married or lives common law, the number falls to almost half that number (27%) in Point Douglas South.

Employment, Income, and Need

Again using 2001 numbers because 2006 were not yet released, two clusters (Inkster West and Seven Oaks East) are below the city average with unemployment rates of less than 5%. Point Douglas North, Inkster East, and Seven Oaks West are relatively close to the city average in terms of unemployment (from 6.0 to 8.7% versus 5.7% for the city) while Point Douglas South stands out with a high unemployment rate of nearly 17%. Also, there is a clear differentiation in terms of household income. With incomes of just over $25,000, households in Point Douglas South live on less than half the city average of $53,176. Point Douglas North and Inkster East fare slightly better but are also below average. No cluster stands out as noticeably affluent although Inkster West has the highest household income at almost $62,000.

Tenure and Mobility

Across the city, approximately two thirds of the population own their home while one third rent. Home ownership provides some insight into neighbourhood stability. In District 3, the numbers overall have been quite consistent from 2001 to 2006 with the exception of Inkster West which is experiencing a reduction in household size. This corresponds to the increase in the numbers of seniors and likely reflects an increase in 'empty-nesters'. Point Douglas South has the lowest percentage of home owners at 43% (the city average is 65%) though this has increased considerably from 33% in 2001, showing an increasing sense of stability. Inkster East is below the city average as well with 57%, while Inkster West, at 84%, is well above. Mobility is expressed by the number of people who have not moved in the past 5 years. The city average is 55%. Most clusters are relatively close to this number with the exception of Point Douglas South at 41%, indicative of greater turnover and Inkster West with 67%, indicative of greater stability.

Main Points

- *Generally, the District exhibits different demographic characteristics for the three inner city clusters versus the three more suburban clusters which would need to be reflected in the programs offered to those residents.*
- *Among clusters, South Point Douglas stands out as the area of greatest need with low education, high unemployment, low household income, and high lone parent*

families. Yet it may have turned a corner because some of the figures are better today in 2006 than they were in 2001.

- *The distribution of aboriginals and new immigrants varies considerably throughout the District. Each area, perhaps even each centre, may need to tailor its programs accordingly.*

NOTE:
The six cluster areas identified in Map 1 are relatively small. The demographic analysis at that scale is informative because each of the six clusters has unique characteristics. However, from a planning perspective, these areas are too small in that two of the clusters contain but one community centre. Consequently, for the remainder of this plan, the six clusters have been collapsed into three: Point Douglas now includes both North and South, Inkster now includes both East and West, and Seven Oaks now includes both East and West.

4. Overview of Current Programs

Table 3 provides a summary of programming hours and programs offered by each centre and by each cluster based upon information provided by the centres themselves. The 14 community centres together offer 224 programs accounting for over 30,000 hours of recreation programming. This ranges from an estimated 875 programming hours provided through Tyndall Park Community Centre to over 4,500 estimated programming hours provided through the Weston Memorial Community Centre.

In relation to population, the number of program hours per person works out to be:

Point Douglas:	0.24 hours per person
Inkster:	0.26 hours per person
Seven Oaks:	0.24 hours per person
LSWK District:	**0.23 hours per person**
City Average:	**0.33 hours per person**

It would appear that each cluster provides about the same level of programming per capita but the District overall provides considerably less programming than the city average. This may be partly due to the fact that this District does not have a large District-scale centre which tends to focus on highly structured programming serving a broad population. As well, it is important to note that programs tend to be delivered based upon staff and financial resources, both of which are considerably more limited in this District. Furthermore, facility limitations often hamper the delivery of specific programs.

A final consideration for lower levels of programming is the relationship that community centres hold with the local School Divisions. A lack of access to school facilities, especially to full-size gyms, will limit the amount of off-site programming.

Within the District, the greatest emphasis is on children and youth programming with 124 of the 224 programs (56%) dedicated to that age group. This is relatively consistent with other parts of the city. Only 13 programs (6%) are directed toward seniors while 27 (12%)

are available for adults. Point Douglas offers the most number of programs (105) covering all user groups, though 57 of those are directed toward children and youth. Generally, all clusters have some program offerings for all user groups.

Table 3: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAMS

Facility	Program Hours	No. of Programs	Breakdown of Programs: Pre-School	Children/ Youth	Adults	Seniors	Special Events and Services
Point Douglas Pop: 46,550							
Central	3,770	15	0	10	1	2	2
Burton Cummings	1,511	18	0	11	2	0	5
Ralph Brown	1,464	39	7	13	8	6	5
Luxton	1,093	17	2	11	1	0	3
Sinclair Park	1,868	8	0	7	0	1	0
Norquay	1,676	8	0	5	0	0	3
Total for Cluster	**11,382**	**105**	**9**	**57**	**12**	**9**	**18**
Inkster Pop: 29,140							
Tyndall Park	875	7	1	6	0	0	0
Northwood	2,125	30	1	13	2	0	14
Weston Memorial	4,561	24	2	11	2	3	6
Total for Cluster	**7,561**	**61**	**4**	**30**	**4**	**3**	**20**
Seven Oaks Pop: 54,790							
Maples	2,548	7	1	6	0	0	0
Vince Leah	2,004	25	1	11	8	1	4
Garden City	4,172	12	1	9	2	0	0
West Kildonan	2,170	8	1	6	1	0	0
Red River	2,104	6	1	5	0	0	0
Total for Cluster	**12,998**	**58**	**5**	**37**	**11**	**1**	**4**
District 3: LSWK Pop: 136,125 14 community centres*	**31,941**	**224**	18 8%	124 56%	27 12%	13 6%	42 19%

Source: Community Centre Profiles
** Brooklands has since shut down and does not appear in these data.*

Looking more closely at individual centres, Ralph Brown not only provides the most number of programs at 39, but provides a well balanced set of programs serving all user groups with multiple program opportunities. Yet, many other centres provide a greater number of program hours. It would appear the strategy at Ralph Brown is to focus more on a breadth of opportunities rather than depth of programming. Garden City, by way of contrast, offers less than a third of the number of programs (12) but provides over 4,000 hours of programming.

Northwood places considerable effort (nearly 50%) on the provision of special events. Special events can be important because they tend to attract a broader base of participants. Having events for the entire family has a positive impact on the operations of the centres, facilitating the recruitment of volunteers among other benefits.

Vince Leah offers the only program for seniors in Seven Oaks in spite of Seven Oaks having the highest concentration of seniors in the District. Almost two thirds of the programs in this cluster are directed toward children and youth.

Six centres, Sinclair Park, Norquay, Tyndall Park, Maples, West Kildonan, and Red River all offer fewer than 10 programs, considerably less than Ralph Brown, Northwood, and Vince Leah. These six centres, collectively, offer 44 programs, 80% of which are aimed toward children and youth.

Main Points

- *The District overall appears to be considerably less well programmed, in terms of hours of offerings, relative to the rest of the city. All three cluster areas are below the city average of 0.33 but all three clusters are consistent with one another.*
- *Although a few centres provide a wide range of programs offering something for all user groups, they are the exception. Overall, the District is inconsistent in providing a balance of programs.*
- *An emphasis on the provision of programs directed toward children and youth may be appropriate in areas of greater need where the emphasis may be on addressing the needs of at-risk youth.*
- *It would appear that Seven Oaks, in particular, could benefit from a wider range of programming.*

5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers

Table 4 provides an estimate of the number of volunteer hours and number of volunteers.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE VOLUNTEERS

Cluster	Facility Name	Volunteer Hours	Number of Volunteers
Point Douglas 6 community centres Pop: 46,550	Central	13,700	
	Burton Cummings	5,500	
	Ralph Brown	2,800	
	Luxton	3,300	
	Sinclair Park	13,400	
	Norquay	1,100	
	Total for Cluster	**39,800**	**330 (est)**
Inkster 3 community centres Pop: 29,140	Tyndall Park	16,400	
	Northwood	13,500	
	Weston Memorial	2,300	
	Total for Cluster	**32,200**	**270 (est)**
Seven Oaks 5 community centres Pop: 54,790	Maples	34,100	
	Vince Leah	13,100	
	Garden City	10,700	
	West Kildonan	4,400	
	Red River	18,800	
	Total for Cluster	**81,100**	**670 (est)**
District 3 Lord Selkirk/West Kildonan 14 community centres	**Population 136,125**	**153,100**	**1,270 (estimate)**

Source: Community Centre Profiles and derivation from national averages on volunteerism.

NOTE: The volunteer hours have been provided by the individual community centres and not all centres monitor this information with the same degree of accuracy. The number of volunteers is a rough estimate based upon the fact that, on average, each volunteer in

Canada commits 122 hours of their time. Given the range of potential error, these figures should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude only.

The community centre system city-wide is supported by approximately 1.9 volunteer hours per person. It is estimated that the LSWK District overall is served by approximately 1,270 volunteers committing over 153,000 hours of time to the community centre system. With a population of just over 136,000, this amounts to approximately 1.1 hours per person. Therefore, overall, the LSWK District is not consistent with other areas of the city in terms of volunteer support.

In relation to cluster populations, the number of volunteer hours works out to be:

Point Douglas:	0.9 hours per person
Inkster:	1.1 hours per person
Seven Oaks:	1.5 hours per person
LSWK District:	**1.2 hours per person**
City Average:	**1.9 hours per person**

The District includes areas of greater need, particularly in Point Douglas and Inkster (East) where incidents of low income and single parent families are well above the city average, which may account for lower levels of volunteer support. Addressing basic family needs may take precedent over contributing to the community.

Within the District, Seven Oaks is the best supported, having the greatest number of volunteer hours to serve the 5 community centres. However, it is still substantially below the city average. In this case, the lower level of support may be the result of fewer programs.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE STAFF

Cluster	Facility Name	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Green Team, etc	Seasonal
Point Douglas 6 community centres Pop: 46,550	Central	-	3	2	3	-
	Burton Cummings	2	2	-	2	-
	Ralph Brown	2	-	25	2	-
	Luxton	-	12	-	2	-
	Sinclair Park	-	3	-	2	-
	Norquay	-	3	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**4**	**23**	**27**	**11**	**0**
Inkster 3 community centres Pop: 29,140	Tyndall Park	1	-	-	-	3
	Northwood	1	3	-	3	-
	Weston	2	3	-	4	-
	Total for Cluster	**4**	**6**	**0**	**7**	**3**
Seven Oaks 5 community centres Pop: 54,790	Maples	4	-	-	1	7
	Vince Leah	-	3	2	4	-
	Garden City	4	3	-	1	-
	West Kildonan	2	5	2	-	1
	Red River	-	4	6	-	2
	Total for Cluster	**10**	**15**	**10**	**6**	**10**
District 3: LSWK 14 community centres	**Population 136,125**	**18**	**44**	**37**	**24**	**13**

Source: Community Centre Profiles

As shown in **Table 5**, the District's 14 community centres are operated on a day-to-day basis through a combined 18 full-time staff and an additional 118 part-time, casual, special teams, and seasonal staff. The dominant centre in the District, Ralph Brown has the greatest number of staff with 29 workers. The other centres in the cluster operate with much less staff support.

Of note, nearly half the centres operate without the support of a full-time staff person. This tends to place a heavier burden of responsibility on volunteer support, yet it has been shown that volunteer support is not particularly strong either.

Main Points

- *While the District overall has considerably fewer volunteers than the rest of the city, much of the District includes areas of higher need. Committing to volunteerism is difficult when faced with the challenge of poverty.*
- *The Seven Oaks cluster would appear to have the greatest amount of support with the highest number of volunteers and staff.*
- *From a staffing perspective, Ralph Brown is clearly a dominant community centre with 2 full-time and 25 casual staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest number of programs. This level of staffing is necessary for Ralph Brown to deliver its current breadth of programming, as they cannot depend upon sufficient volunteer support in an area of proven need.*

6. Overview of Current Facilities

In 2004, a comprehensive study of recreation facilities in Winnipeg evaluated each of the City's recreation facilities in terms of their overall condition using what was called a Facility Condition Index or FCI. The FCI represented the amount of money it would have taken to get the facility to an average level of upkeep. This amount was provided in relation to the replacement cost of the facility so the lower the number the better. An FCI of .50, then, meant that an investment of 50% of the replacement cost of the facility was needed at that time to get the facility into respectable condition. If that investment had been made, then an ongoing average maintenance program would have been able to keep it in that condition.

Table 6 shows the FCI rating for the District's facilities. It also translates the FCI into a dollar figure identified as the preservation need (as of 2004). The FCI of 0.44 indicates that the District's community centres overall are in considerably worse shape in relation to the city average of 0.34 for community centres and 0.41 when the city-run recreation facilities are included. As of 2004, the preservation funds needed were identified at more than $13 M. Such an investment at that time would have brought the facilities up to reasonable condition.

Four facilities are identified with an FCI of over 1.00. This means the amount of maintenance required on these facilities is greater than the replacement cost of the facility.

NOTE: The assessment provided in Table 6 is now 4 years old and was based upon information that was a few years old at the time. Given that few major capital investments have been made in recent years, there is still merit in the assessment although it is likely that many of the facilities are in worse shape today. Furthermore, the costs would be significantly higher than those presented. The Table should be used simply as representing an order of magnitude of the investment needed and the relative need among centres and clusters. In some instances investment has taken place leading to an improved facility today. Those facilities have been flagged in Table 6.

Table 6: FACILITY CONDITION AND PRESERVATION NEEDS (as of 2004)

Facility Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	FCI	Preservation Needs
Point Douglas (16 facilities)				
Community Centre	Sinclair Park*	13,618	1.00+	$2,000,000
Satellite	Sinclair Park – Boyd Park*	4,904	0.40	$200,000
Satellite	Sinclair Park – Robertson	1,344	1.00+	$135,000
Community Centre	Ralph Brown	3,703	0.25	$115,000
Community Centre	Luxton	8,162	0.46	$445,000
Community Centre	✦Burton Cummings	10,459	0.17	$215,000
Community Centre	Central	20,294	0.45	$730,000
Community Centre	✦Norquay	10,619	0.37	$515,000
Recreation Centre	St. John's Leisure Centre	10,369	0.38	$500,000
Recreation Centre	Old Exhibition Rec Centre	3,300	0.43	$220,000
Senior Centre	North End Seniors Centre	2,528	0.36	$115,000
Recreation Centre	Strathcona Recreation Centre	1,728	0.12	$25,000
Recreation Centre	Aberdeen Recreation Centre	1,876	0.65	$155,000
Senior Centre	Dufferin Seniors Centre	1,500	0.16	$60,000
Recreation Centre	Turtle Island Recreation Centre	12,771	0.30	$260,000
Recreation Centre	Freighthouse Recreation Centre	14,263	0.78	$175,000
	Total for Cluster	**121,438**	**Avg. 0.46**	**$5,865,000**
Inkster (8 facilities)				
Community Centre	✦Tyndall Park	6,470	0.06	$130,000
Satellite	Tyndall Park – Garden Grove	1,771	0.46	$105,000
Satellite	Tyndall Park – Manitoba*	1,839	1.00+	$190,000
Community Centre	Brooklands*	7,313	0.32	$380,000
Community Centre	✦Weston Memorial	12,725	0.49	$760,000
Community Centre	Northwood	10,339	0.46	$440,000
Satellite	Northwood – Frank Whyte	1,835	0.58	$135,000
Senior Centre	Brooklands Pioneer Senior Citizens	3,614	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**45,906**	**Avg. 0.48**	**$2,140,000**
Seven Oaks (10 facilities)				
Community Centre	Maples	9,199	0.34	$355,000
Arena	Maples Arena – Multiplex	4,557	0.18	$500,000
Satellite	Maples - Elwick	2,266	0.42	$115,000
Community Centre	✦Garden City	10,785	0.86	$1,330,000
Soccer	Garden City – Soccer Complex	6,687	0.04	$100,000
Community Centre	✦West Kildonan	4,885	0.12	$255,000
Arena	✦West Kildonan Arena	3,574	0.51	$1,300,000
Community Centre	Vince Leah	12,195	0.46	$710,000
Community Centre	Red River	11,270	0.00	$0
Senior Centre	Bleak House	4,000	1.00+	$385,000
	Total for Cluster	**69,418**	**Avg. 0.39**	**$5,050,000**
Total: 34 facilities	**District 3 All Facilities**	**236,762**	**Avg. 0.44**	**$13,055,000**

*Source: City of Wpg * Brooklands, Tyndall Park-Manitoba, and Sinclair Park-Boyd Park have since closed..*
✦ Facilities where improvements have been made since 2004 which could have an impact on the FCI rating.

Table 7 itemizes the amenities that can be found in the District's community centres. District-wide, there appears to be a reasonable availability of amenities, although it has been shown that facilities in this District tend to be older and in poorer condition on average. The distribution of amenities throughout the District shows areas of potential concern. Inkster, for example, has no games room or nursery school areas among its three community centres. Furthermore, Tyndall Park, which is fairly isolated to the west of the District, does not have a gymnasium or a multi-purpose room. The shortage is partly offset through a joint use agreement that is intended to provide access to a school gym and multi-purpose room. Likewise, it is intended that Ralph Brown CC share joint use of the adjoining school's gym; however, in both cases, the agreement is imperfect and actually allows very limited use of these amenities. Shortages of this nature can inhibit the ability to provide a broad spectrum of programs to the community.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE AMENITIES

Facility Name	Board Room	Computer Rm / Office	Canteen	Kitchen	Nursery School Area	Games Room	Gym	Hall	MPR	Indoor Arena	Other
Point Douglas											
Central	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	-	-	-
Burton Cummings	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Ralph Brown	-	3	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
Luxton	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-
Sinclair Park	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-
Robertson site	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Norquay	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1craft rm.
Beaconsfield site	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total for Cluster	**2**	**10**	**7**	**5**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**-**	**1**
Inkster											
Tyndall Park	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Garden Grove site	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northwood	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
Weston Memorial	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
Total for Cluster	**2**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**-**	**-**	**2**	**-**	**2**	**-**	**-**
Seven Oaks											
Maples	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
Elwick site	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Vince Leah	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
Garden City	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1 soccer
West Kildonan	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	1 dance
Red River	-	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
Total for Cluster	**4**	**5**	**6**	**4**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**2**	**2**
Total for District	**8**	**18**	**17**	**12**	**4**	**7**	**10**	**7**	**10**	**2**	**2**

Source: Community Centre profiles.

Shown in **Table 8** are the Space to Population Ratios (SPR) for the District. The SPR is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amount of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. In other words, there is no 'ideal' amount of recreation space per capita. This is a relative measure only.

NOTE: For this purpose it is important to understand the state of the system as of 2005, the point at which the RLLF policy was adopted. While Brooklands CC, Boyd Park, and Manitoba have since been closed, they are included in the Table in order to have an accurate starting point for the proposals that follow.

Relative to the rest of the city, residents of District 3 have access to less *community centre space* than the city average (1.33 square feet of space per person versus 1.50 square feet city-wide). However, the District has access to slightly more *city-managed space* than the rest of the city (0.41 sq ft of space for the District versus 0.38 sq ft city-wide). When the combined space is considered, the District has a lower SPR than the rest of the city (1.74 square feet of space per person versus 1.88 square feet city-wide).

Table 8: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS (SPR)

Cluster	Population	CCs + Sat	Space (sq ft)	SPR	City-run Facilities	Space (sq ft)	SPR	Combined SPR
Point Douglas	46,550	6+2	73,103	1.57	8	48,335	1.04	**2.61**
Inkster	29,140	4+3	42,292	1.45	1	3,614	0.12	**1.67**
Seven Oaks	54,790	5+1	65,418	1.19	1	4,000	0.07	**1.26**
District 3: LSWK	**136,125**	**15+6**	**180,813**	**1.33**	**10**	**55,949**	**0.41**	**1.74**
City	**647,600**	**71+14**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**31**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1.88**

Within the District, there are considerable discrepancies. Point Douglas is considerably better-served than the other clusters, reflective of the fact that it is a high-needs area. Virtually all of the city-managed facilities are in this cluster. Inkster, however, also exhibits characteristics of a high-needs area, particularly in Inkster East (see Table 2), yet its SPR is below the city average. This may be partly due to the growth in population in Inkster West (40% since 1986). Seven Oaks, meanwhile, has the lowest SPR at 1.26, again partly due to the fact that both the East and West areas have grown in population by approximately 25% since 1986 (see Table 2) without a corresponding growth in facility space.

Main Points

- *Overall, facilities in District 3 are in considerably poorer state of repair than the city average. Four facilities have an FCI over 1.00 which means it would be more economical to rebuild than to repair them. (One of these, Tyndall Park –Manitoba site, has closed. Another, Sinclair Park CC, has been approved for redevelopment.)*
- *There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District with a couple of exceptions: the Tyndall Park area does not have a gym or a multi-purpose room (although it has limited access to a school gym and multi-purpose room) and the Inkster cluster overall does not have access to a games room or nursery school space.*

- *Relative to other areas of the city, the LSWK District has less space per capita although, within the District, the highest needs area is relatively well served, with recreation space augmented by a large number of city-managed facilities.*

7. Summary of Current Issues and Concerns

The planning model used in this exercise is one that examines the inter-relationship among people, programs, and facilities with the underlying assumption that one must understand the needs of the people in order to develop relevant programs and, in turn, it is the nature of the programs that will dictate the types of facilities needed. Issues and concerns were identified in all three areas.

People

Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is the highest priority issue for the District. There is a concern that community centres are taken for granted and that volunteering to support the centres is not given the consideration it should by residents. In particular, efforts are needed to recruit younger volunteers in the twenty and thirty year age groups and in getting more parents involved. In support of this, more training for volunteers and staff may be needed.

From a staffing perspective it may be necessary to share staff in an effort to develop more attractive full-time positions. The increasing complexity of program development requires access to professional staff.

The demands on volunteers go beyond the programming challenges. The maintenance and administration of facilities requires time commitments beyond the average volunteer's capabilities. Caretakers, general managers, and administrative staff (including bookkeeping duties) are a necessity.

Another significant priority relates to access to programs and facilities. Given that a significant portion of the District is 'high-needs', access must be considered from the broadest sense, that is, from an economic, social, and physical point of view (including transportation). Attention will need to be paid to identifying and addressing barriers. Having centres open with consistent hours may be one of the solutions.

Communication is a concern. There is a sense that more education could be provided to residents regarding the benefits of community centres and the need to support them both in terms of participation and volunteerism. Some members of the community are not aware that community centres are run largely through the efforts of volunteers.

Demographic changes will need to be addressed. The number of visible minorities and new Canadians will rise and these changes will need to be considered in terms of program participation and volunteer recruitment. It will be important to reach out to these constituencies. Furthermore, it is critical that seniors play a bigger part of the community centre movement in the future.

Programs

Developing and delivering programs is another big challenge facing the District. Programs must be responsive to community needs and it is expected that these needs

will change over time through population growth and demographic change. Furthermore, higher needs areas require a wide range of inexpensive, activity-based programs including some that accommodate parental involvement. While registered sport programs are expected to remain vitally important, a philosophy of broader based programming will need to be introduced and nurtured over time.

There is a concern that community centres need to work more with other service providers; that they need to better tap into the service networks that exist in the District.

Resources are an ongoing issue. This includes money, staff, volunteers, equipment, and facility space. Efficiency measures will need to be addressed and may require a program delivery review with the City of Winnipeg to minimize duplications. Maintaining an inventory of programs and services could help as well.

The UFF is a concern in that it does not reflect programming. A centre gets funding based only upon its square footage and the population it serves. There is no financial benefit to providing more programming.

There is a concern about the costs of registered sports because they vary throughout the District. There may be a need to equalize registration fees. Generally, however, there is a need to increase funding available through the GCWCC Program Registration Fee Subsidy to meet the increasing demand. The main funder of this subsidy is the City of Winnipeg and the City has not increased its contribution in the past decade.

Facilities

Another significant priority concern for the District is the requirement for ongoing facility maintenance. A regular maintenance program needs to be developed and adhered to, perhaps by having a detailed log that identifies required maintenance with a timetable.

Facility operating costs are an ongoing concern including insurance, utilities, safety, etc. The District may need to enter into dialogue with the GCWCC regarding funding support for operations through the UFF. A re-alignment of responsibilities between community centres and the City of Winnipeg may need to be considered. There is a need for additional outdoor amenities.

Over-riding

Social concerns are high in the District. While this is evident in terms vandalism and other crimes, the root cause needs to be addressed. Community centres can help in terms of providing support programs for at-risk youth. However, a greater role for Police Services may also be required such as what has been done in some schools including increased police presence and greater education.

There is a sense that CCB meetings could be enhanced. These meetings could provide a forum for broader discussion to resolve areas of common concern.

Main Points

- *Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is the highest priority for the District overall and one that may require inventive solutions given that social issues over-ride the ability for some residents to provide volunteer support.*

- *Programming will need to evolve over time to meet the needs and pressures of a changing population in terms of demographic make-up (new Canadians, visible minorities, seniors).*
- *Costs are a significant issue in terms of facility maintenance, ongoing operating costs, and program registration fees. The unique needs of this District may warrant special consideration from the GCWCC who will continue to negotiate with the City on the Community Centres' behalf.*
- *In all community centre activities, the reality of social issues will need to be addressed.*

C. Needs Assessment

1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025

The Phase 1 Report that accompanies this study outlined in some detail the anticipated growth over the next twenty years and the impact of this growth on the City's demographic make-up. In short, Winnipeg is expected to experience significant growth averaging approximately 1% per year after a period of near stagnation over the past decade.

Natural growth in population, that is, birth minus deaths, will account for very little of this growth. The bulk of the growth will be attributable to increases in net migration. It is anticipated that fewer people will leave Winnipeg for ex-urban areas, fewer people will leave the Province for other Provinces, and more international migrants will be coming to the Province, especially to Winnipeg. This latter point is the most significant and is the result of an aggressive campaign on the part of the provincial government to increase international immigration through its Nominee Program.

Table 9: ESTIMATED GROWTH to 2025 – ALL DISTRICTS

	Est. Pop. 2005	Growth Allocation	Est. Pop. Increase	Est. Pop. 2025
District 1: City Centre	149,600	10%	13,650	163,250
District 2: Assiniboia	95,125	20%	27,800	122,925
District 3: Lord Selkirk W Kildonan	136,125	10%	13,150	149,275
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	10%	13,650	128,100
District 5: Riel	152,300	50%	69,250	221,550
Winnipeg	647,600	100%	137,500	785,100

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada and City of Winnipeg information

As shown in **Table 9**, the population of Winnipeg is expected to grow by 137,500 by 2025. Given the areas in the city where growth can be accommodated, it is expected that 10% of the growth will occur in District 3. This translates into a potential increase of more than 13,000 people. It is estimated that since the time of the 2005 population estimate used in Table 9, the population of LSWK has already increased by approximately 2,300 through 2006-07.

While the population may grow significantly, there will also be a shift in demographic make-up. In particular, the seniors population will increase, especially the 'younger'

seniors, aged 60-75. Where this group now comprises 17% of the population, that percentage will grow to 23% by the year 2025.

Additionally, the aboriginal population is expected to grow at a faster rate than the general population. While the city overall is expected to grow by 21% to the year 2025, the aboriginal population in itself could increase by over 60% if current growth rates hold true into the future. (See Phase 1 report for more detail.)

Main Points

- *Winnipeg is expected to grow by more than 20% to the year 2025, an increase in population of 137,500. It is possible that District 3 could increase in population by more than 13,000 over that period.*
- *The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.*

2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term

With an estimated growth of 13,150 people anticipated for the District over the next twenty years, it is critical for the planning of programs and facilities to understand where that growth is likely to occur. To begin, based upon permit activity, it is estimated that the District has already grown by approximately 2,300 people through 2006-07.

Map 5 identifies the potential areas for additional growth. Areas identified as 1 to 3 on the map are those areas where growth is more likely to occur in the shorter term, that is, over the next 10 years, perhaps a bit longer. These 'shorter-term' growth areas include:

1. Meadows West – the northern half of this subdivision remains to be developed and is estimated to be able to accommodate approximately 1,200-1,400 people.
2. Amber Trails – this subdivision has grown slowly over the years and is estimated to have capacity remaining for approximately 2,100-2,300 people.
3. Leila North – this area between Pipeline Road and McPhillips Street is largely undeveloped but could accommodate an estimated 1,000 people.

While there are many factors that could influence the timing of these developments, they are, generally speaking, reasonably likely to occur over the twenty year period anticipated in this plan. Should these proposed developments come to fruition, they, together with a few additional small pockets of development not identified on the map, would account for an increase in population of approximately 5,000 people.

Additionally, it is anticipated that policies promoting residential intensification could result in additional infill development and higher density redevelopment throughout the District. A rough estimate of 1,500 additional residents has been allocated toward this potential increase. This is particularly relevant in areas such as Point Douglas South where redevelopment could follow the pattern established along Waterfront Drive. It is anticipated that a redevelopment plan for the neighbourhood will be undertaken in the near future.

4. Old Kildonan-Murray – should the long-term projections hold true, there will be additional pressure for residential accommodation which could trigger development further north toward Murray Avenue and beyond. This area is quite large and could accommodate the additional 4,000-5,000 people identified in the projections.

Map 5: ANTICIPATED GROWTH AREAS FOR DISTRICT 3



The bulk of the growth anticipated for the District will find its way north of Leila Avenue both east and west of McPhillips Street, within the Seven Oaks cluster. This will put increasing pressure on existing facilities in this cluster, which, as shown in **Table 8**, already has the lowest SPR of the District. The growth may trigger the need for expansions and/or new facilities over time.

Main Points

- *The LSWK District needs to plan for substantial growth over the next twenty years, in the range of 13,000 people.*
- *Meadows West, Amber Trails, and Leila North will be the primary growth areas in the near term with the possibility of development north into Old Kildonan-Murray in the longer term.*

- *While the population will grow, it will also change with an increase in seniors, new immigrants, and aboriginals.*

3. Assessing Future Needs

In light of current issues facing the community centre system in District 3 and in order to be well positioned to address forecasted population growth and anticipated changes in demographics, a number of needs have been identified which should be addressed over the coming years.

Addressing the needs of at-risk youth

While structured sport programs directed toward children and youth should continue to be a mainstay, they need to be complemented by non-traditional programs, particularly in areas of the District where children and youth find themselves at greater risk. Community centres in these areas should not only provide opportunities for recreation, they should provide a safe haven with positive role models.

Programming for the whole community

All members of the community should feel that the community centre offers something for them. While it is recognized that children and youth should continue to be the priority, there is a need to ensure a broad range of programs, including more programming for adults and seniors. Furthermore, there is a need to understand the changing nature of the community – to recognize and respond to a growing aboriginal population and an increase in new immigrants.

Building partnerships and fostering collaboration

To address the complex needs of the community, it will be increasingly necessary for community centres to collaborate with other centres and/or build partnerships with other service providers to help ensure that the needs of the community are met.

Facilitating access

It will be necessary to remove barriers that inhibit access to community centres. For many residents in the District, just getting to and from the community centre is a significant challenge. The challenge of transportation will need to be considered in future plans. The cost of participation is another potential barrier that needs to be addressed.

Sustaining a volunteer base and staff resources

Volunteerism is the foundation of the community centre model in Winnipeg. In the poorer areas of the city, however, recruiting and sustaining volunteers is a significant challenge. Recruitment efforts may need to be enhanced to stimulate volunteerism from adults, seniors, youth, and minority groups; however, it may be that the bulk of the work load in some areas of the District will have to be borne by staff.

Addressing the need for resources

If new, innovative programs are to be developed to meet the current and future needs of the community then additional resources need to be devoted to program development. Program development requires specialized expertise and is beyond what can reasonably

be expected of volunteers. As well, there is a need to apply additional resources to facility maintenance and operations given the relatively poor condition of facilities in this District.

Main Points

- *District 3 will have to pay particular attention in the future to the social as well as recreational needs of the community, including addressing the needs of at-risk youth and ensuring that barriers are not inhibiting access to programs.*
- *While children and youth are the mainstay, all segments of the population must see the community centre as offering something for them.*
- *It will be important in the future to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community, particularly in terms of a growing aboriginal community and new immigrants.*
- *Having adequate resources is a prime concern, in terms of volunteers, staff, and funds for ongoing operations, maintenance, and program development.*

D. Moving Forward

1. Defining Success

The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base and high maintenance needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by the City. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple amenities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the specialized services they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

In the case of all the above models, the District Planning Committee agrees that a successful community centre is one that provides relevant programming for all age groups, in a well-maintained, multi-functional space that is open to the public both day and evening.

Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.

- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.
- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

Defining Success

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community.

A successful community centre is deemed to have the following characteristics.

- The community centre is a focal point of the community.
- The community centre makes an important contribution to the quality of life of a neighbourhood or community.
- The community centre serves the immediate population of the neighbourhood.
- The community centre relies on, and benefits from, dedicated volunteers and staff.
- The community centre offer diverse programming and provides a good balance of sport and non-sport programs.
- The community centre has well-maintained facilities.
- The community centre builds partnerships that enhance the pursuit of its mandate.

Main Points

- *The community centre model of the future must consider and respond to community needs at three levels: the local level, the neighbourhood level, and the district or regional level.*
- *The community centre model of the future must reflect the guiding principles upon which the system was founded and must strive to achieve success as defined by the community.*

2. Planning Limitations

Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be

maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. To accommodate the projected growth, 258,000 square feet of additional space can be planned for.

However, there are current imbalances in the system with some areas of the city having a higher SPR than others. The primary directive provided by the GCWCC as guidance for this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close as possible to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time.

Table 10: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR TO 2025 BY DISTRICT

	Current Combined SPR	Space to Plan for	Resulting SPR	Allotted CC Space	Allotted City-Run Space
District 1: City Centre	1.74	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	2.42	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	1.74	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	2.01	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	1.71	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	1.88	**258,000 sf**	**1.88**	206,000 sf	52,000 sf

Source: Derived from previous tables.

Given that District 3 currently holds one of the lowest SPRs among Districts, it has the ability to add a substantial amount of new space into the system over time. **Table 10** shows the amount of space allocated to each District for planning purposes.

It has been calculated that District 3 could add 44,000 square feet of additional space. Should the population increase in the District by 13,150 people to the year 2025 as projected, the District's SPR would rise from its current level of 1.74 to 1.88 with the addition of this new space.

The basis for this allocation is the City's RLLF policy. The policy covers community centres and similar city-managed recreation, leisure, and senior centres. If the current city-wide ratio of community centre space to city-managed space was to hold in the future, the 44,000 sq ft of new space would include 35,000 sq ft of community centre space and an additional 9,000 sq. ft. of city-managed space. This breakdown of space is a critical point of future discussions with the City of Winnipeg.

The challenge for the District is to distribute this space in a way that acknowledges current imbalances in the system while also ensuring that anticipated growth is addressed properly and fairly.

It bears noting that the redevelopment of Sinclair Park, which is currently under way, is space neutral. That is, the new facility will not result in an increase in square footage. However, a proposed addition to the Old Ex Recreation, currently out for tender by the City of Winnipeg, will result in additional square footage which will need to be accounted for under the policy.

Main Points

- *It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space.*
- *Respecting the GCWCC's goal, plans for District 3 must accommodate a potential increase in population of over 13,000 people to the year 2025 while adding 44,000 sq ft of additional space into the system over time.*
- *The 44,000 sq ft of new space includes a potential 35,000 of community centre space together with a potential 9,000 sq ft of city-managed space. This breakdown can, and should, be discussed and negotiated with the City of Winnipeg because the critical point as determined by the policy is the total amount of space, not who governs its use.*

3. Planning Strategies

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the needs of the District identified earlier.

Addressing the needs of at-risk youth

Strategies:

- Unstructured Programs: Some community centres could offer more drop-in opportunities for children and youth to engage in unstructured sport or just 'hang out'.
- Flex Space: It may be possible to develop more flexible, multi-purpose space that is able to be used creatively for a variety of purposes as determined by the users. A youth lounge, for example, can provide a safe, secure, yet informal environment.
- Outdoor Amenities: The provision of unstructured programming and drop-in opportunities should include access to additional outdoor amenities.
- Consistent Hours: While resources may be an issue, developing consistent hours of operation and extending hours later into the evening may assist in providing alternative activities for youth. Likewise, consistent staff/familiar faces are essential in developing a sense of trust and dependability. Providing a safe environment is paramount to youth participation.
- Board Involvement: Recruiting youth volunteers to participate on the community centre board can help ensure that decisions reflect the needs of youth while building a greater sense of ownership.

Programming for the whole community

Strategies:

- Demographic Monitoring: It will be necessary to keep track of changing neighbourhood demographics (increasing seniors, immigrants, aboriginals, etc.) in

order to anticipate programming needs. The City's Community Resource Coordinators (CRC's) can provide assistance in this regard while providing insight into the role of other service providers.

- Role Definition: It is important to recognize that not every community centre can meet every need. Role differentiation will be the key. For example, local centres might concentrate on drop-in and leisure activities while the larger centres could offer the traditional sports.
- Seniors Programming: In many centres it may be possible to accommodate seniors programming during the day.
- Parent and Child Programming: It may be possible to offer more opportunities for participation by parents with young children during morning or afternoon hours.
- Exercise Classes: Fitness and exercise programs could be beneficial since there may be affordability issues related to membership in private fitness facilities.
- Family Nights: Family Nights would encourage all members within a family to attend, offering something for all ages and promoting the sense of ownership and belonging.
- New Immigrants: With a growing number of new immigrants, it will be important to understand their needs. Research and consultation will be necessary. Needs may vary over time and programs will have to be responsive.
- New Sports: It may be necessary to introduce new sports (e.g. cricket) that are in sync with the emerging cultures represented by new immigrants.

Building partnerships and fostering collaboration

Strategies:

- Internal Collaboration: CCB meetings can be reconfigured to encourage greater collaboration among centres including information sharing to help resolve common issues. There is also benefit in communicating with other districts to gain their perspective on common issues. This might be accomplished through special meetings organized by GCWCC to discuss relevant topics suggested by the Community Centres.
- Schools: There is an opportunity for greater partnership with schools. For example, Ralph Brown receives great support from the Youth Opportunities Program at St. John's High School, a model that could be followed elsewhere.
- City of Winnipeg: The City offers Free Play programs and Youth Access (drop-in) programs where they provide the staff and the community centre provides the space. Centres can explore this partnership opportunity.
- Winnipeg Regional Health Association: There are health related educational programs such as Healthy Baby and Nutrition Classes that could be offered through a partnership with WRHA and accommodated within community centres.
- Networks: The CRC can assist in getting the community centre engaged with local service provider networks. Networking can include working with local cultural centres.

Community network associations can be invited to meet at community centres in order to increase awareness of each other's roles. Community Centres can be the hub of the community, a place where residents are able to access information about all the service providers in their neighbourhood.

- Sports Associations: A better relationship with sports associations is being explored by the GCWCC Sports Committee. Sports Associations and Community Centres could collaborate to set common registration dates throughout the City.

Facilitating access

Strategies:

- Local Centres: In areas where access is an issue, it may be necessary to maintain a larger number of small local community centres that are more easily accessed by walking to reduce transportation as a barrier to access.
- City Support: It may be necessary to negotiate additional support from the City in order to offer program subsidies to offset the cost of registration for those in greatest need.
- Food Provision: Through a partnership with a social service agency it may be possible to offer programs where a meal or snack is provided at little or no cost.
- Physical Accessibility: It may be necessary to address physical barriers to ensure that facilities can accommodate all members of the community including mothers with strollers, seniors, and the physically challenged.
- Transportation: Mobility must be examined to determine appropriate programming. Where off-site programming is necessary, options could be explored to provide transportation (e.g. Central CC is able to provide transportation through a donated van).

Sustaining a volunteer base and staff resources

Strategies:

- Communication: Communication within the local neighbourhood and within the District can help educate the community as to the role of community centres and the importance of volunteer support.
- Staff and Volunteer Training: To assist in the provision of better training for volunteers and staff, job descriptions can be created for each position and adapted to the needs of each centre. Knowing exactly what is expected of you might help people to volunteer.
- Shared Staff: Funding challenges can sometimes be overcome by working together and sharing resources. Creating full-time positions (e.g. bookkeepers, rink maintenance, dance instructors, etc.) to serve a number of centres may be an option. Partnering with other service providers and taking advantage of their staff is another option. In particular, it may be necessary to solicit greater staff support form the City in high needs areas.

- Resident Associations: Partnering with local resident associations may be one way of getting assistance for recruiting new volunteers and for getting input on program development. Resident associations often have an established communication network that Community Centres may be able to tap into.
- Seniors: If more seniors are encouraged to use community centres through additional programs that meet their needs, it creates a new pool of potential volunteers.
- Boundary Review: A boundary review could help address the volunteer base and help correct issues surrounding the formation of sports teams.

Addressing the need for resources

Strategies:

- UFF Review: The GCWCC can be approached to review its funding formula to incorporate programming into the decision to provide resources to Community Centres. Currently, there is little incentive to offer increased programming; current programming grants are unsustainable.
- Priority Upgrades: In this District, the preservation of local, accessible centres is a priority. Many of these centres do not require expansions but rather an improvement of the existing space through renovations.
- Maintenance: Qualified staff, a maintenance regimen, and a maintenance budget will help to keep the facilities from falling into further disrepair. It is recommended that the City of Winnipeg assume a larger role in Community Centre maintenance, so that volunteers may concentrate on program delivery.
- Registration Fees: Standardized registration fees can bring greater consistency and predictability while recognizing the need to keep fees as low as possible. Although it may be difficult to influence the fees set by Sports Associations (this may be addressed through the GCWCC Sports Committee), it may be possible to examine the extra costs associated with Community Centre administration fees (e.g. booster cards, equipment fees, etc)

4. Development Scenarios for Consideration

Synopsis

District 3 is a community with two very different dynamics. The south part of the District includes a number of older neighbourhoods including West Alexander, Centennial, Point Douglas, Dufferin, William Whyte, and St. John's that are recognized as high-needs areas requiring major improvements. These neighbourhoods tend to have lower education levels, greater unemployment, lower income, and lower rates of home ownership. Nonetheless, some significant rejuvenation efforts are underway in these areas. Community centres in these areas are complemented by a high concentration of city-managed facilities to address the higher needs of the disadvantaged, resulting in a high SPR.

Meanwhile, the north and west parts of the District, including neighbourhoods such as Tyndall Park, the Maples, Garden City, and Riverbend, have received a significant

amount of the city's growth in recent years. These areas are characterized as more affluent with new or newer homes. The northern part of the District is projected to capture additional growth over the next couple of decades which will put pressure on service provision to keep up with demand. To date, it would appear the growth of recreation facilities in these areas has lagged behind population growth as evidenced by lower SPRs, particularly in Inkster West and Seven Oaks West.

Past and Current Projects

The 2006 GCWCC report entitled "Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement" identified a number of proposals as candidates for funding. These proposals serve as the starting point for presenting projects for consideration. There was one project identified from District 3 in the report. It has since been approved.

Project Update: Redevelop Sinclair Park Community Centre

What: The Sinclair Park Boyd Park satellite has been declared surplus and the Sinclair Park main site is being redeveloped to include the creation of a full-size gym.

Why: The Sinclair Park main site had an FCI greater than 1.00 which meant it was in dire need of repair. A more contemporary facility was deemed necessary to enhance its ability to meet the broader programming needs of a disadvantaged area of the city. The Boyd Park site, meanwhile, was deemed to no longer be viable. Its closure allowed the expansion to take place.

How: This project has already been approved. Funding has been secured and construction is slated for 2009. The project is consistent with the RLLF policy and will not result in an increase in square footage.

Additional Closures

The Brooklands Community Centre and the Manitoba satellite of Tyndall Park Community Centre have been closed since 2005.

Map 6 identifies additional scenarios that could be pursued. These scenarios provide reconfiguration options that would assist in meeting the District's needs.

NOTE: Not all centres are, or need be, included in the scenarios. It was contemplated that those centres not specifically identified for possible change would carry on as status quo. However, these centres may still be involved in collaborative programming and governance reviews.

Scenario 1: *Increase Facility Space in Inkster West and Seven Oaks West*

What: Maples CC, Northwood CC, and Tyndall Park CC will develop a joint strategy to address the significant shortage of facility space in the Seven Oaks West and Inkster West areas. This strategy will encompass two scenarios currently being considered:

- Expanding and redeveloping the Maples main site while closing the current satellite facility at Elwick. Also, constructing a new fieldhouse and developing sports fields in the Seven Oaks West area, as a new satellite.

- Expanding the Northwood main site to address the lack of storage space and to improve the functionality of this centre by adding additional multi-purpose space. This would allow for more diverse programming, addressing the broader needs of the community.

Why: Inkster West has a SPR of 0.63 sq ft per person and Seven Oaks West has an SPR of 0.73 sq ft per person, by far the least served areas of the District which averages 1.74 sq ft per person. Furthermore, the northern portion of Seven Oaks West is expected to continue to grow over the next decade or so, resulting in an additional 4,000 to 5,000 people. The imbalance of space relative to other areas of the District is severe today and will only get worse as population grows. This amply justifies significant expansion.

How: Discussions need to take place among the three centres. For consideration are the magnitude of expansion plans for Maples and Northwood, the possible expansion of Tyndall Park, and changes in governance including possible amalgamations among centres.

Scenario 2: *Renovate Luxton CC*

What: Renovate Luxton CC to address serious concerns about accessibility to the site and within the building.

Why: Luxton CC is an active centre that is dealing with site and building limitations. There is very little parking and the entrance and egress from the site is convoluted. One solution is to acquire neighbouring properties in order to create a through lane between Luxton and Inkster together with parking stalls. This would help alleviate site issues. Furthermore, the main floor is a bi-level which creates accessibility problems and limits the use of the space. Creating a single level would address concerns.

How: Neighbouring residential properties would need to be purchased to address site accessibility. Renovations would not add square footage and could take place when other major maintenance projects (eg. roof replacement) are undertaken.

Scenario 3: *Expand Vince Leah CC and redevelop West Kildonan CC*

What: Once the existing arena at West Kildonan has reached the end of its life cycle, a new arena could be added onto Vince Leah while closing the arena at West Kildonan CC. West Kildonan CC would be redeveloped into a proper local centre including the possible addition of a full-size gym.

Why: West Kildonan is a small centre that offers relatively few programs. Its main feature is an indoor arena, built in 1966. Vince Leah, meanwhile, has a significantly larger facility and runs a large number of programs with good volunteer support. Furthermore, it has a large site (33 acres) that could easily accommodate a new arena. Moving the arena to Vince Leah and redeveloping West Kildonan would address these concerns.



Map 6 - District 3: Lord Selkirk - West Kildonan
Proposed Development Scenarios

How: Within the RLLF policy, no new indoor arenas can be built. The addition of a new arena at Vince Leah could only occur with the subsequent closure of the arena at West Kildonan. The new arena could have heated square footage consistent with what is currently the case with West Kildonan. West Kildonan should be redeveloped into a proper local centre. Should additional space be required for the redevelopment of West Kildonan CC, it would need to be rationalized with the RLLF policy.

Scenario 4: *Expand Weston Memorial*

What: Weston Memorial Community Centre could be expanded to increase its programming space.

Why: With the closure of Brooklands CC, Weston Memorial has had an increase in the size of population it serves. The population is also one of greater need. While governance has been an issue (governance is currently provided by the GCWCC), the centre is viable in terms of usage and fills a pressing need in the community.

How: The amount of square footage gained as a result of the closure of Brooklands could be allocated to the expansion. Governance options need to be explored leading to the adoption of a longer-term governance strategy.

5. Moving Forward on Scenarios

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested. This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres. This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (eg. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

Reviewing Boundaries

When any of the scenarios becomes a real project, it may be necessary for the GCWCC to undertake a boundary review in light of the changes to facilities (closures, mergers, expansions) or in response to population growth and the addition of a new facility.

6. Addressing Overall Priorities

Priority No. 1: Enhance volunteer and staff recruitment and retention

The District has less than the city average in terms of volunteer support. This is partly a reflection of the socio-economic circumstances of the community. Efforts could focus on inventive recruitment, seeking to attract non-traditional volunteers such as seniors. Overall, it would be beneficial for the GCWCC to offer “How to Recruit a Volunteer” seminars and to offer ‘job’ descriptions and proper training. However, greater communication may be the single most effective option. The key is to inform local residents about the vital role that community centres play and the need to sustain operations through volunteer support.

As well, greater involvement by the City in program development would ease the burden placed on volunteers as would the pursuit of shared staff to assist with programming needs. Staff sharing among centres and between centres and other service providers will need to be pursued. It is possible that the development of newer more contemporary facilities could facilitate volunteer and staff recruitment as could a boundary review.

Priority No.2: Support facility maintenance and operations

The District has a higher than average FCI. Its facilities tend to be older and in poorer condition, making it difficult to address the requirements for maintenance and to meet the additional ongoing costs of operations. All development scenarios are intended to address this priority to some degree. They all result in an enhanced, more contemporary facility that would have reduced maintenance requirements and reduced operating costs while dealing responsibly with the directive of restricting the amount of new space introduced into the system.

Additionally, having qualified maintenance staff, a maintenance regimen, and a dedicated maintenance budget (with support from the City) will be necessary to keep facilities from falling into further disrepair. It is important to recognize that, in this District, consolidation and closures are less of an option. Rather, the District will strive to maintain its current complement of facilities in areas of greatest need in an effort to encourage community access.

Priority No. 3: Develop and sustain programs that meet community needs

The greatest focus will be on meeting the needs of at-risk youth with efforts directed toward greater youth involvement on Boards, and greater opportunities for informal drop-in and unstructured sport, both indoor and outdoor. To accommodate this, a greater emphasis will be paid to the provision of consistent and, if possible, enhanced hours of operation to provide dependable and familiar surroundings.

It will be important as well to understand the changing demographic make-up of the community and to provide services that meet their needs. Numbers of seniors, new Canadians, and aboriginals are all expected to grow at a greater rate than the general population, therefore new programs will have to be developed. The approach could be to pool resources on a district-wide basis to engage the services of a full-time qualified program development officer(s) that can lay the groundwork for more expansive

programming to the point where volunteers or staff can then deliver the programs. The planning work could be extensive, involving consultation with community groups, demographic research, and marketing.

Finally, in recognition of a higher proportion of low income families and single parent households in some parts of the District, barriers to access will need to be addressed. Partnerships with other service providers including the City of Winnipeg can help generate solutions.

APPENDIX

Summary of Other Service Providers (a work in progress)

Seven Oaks

- Elwick Village Centre
- Kildonan Youth Activity Centre
- Maples Youth Activity Centre
- Middlechurch Community Services Council
- Seven Oaks Early Years Coalition
- Seven Oaks Healthy Living
- Seven Oaks Seniors Links
- Victory Lighthouse Program

Inkster

- Nor'West Co-op Community Health Centre
- Nor'West Resource Centre – Gilbert Park
- Nor'West Resource Centre – Blake Gardens
- Nor'West Resource Centre – Alexander
- Salvation Army

Point Douglas

- Andrews Street Family Centre
- Flora House
- Mama Wi Chi Itata Centre
- North End Women's Centre
- North End Stella Ministry
- The Welcome Home
- Boys and Girls Club (Aberdeen and College sites)
- Burrows Resource Centre
- Indian and Métis Friendship Centre
- Inner City Youth Alive
- Ndinawe Youth Resource Centre
- Springs Inner City Youth Program
- Pritchard Park Recreation Centre

Downtown

- Broadway Seniors Resource Centre
- Downtown Parent-Child Coalition
- Downtown Seniors Resource Council
- Rossbrook House
- West Central Women's Resource Centre
- Wolseley Family Place

URBANEDGE
consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 2

EAST KILDONAN TRANSCONA DISTRICT PLAN



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

FINAL - MARCH 11, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

EAST KILDONAN TRANSCONA DISTRICT PLAN

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. Direction and Parameters **7**
1. Plan 2025 7
2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy 7
3. The Starting Point 7
4. The Planning Model 8
5. People Overview 8
6. Programs Overview 8
7. Facilities Overview 9
8. The Vision 9
9. District Plans 9

B. Current Situation **10**
1. East Kildonan Transcona District and Neighbourhood Clusters 10
2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities 14
3. Demographic Make-up 16
4. Overview of Current Programs 18
5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers 20
6. Overview of Current Facilities 22
7. Current Issues and Concerns 26

C. Needs Assessment **27**
1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025 27
2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term 28
3. Assessing Future Needs 30

D. Moving Forward **31**
1. Defining Success 31
2. Planning Limitations 34
3. Planning Strategies 35
4. Past and Current Project Proposals 39
5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios 40
6. Moving Forward on Scenarios 43
7. Addressing Overall Priorities 44

Appendix **46**

List of Maps

Map 1: District and Cluster Boundaries 10
Map 2: Community Centres 11
Map 3: City-Managed Facilities 12
Map 4: Combined Community Centres and City-Managed Facilities 13
Map 5: Growth Areas for the District 29
Map 6: Potential Development Scenarios to 2025 42

List of Tables

Table 1: All Recreation and Leisure Facilities (as of 2005) 14
Table 2: Demographic Overview 2001 and 2006 16
Table 3: Summary of Community Centre Programs 19
Table 4: Summary of Community Centre Volunteers 20
Table 5: Summary of Community Centre Staff 21
Table 6: Facility Condition and Preservation Needs (as of 2004) 23
Table 7: Summary of Community Centre Amenities 24
Table 8: Space to Population Ratios 25
Table 9: Estimated Growth to 2025 – All Districts 28
Table 10: Amount of Space to Plan For to 2025 by District 34

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
EKT – East Kildonan Transcona District
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio
CCB – Community Centres Board
CRC – Community Resource Coordinator

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of a Planning Committee established by the Community Centre Board for District 4: East Kildonan Transcona.

KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
EAST KILDONAN TRANSCONA DISTRICT PLAN

Executive Summary

Current Recreation Space

The East Kildonan Transcona District is served by 13 community centres, including four indoor arenas. One of these centres also operates an indoor soccer complex. In total, there are 22 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As well, there are 9 city governed facilities that provide complementary services in the District. This includes an additional city-run arena.

In total, there is 237,000 sq ft of recreation space to serve a population of 114,000, or 2.07 sq ft per person. With the city average being 1.88 sq ft of recreation space per person, the EKT District overall has access to more space than other areas of the city.

Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents in River East South and Transcona have access to more space than do residents elsewhere in the District. The eastern portion of River East is the least well served, relative to other areas of the District.

Demographics

Generally, the District exhibits different demographic characteristics east of Gateway from south and west of Gateway. Transcona and River East East have similar characteristics with more children and fewer seniors than average. Meanwhile, River East West stands out with a very high percentage of seniors while River East South stands out with a more substantial aboriginal population.

Among clusters, River East South is the area of greatest need with generally low education, high unemployment, low household income, and more lone parent families.

Programs

Overall, there appears to be a very consistent amount of programming across the District, averaging 0.21 hours per capita. However, that amount is considerably less than the average across the city which sits at 0.33 hours per capita.

The District provides a considerable range of programs targeted to a variety of age groups although there are few seniors programs. This is likely due to a number of senior centres that are available outside the community centre system. The main emphasis is on the provision of sport programs directed toward children and youth.

Gateway and Park City West provide the most programming hours while SouthTranscona and East Elmwood provide the least.

Staff and Volunteers

The District overall has a considerable variance in the amount of volunteer support it enjoys ranging from an estimated high of 3.0 hours per person in Transcona to an

estimated low of 0.7 hours per capita in River East South, yet River East South is a high needs area where support is most needed.

East Elmwood operates with no staff, supported by a very small core of volunteers.

From a full-time and part-time staffing perspective, Gateway and East End clearly dominate the District. This is consistent with the centres operating two indoor rinks each (together with indoor soccer in the case of Gateway).

Facilities

Overall, facilities in EKT are in about the same state of repair as the average for the city overall. Generally, this means that (as of 2004) about one third of their replacement value needed to be invested in maintenance to get them into reasonable condition. The District's community centres are in somewhat better condition than its city-run facilities.

There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District although the eastern side of River East contains no games room or gymnasium, making it dependent on off-site access if programming is to be geared toward those types of facilities.

Primary Issues and Concerns

Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is the highest priority for the District overall and one that may require inventive solutions given the changing face of the community (growing populations of seniors, immigrants, and aboriginals).

Another major concern is the ability of centres to secure sustainable funding for the variety of programs they need to offer to meet the needs of the community (beyond registered sports).

The needs of the community cannot be met with inadequate facilities and equipment. There is great concern about access to gyms and sport fields and the state of repair of maintenance and operations equipment.

Growth and Its Impact

It is possible that EKT could increase in population by more than 13,000 to the year 2025. The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.

In the nearer term, growth will be concentrated in the Regent West and Canterbury Park areas. Longer term, residential development may be directed toward South Transcona.

It will be important in the future to introduce programs for the whole community, programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community, particularly in terms of a growing aboriginal community and new immigrants.

Having adequate resources is a prime driver for change, in terms of volunteers, staff, and funds for ongoing operations, maintenance, and program development.

Areas that will need to be addressed include the development of more suitable facilities, improved governance practices, and stronger communications. Partnerships and collaboration will guide future efforts.

Vision

The community centre model of the future should continue to have a combination of small local centres, mid-size neighbourhood centres, and large district centres. The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing.

It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space. Respecting this goal, plans for the EKT District must accommodate a potential increase in population of over 13,000 people while adding no more than 10,500 sq ft of new space.

Development Scenarios

Already approved or under way (since 2005)*:*

Bronx Park Community Centre: Home of Good Neighbours Senior Centre: Construction is currently underway on a new 25,000 sq ft facility at Bronx Park. This includes a merger with the Good Neighbours Senior Centre.

Kelvin Closure: The Kelvin CC has been closed and demolished. The fields and a field house remain. The portion of the site fronting onto Henderson may be sold with the proceeds directed toward the Community Centre Investment Fund.

Potential new developments*:*

Valley Gardens and Morse Place: Valley Gardens CC and Morse Place CC could explore amalgamation and could relocate to the Terry Sawchuk arena site, taking over management of the arena.

Chalmers EK Seniors Centre: Chalmers CC could explore the amalgamation of their centre with the EK Senior Centre currently occupying a city-leased facility. The amalgamation would make better use of existing space.

Park City West: Park City West CC could be expanded to accommodate an indoor arena and an Active Living Centre followed by the decommissioning of the Roland Michener Arena. This area is projected to have the highest population growth in Transcona.

Oxford Heights: Oxford Heights CC could be expanded to convert their small gym into a full-size gym to address a shortage of full-size gym space in Transcona.

East End: East End CC could implement Phase 2 of its development plan adding two floors adjoining their Rink 1 with new dressing rooms, a canteen, and additional support and programming space.

South Transcona: South Transcona could eventually expand to meet the needs of the community should residential growth occur in this area of the District as projected in the long term.

NOTE: The development scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.

GCWCC Plan 2025
EAST KILDONAN TRANSCONA DISTRICT PLAN

A. Direction and Parameters

This section repeats the Executive Summary of the Plan 2025 Phase 1 report. For a more detailed explanation of the Direction and Parameters provided to this plan, refer to the report. It can be found on the GCWCC web site at www.gcwcc.mb.ca.

1. Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system was unsustainable. The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

3. The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005 and that year serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of space using the 'heated square footage' definition.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres, facilities which are similar to community centres in terms of nature of programs delivered to the community. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of recreation space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

4. The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



5. People Overview

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, 25.6 versus 39.2 in 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500, will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by District 2 with 20%, and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

6. Programs Overview

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging, from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listing and third party agreements.

7. Facilities Overview

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

8. The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

9. District Plans

This District Plan contains:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC reflective of Phase One of Plan 2025.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, recreation programs offered, volunteer support provided, and community centre facilities.
- A summary of issues and concerns identified by community centre representatives.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- A series of strategies to address the needs over the long term.
- An overview of scenarios showing how changes could manifest themselves over time through possible expansions, mergers, closures, and the construction of new facilities.
- A short list of projects deemed to be of highest priority in meeting community needs.
- Selected strategies to address the most critical issues and concerns.
- An action plan to guide decision-making over the short term.

B. Current Situation

1. East Kildonan Transcona District and Neighbourhood Clusters

The East Kildonan Transcona District, or District 4, encompasses the entire north-east quadrant of the city. It is bounded by the Red River to the west, the Perimeter Highway to the north and east, and Mission Street to the south. The District is generally (but not exactly) aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political boundaries that make up the East Kildonan Transcona Community Committee.

The reason for the differences is that the Community Centre District must consider appropriate catchment areas around each of its community centres to ensure residents are well served while the political boundaries have more to do with the even distribution of population by ward. Even so, efforts have been made to keep the community centre boundaries as consistent as possible with political boundaries.

For planning purposes the District has been split into four areas called neighbourhood clusters. These units are used because research information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster. The clusters include River East West, River East East, River East South, and Transcona.

Map 1 shows the boundaries of the District in black outline together with the neighbourhood cluster areas in various shades.



Map 1: District Boundaries and Cluster Areas



Map 2 - District 4: East Kildonan - Transcona Community Centres - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- District 4 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 3 - District 4: East Kildonan - Transcona
Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Recreation Facilites (City of Winnipeg)
- District 4 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre
SC - Senior Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 4 - District 4: East Kildonan - Transcona
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 4 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- RIVERS

CC - Community Centre
RC - Recreation Centre
LC - Leisure Centre
SC - Senior Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008

2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities

The previous **Maps 2, 3, and 4** show the distribution of Community Centres, the distribution of City-Managed Facilities, and the combined distribution of all facilities.

Table 1 provides the list of all facilities for the District by neighbourhood cluster as of 2005.

Table 1: ALLRECREATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (as of 2005)

Cluster	Type	Facility Name	Heated Sq Ft
River East West 3 community centres 1 recreation centres Pop: 24,565*	Community Centre	Bronx Park✦	25,000
	Community Centre	Melrose Park	12,928
	Community Centre	North Kildonan	11,769
		Total Community Centres	49,697
	Recreation Centre	Good Neighbours Senior Centre✦	0
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**49,697**
River East East 3 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop. 39,530*	Community Centre	Gateway	15,417
	Arena	Gateway Arena (2 rinks)	9,842
	Indoor Soccer	Gateway Soccer Complex	10,043
	Community Centre	Valley Gardens	10,172
	Community Centre	Morse Place	9,597
		Total Community Centres	55,071
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**55,071**
River East South 2 community centres 3 recreation centre Pop: 17,050	Community Centre	Kelvin	9,771
	Community Centre	Chalmers	14,950
	Community Centre	East Elmwood	7,570
		Total Community Centres	32,291
	Recreation Centre	East Kildonan Senior Centre	6,345
	Recreation Centre	Elmwood Winter Club	7,704
	Recreation Centre	East End Cultural and Leisure Centre	6,268
		Total City-Managed Facilities	20,317
		Total for Cluster	**52,608**
Transcona 4 community centres 5 recreation centre Pop: 30,650	Community Centre	Park City West	11,876
	Community Centre	Oxford Heights	16,601
	Community Centre	East End	9,780
	Arena	East End Arena (2 rinks)	3,744
	Community Centre	South Transcona	1,636
		Total Community Centres	43,637
	Recreation Centre	Arts Action Centre	3,076
	Recreation Centre	Roland Michener Arena	11,150
	Recreation Centre	Transcona Senior Centre	7,640
	Recreation Centre	Transcona Scout Hall	2,500
	Recreation Centre	Transcona Optimists	12,000
		Total City-Managed Facilities	36,366
		Total for Cluster	**80,003**
District 4 City Centre 13 community centres 9 recreation centres Pop: 114,450**	**16 cc facilities**	**District 4 Community Centre Sub-Total**	**180,696**
	9 city-run facilities	**District 4 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total**	**56,683**
	25 facilities	**DISTRICT 4 TOTAL**	**237,379**

Source: GCWCC and City of Winnipeg

** The population of these two clusters was adjusted to reflect Gateway's catchment area.*
*** The District population is different than the sum of each cluster because of an adjustment made based on the Census undercount as determined by Statistics Canada.*

✦ *NOTE: Table 1 lists all facilities as of 2005, the starting point for this plan because it was the point in time when the RLLF policy was adopted. The new Bronx Park*

Community Centre was approved prior to the adoption of the RLLF policy, with the understanding that the Good Neighbours Senior Centre would become surplus inventory. Consequently, the Table reflects the square footage of what was proposed and approved at that time rather than what was in place. The new Bronx Park facility is currently under construction. Kelvin CC has since been closed and demolished. The remaining heated storage facility, fieldhouse, and outdoor amenities are currently operated by Bronx Park. However, since this change occurred after the policy was adopted the square footage must be accounted for. This occurs later in this report.

NOTE: The list of city-run facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively consistent with what is provided by community centres. In this case, it is nine facilities. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas. The combined list represents all those facilities that are subject to the restriction imposed by the RLLF policy.

As of 2005, the East Kildonan Transcona District was served by 13 community centres. Two centres also run indoor arenas, each comprising two rinks, and one of these centres also operates an indoor soccer complex. In total, there were 16 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system.

Throughout the city residents are also served through a number of city-run facilities that, for all intents and purposes, are similar to community centres in the services they provide, but for historical reasons have evolved through into a system of split jurisdiction. To properly plan for the needs of the district, these city-run facilities need to be considered alongside the community centres. There are nine of these facilities in the District.

Table 1 shows the EKT District was served by approximately 237,000 sq ft of combined recreation space. As shown in the first column of the Table, the population as of 2005 is estimated to be approximately 114,500 for the District. This translates into a combined Space to Population Ratio (SPR) as follows:

River East West:	2.02 square feet per person
River East East:	1.39 square feet per person
River East South:	3.09 square feet per person
Transcona:	2.61 square feet per person
EKT District:	**2.07 square feet per person**
City Average:	**1.88 square feet per person**

Main Points

- *Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of River East East have access to considerably less space than do residents elsewhere in the District with 1.39 sq ft per person versus 2.02, 2.61, and 3.09 for the other three clusters.*
- *River East South with three community centres and three city-run recreation centres has the most space with 3.09 sq ft per person. This has become less pronounced with the recent closing of Kelvin.*

- *With the city average being 1.88 square feet of combined recreation space per person, the EKT District overall has access to somewhat more space than other areas of the city with 2.07 sq ft per person on average.*
- *Approximately30% of the District's space is city-managed space, nearly double the city average.*

3. Demographic Make-up

Table 2 provides an overview of the demographic make-up of the EKT District using selected information from the 2001 Census as provided by the City of Winnipeg together with 2006 Census data derived from Statistics Canada information currently available on their website.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW 2001 and 2006

2001 Census Info	River East West	River East East	River East South	Transcona	CITY
Total Population	37,035	26,785	17,150	30,255	619,544
Population Change 86-01	-7.3%	+10.3%	-8.4%	+8.4%	+4.2%
Children 5-19	17.8%	24.0%	20.3%	22.5%	19.8%
Seniors 55+	30.2%	16.4%	18.8%	18.8%	22.1%
Aboriginal Identity	4.7%	8.1%	14.8%	5.9%	8.6%
Immigrant	18.0%	16.6%	13.3%	9.6%	17.3%
Married & Common Law	51.3%	54.7%	39.6%	57.3%	48.8%
Hold University Degree	13.2%	11.4%	6.5%	7.9%	18.3%
Unemployment	5.0%	4.9%	8.5%	5.1%	5.7%
Low Income Households	18.6%	17.6%	30.1%	11.1%	20.3%
Average Household Income	$50,068	$55,661	$38,420	$56,546	$53,176
Household Size	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.7	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	62%-38%	72%-28%	61%-39%	87%-13%	64%-36%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	61.9%	60.2%	67.5%	67.5%	57.7%

2006 Census Info	River East West	River East East	River East South	Transcona	CITY
Total Population	36,370	27,725	17,050	30,650	633,451
Population Change 01-06	-1.8%	+3.5%	-0.6%	+1.3%	+2.2%
Children 5-19	17.0%	21.9%	19.1%	21.4%	19.0%
Seniors 55+	34.2%	22.3%	20.1%	21.7%	25.2%
Aboriginal Identity	5.6%	8.5%	17.8%	9.5%	10.1%
Immigrant	17.7%	18.4%	14.9%	10.2%	18.4%
Married & Common Law	47.0%	48.2%	38.0%	48.5%	44.4%
Lone Parent Families	17.4%	18.4%	29.7%	18.7%	19.5%
Household Size	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.4
Tenure – Own vs. Rent	61%-39%	75%-25%	63%-37%	87%-13%	65%-35%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	57.3%	57.3%	50.0%	65.0%	55.2%

Source: City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada

From these data, a few observations can be made:

Population Change

Two of the clusters, River East West and River East South, experienced considerable population loss over the fifteen years from 1986-2001, roughly half a percent per year. However, the most recent 5 year period, from 2001-06, indicates that the population loss has slowed and perhaps stabilized. Meanwhile, the remaining part of the District, that is, the area south-east of Gateway experienced modest growth over the fifteen years from 1986-2001, at more than half a percent per year, a pattern that continues in River East East. Growth appears to have slowed somewhat in Transcona.

Children, Seniors, and Household Size

Looking at the 2006 information, the number of seniors (55+) is a bit lower than the city average of 25.2% in River East East, River East South, and Transcona but is a lot higher than the city average in River East West where it sits at 34.2%, highest of all city clusters. All clusters show an increased number of seniors from 2001, following the aging trend for the city overall. With such a high number of seniors in this cluster, one might expect a very low percentage of children but it is only 2% less than the city average of 19%. The other three clusters are slightly higher than the city average. River East East and Transcona have the largest household size at 2.7 and 2.6 respectively.

Aboriginals and Immigrants

Looking at the most recent data (2006), the River East West cluster shows only about half the city average of people of aboriginal identify (5.6% compared to 10.1%) while River East South shows more than triple the River East West amount at 17.8%. None of the clusters has an immigrant population higher than the city average of 18.4% with Transcona being the lowest at 10.2%. If the aboriginal and immigrant populations are combined, then the most diversified cluster is River East South at about a third of its population from these groups, modestly higher than the city average. In all clusters, the number of immigrants and aboriginals is higher than it was in 2001, reflecting a trend toward an increasingly diversified community.

Education

While the 2006 figures for education were not yet available, the 2001 figures show a distinct pattern of lower than average education (that is, fewer numbers of people with university degrees) in all clusters, with two clusters, River East South and Transcona, at less than half the city average of 18.3%. This is likely a reflection of the social challenges facing many residents of River East South and of the blue collar workforce that tends to be associated with Transcona.

Employment, Income, and Need

Again using 2001 numbers because 2006 were not yet released, River East South, at 8.5% shows the highest level of unemployment while the other three clusters are very near the city average of 5.7%. Given that, and the lower education levels, it is not surprising to see that River East South has the lowest household income at just over

$34,000, considerably below the city average of over $53,000. And, while 20.3% of city households are considered low income, the number rises to 30.1% in River East South. At 11.1%, Transcona has one of the fewest incidences of low income in the city.

Tenure and Mobility

Across the city, approximately two thirds of the population own their home while one third rent. Home ownership provides some insight into neighbourhood stability. The numbers overall have been quite consistent from 2001 to 2006. Transcona has the greatest percentage of home owners at 87% while the remaining three clusters are not too far off the city average. This pattern is reinforced by the number of people who have not moved in the past 5 years. The city average is 55% but only 65% of those in Transcona and 63% of those in River East West did not move over the last 5 years.

Main Points

- *Generally, the District exhibits different demographic characteristics east of Gateway from south and west of Gateway. Transcona and River East East have similar characteristics with more children and fewer seniors than average. Meanwhile, River East West stands out with a very high percentage of seniors while River East South stands out with a more substantial aboriginal population.*
- *Among clusters, River East South stands out as the area of greatest need with generally low education, high unemployment, low household income, and more lone parent families.*

4. Overview of Current Programs

Table 3 provides a summary of programming hours and programs offered by each centre and by each cluster based upon information provided by the centres themselves. The 12 community centres together offer 152 programs accounting for over 24,000 hours of recreation programming. This ranges from an estimated 336 programming hours provided through East Elmwood Community Centre to over 4,400 estimated programming hours provided through Gateway Community Centre.

It should be noted that the data have been provided by the community centres themselves and are difficult to verify. Consequently, the numbers should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude rather than a precise representation.

It would appear that all four clusters offer a very similar level of programming to their residents. However, the District overall offers an amount of programming considerably below the city average.

In relation to population, the number of program hours per person works out to be:

River East West:	0.20 hours per person
River East East:	0.21 hours per person
River East South:	0.23 hours per person
Transcona:	0.24 hours per person
East Kildonan Transcona District:	**0.21 hours per person**
City Average:	**0.33 hours per person**

Table 3: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAMS							
			Breakdown of Programs				
Facility	Program Hours	No. of Programs	Pre-School	Children/ Youth	Adults	Seniors	Special Events
River East West Pop: 24,565*							
Bronx Park	1,277	11	1	3	6	1	-
Melrose Park	1,466	7	-	4	2	1	-
North Kildonan	2,253	16	1	9	3	-	3
Total for Cluster	**4,996**	**34**	**2**	**16**	**11**	**2**	**3**
River East East Pop: 39,530*							
Gateway	4,414	16	1	8	1	1	5
Valley Gardens	2,853	17	2	11	2	-	2
Morse Place	857	9	-	6	2	1	-
Total for Cluster	**8,124**	**42**	**3**	**25**	**5**	**2**	**7**
River East South Pop: 17,050							
Chalmers	3,537	10	-	6	1	-	3
East Elmwood	336	10	-	6	2	1	1
Total for Cluster	**3,873**	**20**	**-**	**12**	**3**	**1**	**4**
Transcona Pop: 30,650							
Park City West	3,870	18	2	10	2	-	4
Oxford Heights	909	17	1	11	1	-	4
East End	1,767	13	-	8	2	-	3
Transcona South	668	8	1	4	1	-	2
Total for Cluster	**7,214**	**56**	**4**	**33**	**6**	**-**	**13**
District 4 East Kildonan Transcona Pop: 114,450	**24,207**	**152**	**9** 6%	**86** 57%	**25** 16%	**5** 3%	**27** 18%

Source: Community Centre Profiles
** The population of these clusters has been adjusted to reflect Gateway's catchment area*

Within the District, the greatest emphasis is on children and youth programming with 86 of the 152 programs (57%) dedicated to that age group. This is relatively consistent with other parts of the city. Only 5 programs (3%) are directed toward seniors while 25 (16%) are available for adults. Transcona offers the most number of programs (56) but offers no programming for seniors although the city-run Transcona Senior Centre is available. River East West with its very high percentage of seniors offers 2 programs although the city-run Good Neighbours Senior Centre operates here. River East South, an area of higher need with a large number of single parent households, offers no pre-school programs.

It is important to note, however, that programs tend to be delivered based upon staff and financial resources both of which are somewhat more limited in this District. Furthermore, facility limitations often hamper the delivery of specific programs. As well, there are a number of other service providers in the District. (See Appendix.)

All clusters and most centres offer some special events. Special events are very positive in that they tend to attract a broader base of participants. Having events for the entire family has a positive impact on the operations of the centres, facilitating the recruitment of volunteers among other benefits. As well, through partnerships with other community agencies more programs can be offered making greater use of facilities.

Looking at individual centres, Gateway, Chalmers, and Park City West lead the pack in terms of numbers of program hours.

Main Points

- *Overall, there appears to be a very consistent amount of programming across the District, averaging 0.21 hours per capita. However, that amount is considerably less than the average across the city which sits at 0.33 hours per capita.*
- *The District provides a considerable range of programs targeted to a variety of age groups although there are few seniors programs likely due to a number of senior centres that are available outside the community centre system. As with other areas of the city, the main emphasis is on the provision of sport programs directed toward children and youth (comprises over 50% of all programs offered).*
- *Gateway, Park City West, and Chalmers provide the most programming hours while Oxford Heights, Morse Place, Transcona South, and East Elmwood provide the least.*

5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers

Table 4 shows an estimate of volunteer hours and a rough estimate of volunteers.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE VOLUNTEERS

Cluster	Facility Name	Volunteer Hours	Number of Volunteers
River East West 3 community centres population 24,565*	Bronx Park	6,900	
	Melrose Park	37,300	
	North Kildonan	17,600	
	Total for Cluster	**61,800**	**500 (est)**
River East East 3 community centres population 39,530*	Gateway	38,300	
	Valley Gardens	21,800	
	Morse Place	1,000	
	Total for Cluster	**61,100**	**500 (est)**
River East South 2 community centres population 17,050	Chalmers	11,500	
	East Elmwood	1,500	
	Total for Cluster	**12,000**	**100 (est)**
Transcona 4 community centres population 30,650	Park City West	38,200	
	Oxford Heights	43,300	
	East End	4,400	
	Transcona South	5,600	
	Total for Cluster	**91,500**	**750 (est)**
District 4 **City Centre** 12 community centres	**Population 114,450**	**226,400**	**1,850 (est)**

Source: Community Centre Profiles and derivation from national averages on volunteerism.
** The population of these clusters has been adjusted to reflect Gateway's catchment area.*

NOTE: The volunteer hours have been provided by the individual community centres and not all centres monitor this information with the same degree of accuracy. The number of volunteers is a rough estimate based upon the fact that, on average, each volunteer in Canada commits 122 hours of their time. Given the range of potential error, these figures should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude only.

The community centre system city-wide is supported by approximately 1.9 volunteer hours per person. It is estimated that EKT, overall, is served by approximately 1,850 volunteers committing over 225,000 hours to the community centre system. With a population of 114,500, this amounts to an estimated 2.0 hours per person. As a result, the EKT District is on par with other areas of the city in terms of volunteer support.

In relation to population, the number of volunteer hours works out to be:

River East West:	2.5 hours per person
River East East:	1.5 hours per person
River East South:	0.7 hours per person
Transcona:	3.0 hours per person
East Kildonan Transcona District:	**2.0 hours per person**
City Average:	**1.9 hours per capita**

The pattern of volunteer support city-wide is one of higher support in the suburban areas compared to the inner city (approx 2.3 hours per person vs 1.5 hours per person). The EKT District reflects this same pattern. River East South, which is considered inner city, exhibits the challenges of maintaining volunteer support where social concerns are high. The volunteer support here is about half the city average for inner city areas. Overall, Morse Place in River East East has the lowest level of volunteer support with an estimated 1,000 hours.

Meanwhile, Transcona has stronger volunteer support at 3.0 hours per person committed to the community centre system. Transcona has always maintained a strong individual identify and this may be a reflection of its internal pride and commitment. Within the cluster, Park City West and Oxford Heights dominate. Together they represent 90% of the volunteer hours committed to the cluster.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE STAFF

Cluster	Facility Name	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Green Team, etc	Seasonal
River East West 3 community centres population 24,565	Bronx Park	1	-	4	-	-
	Melrose Park	-	1	-	1	2
	North Kildonan	1	3	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**2**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**2**
River East East 3 community centres population 39,530	Gateway	8	8	-	-	6
	Valley Gardens	1	3	4	-	1
	Morse Place	1	-	-	1	-
	Total for Cluster	**10**	**11**	**4**	**1**	**7**
River East South 2 community centres population 17,050	Chalmers	3	2	-	2	-
	East Elmwood	-	-	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**3**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**
Transcona 4 community centres population 30,650	Park City West	1	2	-	1	-
	Oxford Heights	2	-	-	-	-
	East End	2	10	5	1	2
	Transcona South	-	6	-	1	-
	Total for Cluster	**5**	**18**	**5**	**3**	**2**
District 4 City Centre 12 community centres	**Population 114,450**	**20**	**35**	**13**	**7**	**11**

Source: Community Centre Profiles.

As shown in **Table 5**, the EKT District overall is operated with the services of 20 full-time staff and another 66 part-time, casual, seasonal, and green team members. River East East and Transcona clusters have the highest numbers and broadest base of staffing, particularly when looking solely at full-time and part-time positions with 21 and 23 respectively. This is largely due to the presence of Gateway in the former and East End in the latter, with each centre operating 2 indoor rinks (and indoor soccer in the case of Gateway). They alone account for 28 of those 44 positions.

A high number of staff eases the pressure off volunteers, allowing them to be more productive, and helps facilitate the delivery of a large variety of programming options. With no staff support at all, East Elmwood relies entirely on its volunteer support in an area where volunteerism is low yet the need for programming is high. Melrose Park is not much different with but one part-time staff and some modest seasonal and Green Team support.

Main Points

- *The District overall has a considerable variance in the amount of volunteer support it enjoys ranging from an estimated low of 0.7 hours per person in River East South to an estimated high of 3.0 hours per person in Transcona yet River East South is a high needs area where support is most needed..*
- *East Elmwood stands out with no staff, supported by a very small core of volunteers.*
- *From a full-time and part-time staffing perspective, Gateway and East End clearly dominate the District. This is consistent with the centres operating two indoor rinks each (together with indoor soccer in the case of Gateway) though not as consistent with the level of programming identified in the previous section for East End.*

6. Overview of Current Facilities

In 2004, a comprehensive study of recreation facilities in Winnipeg evaluated each of the City's recreation facilities in terms of their overall condition using what was called a Facility Condition Index or FCI. The FCI represented the amount of money it would have taken to get the facility to an average level of upkeep. This amount was provided in relation to the replacement cost of the facility so the lower the number the better. An FCI of .50, then, meant that an investment of 50% of the replacement cost of the facility was needed at that time to get the facility into respectable condition. If that investment had been made, then an ongoing average maintenance program would have been able to keep it in that condition.

Table 6 shows the FCI rating for the EKT District's facilities. It also translates the FCI into a dollar figure identified as the preservation need (as of 2004). The FCI of 0.26 indicates that the District's community centres overall are in somewhat better shape in relation to the city average of 0.34 for community centres and 0.32 when the city-run recreation facilities are included. As of 2004, the preservation funds needed were identified at more than $8 M. Such an investment at that time would have brought the facilities up to reasonable condition.

Among the community centre facilities, several are quite high, near the 0.50 range, including Morse Place, East Elmwood, and Oxford Heights. However, one community centre stands out above that. The Transcona South Community Centre has the highest FCI at 0.72 but has recently undergone some renovations which would improve this rating.

With an average FCI of 0.44, the city-run facilities are in considerably greater state of disrepair than the community centres. The East Kildonan Senior Centre is the worst of the lot with an FCI close to 1, meaning it would likely be more economical to tear it down and rebuild than to repair it. Of the city-run facilities, the Transcona Seniors Centre, with an FCI of 0.33 requires the least amount of maintenance. This is testimony to the relatively poorer state of the city-run facilities.

Table 6: FACILITY CONDITION AND PRESERVATION NEEDS (as of 2004)

Facility Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	FCI	Preservation Needs ($)
River East West				
Community Centre	Bronx Park*	25,000	0.00	0
Community Centre	✦Melrose Park	12,928	0.32	575,000
Community Centre	North Kildonan	11,769	0.19	270,000
Recreation Centre	Good Neighbours Senior Centre*	0	0.00	0
	Total for Cluster	**49,697**	0.17	$845,000
River East East				
Community Centre	✦Gateway	15,417	0.09	265,000
Arena	Gateway Arena (2 rinks)	9,842	0.03	220,000
Indoor Soccer	Gateway Soccer Complex	10,043	-	-
Community Centre	Valley Gardens	10,172	0.29	369,000
Community Centre	Morse Place	9,597	0.50	576,000
	Total for Cluster	**55,071**	0.23	$1,430,000
River East South				
Satellite	Kelvin	2,237	-	-
Community Centre	Chalmers	14,950	0.16	300,000
Community Centre	East Elmwood	7,570	0.49	463,000
Recreation Centre	East Kildonan Senior Centre	6,345	0.95	760,000
Recreation Centre	Elmwood Winter Club	7,704	-	-
Recreation Centre	East End Cultural & Leisure Centre	6,268	0.43	340,000
	Total for Cluster	**45,074**	0.51	$1,863,000
Transcona				
Community Centre	✦Park City West	11,876	0.20	405,000
Community Centre	Oxford Heights	16,601	0.50	1,065,000
Community Centre	East End	9,780	0.12	215,000
Arena	East End Arena (2 rinks)	3,744	0.03	200,000
Community Centre	✦South Transcona	1,636	0.72	255,000
Recreation Centre	Arts Action Centre	3,076	0.56	216,000
Recreation Centre	Roland Michener Arena	11,150	0.42	1,500,000
Recreation Centre	Transcona Senior Centre	7,640	0.33	230,000
Recreation Centre	Transcona Scout Hall	2,500	0.42	152,000
Recreation Centre	Transcona Optimists	12,000	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**80,003**	0.37	$4,238,000
12 community centre facilities	District 4 Community Centre Facilities	180,696	Avg. 0.26	$5,178,000
9 city-run facilities	District 4 City-Run Facilities	56,683	Avg. 0.44	$3,198,000
Total: 25 facilities	**District 4 All Facilities**	**237,379**	**Avg. 0.32**	**$8,376,000**

Source: City of Winnipeg ** Changes to facilities were approved prior to the RLLF policy.*
✦ Facilities where improvements have been made since 2004 which could have an impact on the FCI rating.

NOTE: The assessment provided in Table 6 is now 4 years old and was based upon information that was a few years old at the time. Given that few major capital investments have been made in recent years, there is still merit in the assessment although it is likely that many of the facilities are in worse shape today. Furthermore, the costs would be significantly higher than those presented. The Table should be used simply as representing an order of magnitude of the investment needed and the relative need among centres and clusters. In some instances investment has taken place leading to an improved facility today. Those facilities have been flagged in Table 6.

Table 7 itemizes the amenities that can be found in the District's community centres. This list makes clear some of the pressures they face. Gateway, for example, is a large regional complex with a wide catchment area operating two arenas and an indoor soccer pitch, but it lacks additional amenities including a gym and games room which tends to direct its programming toward highly structured and elite sport. Generally speaking, however, the District has a fairly even distribution of amenities. However, among the three centres in River East East there is not a games room or a gymnasium, making it dependent on off-site access if programming is to be geared toward those types of facilities.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE AMENITIES

Facility Name	Board Room	Computer Rm / Office	Canteen	Kitchen	Nursery School Area	Games Room	Gym (cap)	Hall (cap)	MPR (cap)	Indoor Arena	Other
River East West											
Bronx Park*	1	9	2	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	Creative arts Home improvement
Melrose Park	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
North Kildonan	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	
Total for Cluster	**3**	**12**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**0**	
River East East											
Gateway	1	3	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	Indoor soccer 2 mtg rooms
Valley Gardens	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	
Morse Place	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Total for Cluster	**1**	**5**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**2**	
River East South											
Chalmers	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	
East Elmwood	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	
Total for Cluster	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	
Transcona											
Park City West	2	2	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	
Oxford Heights	-	1	2	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	
East End	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	2	
South Transcona	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	
Total for Cluster	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**2**	
Total for District	**10**	**24**	**13**	**13**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**9**	**7**	**4**	

Source: Community Centre Profiles
** These amenities reflect the new Bronx facility currently under construction.*

Shown in **Table 8** are the Space to Population Ratios (SPR), based on figures from 2005. This is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amount of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. This is a relative measure only.

With over 237,000 square feet of space for a population of nearly 115,000 people, District 4 has 2.08 square feet of recreation space per person, somewhat better than the city average of 1.88 square feet, a figure that includes both community centre space and city-run recreation facilities. Within the District, the area of greatest need is also the area with the most space. River East South has the highest SPR of the District at 3.09. This is more than double the space to population ratio of River East East which sits at 1.39.

Table 8: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS (SPR) as of 2005

Area	Population	CCs	Space (sq ft)	SPR	City-run Facilities	Space (sq ft)	SPR	Combined SPR
River East West	24,565*	3	49,697	2.02	0	0	0.00	**2.02**
River East East	39,530*	3	55,071	1.39	0	0	0.00	**1.39**
River East South	17,050	3**	32,291	1.89	3	20,317	1.19	**3.09**
Transcona	30,650	3	43,637	1.42	5	36,366	1.19	**2.61**
District 4: EKT	**114,450**	**12**	**180,696**	**1.58**	**8**	**56,683**	**0.50**	**2.08**
City	**647,600**	**71**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**31**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1.88**

Source: From Phase 1 report but modified to reflect the new Bronx Park facility.
** Population adjusted to reflect Gateway's catchment area.*
*** Includes Kelvin because this is as of 2005.*

The cluster with the least amount of space per capita is River East East, the only cluster with an SPR below the city average (1.39 versus 1.88). It is clear that city-run facilities in River East South and Transcona significantly augment the amount of recreation space available in these areas. The amount of city-run space in both of these clusters is triple the city average.

Main Points

- *Overall, facilities in District 4 are in about the same state of repair as the average for the city overall. Generally, this means that (as of 2004) about one third of their replacement value needed to be invested in maintenance to get them into reasonable condition. The District's community centres are in somewhat better condition than its city-run facilities.*
- *There is a reasonable distribution of amenities throughout the District although in River East East cluster there is no games room or gymnasium, making it dependent on off-site access if programming is to be geared toward those types of facilities.*

- *Relative to other areas of the city, the EKT District is relatively well served with more space per capita. Within the District, River East South, the highest needs area, has the most space per capita. River East East is the only cluster with less space than the city average.*

7. Current Issues and Concerns

The planning model used in this exercise is one that examines the inter-relationship among people, programs, and facilities with the underlying assumption that one must understand the needs of the people in order to develop relevant programs and, in turn, it is the nature of the programs that will dictate the types of facilities needed. Issues and concerns were identified in all three areas.

People

Volunteer recruitment and retention is the number one issue identified for the District. While the District overall is relatively consistent with the rest of the city, volunteerism is inconsistent throughout the District and remains an ongoing challenge. Recruiting volunteers in the future is expected to become increasing difficult particularly in light of changing demographics – an aging population with an increasing number of new Canadians. Furthermore, volunteer burnout is a contributing factor in the efforts to keep the community centre movement sustainable. It has been observed that administration duties have been increasing significantly, putting more stress on volunteers.

An additional challenge is recruiting and retaining full-time and seasonal workers for the centres. It is particularly challenging given the nature of the community centre operations and required skills.

Programs

Another major priority for the District is finding and sustaining funding for programs. It was noted that, at present, revenue received from soccer is used to subsidize the delivery of other programs and activities – not an ideal situation.

Another significant concern is the relationship between community centres and sport associations. It is felt that community centres should have stronger control over grass roots sports programs.

Furthermore, a better balance needs to be established between the provision of registered sport programs and other recreational opportunities.

How to program for an aging population is another concern that will need to be addressed. This includes both adults and seniors in consideration of a growing trend toward active living and social programming. The role of community centres versus other service providers will need to be sorted out to avoid duplication and optimize the use of resources.

There is a concern that not enough is being done to understand the programming needs of new Canadians and the Aboriginal community. Gaining an understanding of, and support from, both of these targeted populations would build a better base for future users as well as attract additional volunteers.

Facilities

There is a concern that existing facilities are inadequate to meet the programming needs of the community. Many of the centres do not have the type of space that is required to operate contemporary recreation programs. The biggest priority is to address the need for full-size gyms and sport fields. However, there is also a need for more contemporary facilities such as space for active living programs directed toward fitness programs for adults and seniors – walking, aerobics, weight training, etc.

While the facilities are aging and in need of repair, so too is the equipment. This is becoming a growing concern. Equipment such as tractors and ice surface machines that are in a state of disrepair present major stumbling blocks in providing appropriate maintenance and safe play surfaces. Deteriorating HVAC (heating, ventilation, air-conditioning) systems represent big-ticket repairs that community centres must contend with.

Vandalism is a significant concern as part of an overall need to address crime prevention. Naturally, vandalism and crime prevention programs are tied together and this issue needs to be addressed from an overall perspective, not just a facility perspective.

Main Points

- *Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is the highest priority for the District overall and one that may require inventive solutions given the changing face of the community (growing populations of seniors, immigrants, and aboriginals).*
- *Another major concern is the ability of centres to secure sustainable funding for the variety of programs they need to offer to meet the needs of the community (beyond registered sports).*
- *The needs of the community cannot be met with inadequate facilities and equipment. There is great concern about access to gyms and sport fields and the state of repair of maintenance and operations equipment.*

C. Needs Assessment

1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025

The Phase 1 Report outlined in some detail the anticipated growth over the next twenty years and the impact of this growth on the City's demographic make-up. In short, Winnipeg is expected to experience significant growth averaging approximately 1% per year after a period of near stagnation over the past decade.

Natural growth in population, that is, birth minus deaths, will account for very little of this growth. Rather, the bulk of the growth will be attributable to increases in net migration. It is anticipated that fewer people will leave Winnipeg for ex-urban areas, fewer people will leave the Province for other Provinces, and more international migrants will be coming to the Province, especially to Winnipeg. This latter point is the most significant and is the result of an aggressive campaign on the part of the provincial government to increase international immigration through its Nominee Program.

Table 9: ESTIMATED GROWTH to 2025 – ALL DISTRICTS				
	Est. Pop. 2005	Growth Allocation	Est. Pop. Increase	Est. Pop. 2025
District 1: City Centre	149,600	10%	13,650	163,250
District 2: Assiniboia	95,125	20%	27,800	122,925
District 3: Lord Selkirk W Kildonan	136,125	10%	13,150	149,275
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	10%	13,650	128,100
District 5: Riel	152,300	50%	69,250	221,550
Winnipeg	647,600	100%	137,500	785,100

Source: Derived from Stats Can and City of Winnipeg information

As shown in **Table 9**, the population of Winnipeg is expected to grow by 137,500 by 2025. Given the areas in the city where growth can be accommodated, it is expected that approximately 10% of the growth will occur in District 4. This translates into a potential increase of over 13,000 people.

While the population is expected to grow significantly, there will also be a shift in demographic make-up. In particular, the seniors population will increase considerably, especially the 'younger' seniors, aged 60-75. Where this group now comprises 17% of the population, that percentage will grow to 23% by the year 2025.

Additionally, the aboriginal population is expected to grow at a faster rate than the general population. While the city overall is expected to grow by 21% to the year 2025, the aboriginal population in itself could increase by over 60% if current growth rates hold true into the future. (See Phase 1 report for more detail.)

Main Points

- *Winnipeg is expected to grow by more than 20% to the year 2025, an increase in population of 137,500. It is possible that District 4 could increase in population by more than 13,000 over that period.*
- *The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.*

2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term

Significant growth is anticipated for the city and it is critical to understand where it likely to occur. **Map 5** identifies the potential areas of growth.

Growth is anticipated in the following areas:

1. Regent West – considerable development has already begun in this area with significantly more projected over the next few years; it is expected that an additional 7,000 residents could be accommodated in the areas of Harbourview and Transcona West.
2. Canterbury Park – there is a considerable amount of further development that could take place in Canterbury Park which could result in over 1,500 new residents.

3. South Transcona – this area has considerable infrastructure challenges but pressure for increased residential development could make it feasible in the long run with the potential to add another 2,500 to the mix.
4. Inner City Intensification – it is anticipated that policies promoting residential intensification could result in additional infill development and higher density redevelopment of existing properties, particularly in areas closer to the downtown where a pattern of redevelopment and intensification has started to emerge.

While there are many factors that could influence the timing of these developments, they are, generally speaking, reasonably likely to occur over the twenty year period anticipated in this plan. Should these proposed developments come to fruition, they would account for an increase in population of approximately 13,000 people.

Map 5: ANTICIPATED GROWTH AREAS FOR THE DISTRICT



Main Points

- *The EKT District needs to plan for substantial growth over the next twenty years, in the range of 13,000-14,000 people.*
- *Regent West and Canterbury Park will be the primary growth areas in the near term with the possibility of development in South Transcona in the longer term.*

- *While the population will grow, it will also change with an increase in seniors, new immigrants, and aboriginals.*

3. Assessing Future Needs

In light of current issues facing the community centre system in District 4 and in order to be well positioned to address forecasted population growth and anticipated changes in demographics, a number of needs have been identified which should be addressed over the coming years.

Programming for the whole community

All members of the community should feel that the community centre offers something for them. There is a need to ensure a broad range of programs, including more non-sport programming for children and youth and programs that provide fitness, leisure, and socializing opportunities for adults and seniors. Furthermore, there is a need to understand the changing nature of the community – to recognize and respond to a growing aboriginal population and an increase in new immigrants.

Building partnerships and fostering collaboration

To address the complex needs of the community it will be increasingly necessary to look beyond individual community centres. Collaborating with other community centres and/or building partnerships with other service providers will help identify gaps to avoid duplication of effort while ensuring that the needs of the community are met.

Sustaining a volunteer base and staff resources

Volunteerism varies throughout the District. Recruitment efforts need to be enhanced in some areas to ensure an ongoing commitment to volunteerism by all members of the community including adults, seniors, youth, and minority groups. As well, there will be continued pressure to attract and retain qualified staff where particular expertise is needed such as general managers, program developers, ice-makers, etc. There is a need to ensure that staff are current with workplace requirements (benefits, training, etc.)

Addressing the need for resources

There is a need to develop and sustain ongoing sources of revenue to support a broad based approach to programming and to keep programs affordable. As well, there is a need to apply additional resources to facility maintenance and operations given the relatively poor condition of facilities and equipment in the District.

Developing more suitable facilities

There is a need to develop more flexible, multi-purpose space to meet the changing needs of the community while ensuring that existing facilities can meet the program requirements. Access to full-size gyms, sport fields for children and youth and wellness and active living (fitness) facilities for adults and seniors are priorities.

Strengthening governance

The role of community centres continues to evolve. It will be important to clearly establish goals and expectations and to ensure continuity as boards change over time.

Furthermore, with a large number of city-run facilities in some areas, governance of recreation facilities in the District should be addressed collaboratively with the City. Alternative forms of governance may need to be explored where a viable community centre (in terms of use and participation) in a high-need area has difficulty maintaining a volunteer board.

Addressing the need for improved communications

There is a need to ensure strong communication efforts both internally and externally. Internally includes the need for enhanced communication among centres and between individual centres and the GCWCC if collaborative partnerships are to be developed. Externally includes enhancing communications between centres and the community and between centres and the City to inform, educate, and build ongoing support.

Main Points

- *It will be important in the future to introduce programs for the whole community, programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community, particularly in terms of a growing aboriginal community and new immigrants.*
- *Having adequate resources is a prime driver for change, in terms of volunteers, staff, and funds for ongoing operations, maintenance, and program development.*
- *Areas that will need to be addressed include the development of more suitable facilities, improved governance practices, and stronger communications. Partnerships and collaboration will guide future efforts.*

D. Moving Forward

1. Defining Success

The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base and high maintenance needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by other service providers. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple amenities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the specialized services they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

In the case of all the above models, the District Planning Committee agrees that a successful community centre is one that provides relevant programming for all age groups, in a well-maintained, multi-functional space that is open to the public both day and evening.

Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.
- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.
- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

Defining Success

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community.

A successful community centre is deemed to have the following characteristics.

- The community centre is a focal point of the community.
- The community centre makes an important contribution to the quality of life of a neighbourhood or community.
- The community centre serves the immediate population of the neighbourhood.
- The community centre relies on, and benefits from, dedicated volunteers and staff.
- The community centre offer diverse programming and provides a good balance of sport and non-sport programs.
- The community centre has well-maintained facilities.
- The community centre builds partnerships that enhance the pursuit of its mandate.

Main Points

- *The community centre model of the future must consider and respond to community needs at the local level, the neighbourhood level, and the district level.*

- *The community centre model of the future must reflect the guiding principles upon which the system was founded and must strive to achieve success as defined by the community.*

2. Planning Limitations

Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. To accommodate the projected growth, 258,000 square feet of additional space can be planned for city-wide.

However, there are current imbalances in the system with some areas of the city having a higher SPR than others. The primary directive imposed in this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close as possible to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time. This is the direction established by the GCWCC Board.

Given that District 4 currently has an SPR greater than the city average, it has been granted a modest limitation in its ability to add new space into the system in spite of the projected population growth for the District. **Table 10** shows the amount of space allocated to each district for planning purposes.

It has been calculated that District 4 could add 10,500 square feet of additional space... Should the population increase in the District by 13,650 people as projected, the District's SPR would drop from its current level of 2.08 to 1.88, the city average. The challenge for the District is to redistribute its existing space over time to accommodate the anticipated growth while adding no more than 10,500 square feet of additional space.

Table 10: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR TO 2025 BY DISTRICT

	Combined Space Allocation	Resulting SPR	Community Centre Component	City-Run Space Component
District 1: City Centre	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	258,000 sq ft	**1.88**	206,000 sq ft	52,000 sq ft

Main Points

- *It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space.*
- *Respecting the GCWCC's goal, plans for District 4 must accommodate a potential increase in population of 13,650 people to the year 2025 while adding but 10,500 sq ft of additional space into the system over time.*

- *The 10,500 sq ft of new space includes a potential 8,500 of community centre space together with a potential 2,000 sq ft of city-managed space. This can, and should, be discussed and negotiated with the City of Winnipeg because the critical point as determined by the policy is the total amount of space, not who governs its use.*

3. Planning Strategies

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the needs of the District identified earlier.

Need: To program for the whole community

Strategies:

- Demographic Monitoring: It will be necessary to keep track of changing neighbourhood demographics (increasing seniors, immigrants, aboriginals, etc.) in order to anticipate programming needs. The City's Community Resource Coordinators can provide assistance in this regard while providing insight into the role of other service providers.
- Youth Programming: New non-sport or casual, drop-in sport programs need to be developed to balance the emphasis on organized, registered sports. Priority areas are those with high numbers of at-risk youth.
- Seniors Programming: In many centres it may be possible to accommodate more seniors programming during the day to enhance facility utilization while meeting the needs of a target group.
- Parent and Child Programming: It may be possible to offer more opportunities for participation by parents with young children during morning or afternoon hours.
- Adult Programming: Fitness programs and social events could be developed to meet the needs of parents (including single parents) and other adults.
- Family Nights: Family Nights would encourage all members within a family to attend, offering something for all ages and promoting the sense of ownership and belonging.
- New Immigrants: With a growing number of new immigrants, it will be important to understand their needs. Research and consultation will be necessary (with help from the City). Needs may vary over time and programs will have to be responsive.
- New Sports: It may be necessary to introduce new sports that are in sync with the emerging interests of youth and that align as well with the cultures represented by new immigrants.

Need: To build partnerships and foster collaboration

Strategies:

- Internal Collaboration: CCB meetings can be reconfigured to encourage greater collaboration among centres including information sharing to help resolve common

issues. Within a cluster, occasionally attending each others board meetings can provide insight and build relationships among presidents.

- City of Winnipeg: The City offers Free Play programs and Youth Access (drop-in) programs where they provide the staff and the community centre provides the space. Centres can explore this partnership opportunity.
- Networks: The Community Resource Coordinators can assist in getting the community centre engaged with local service provider networks. Community network associations can be invited to meet at community centres in order to increase awareness of each other's roles (though many networks meet during the day).
- Outreach: Community centres could reach out to community agencies and create new partnerships in terms of offering programs. Consideration should be given to partnering with daycares, churches, schools, senior centres, and senior housing developments. City staff (Community Resource Coordinators) are well connected and can assist with networking. Network representatives can be invited to attend CCB meetings (recognizing that network groups tend to meet during daytime hours).
- Sport Associations: Programming for children and youth must be sustained in the development of a clarified role with Sport Associations which can be pursued through the existing GCWCC Sports Committee.
- Cluster Programming: Community centres can enhance their effectiveness by collaborating at a cluster level in the delivery of programs. Having each centre take 'ownership' of a given sport is an example that is currently being applied in some areas.
- School Divisions: Access to full-size gyms is an ongoing concern. It would appear that there is little opportunity to increase access to school gyms but ongoing discussions with the school divisions is necessary to maximize opportunities that may arise.

Need: To sustain a volunteer base and staff resources

Strategies:

- Resident Associations: Partnering with local resident associations may be one way of getting assistance for recruiting new volunteers and for getting input on program development.
- Volunteer Training and Benefits: To encourage ongoing commitment from volunteers, a support structure could be established to ensure that volunteers in key positions have access to the training they require and that legal liability and workplace health requirements are addressed. Coordinating training dates and benefits packages among centres could be of help (The GCWCC could explore employee benefits packages with the Chamber of Commerce.).
- Volunteer Support: Standardized job descriptions for both volunteer and staff would be helpful as well as a calendar of key dates for scheduling purposes. To encourage volunteer participation, daycare/babysitting services could be provided. A

'mentorship' program could link current and former volunteers to assist in the transfer of knowledge.

- Youth Recruitment: Volunteer recruitment from the youth sector can help sustain the community centre movement into the future and could be pursued through a mentorship program and by working with School Division officials to take advantage of the school credit program for volunteerism. Many community centres are adjacent to schools which facilitates the implementation of this strategy.
- Senior Recruitment: Accessing the seniors population through existing community organizations such as Good Neighbours Seniors Centre could be a viable volunteer recruitment strategy to have seniors assist with program delivery or with sitting on the Board. Another option is to seek volunteer support among grandparents of youth program participants. Providing programming for both adults and older adults enhances the sense of belonging which improves chances of volunteering.

Need: To address the need for resources

Strategies:

- Shared Staff: Funding challenges can sometimes be overcome by working together and sharing resources. Creating full-time positions to serve a number of centres may be an option. Partnering with other service providers and taking advantage of their staff is another option. In particular, it may be necessary to solicit greater staff support form the City in high needs areas.
- Maintenance: Efficiencies can be gained through the use of qualified staff, concise job descriptions, a maintenance regimen, and a targeted maintenance budget that can be coordinated among centres and with the GCWCC.
- Buying Power: Collectively, community centres have significant purchasing power which can help reduce costs for goods and services. A district-wide purchasing strategy can be developed.
- New Program Funds: Funding solicitation may need to be program specific in a way that aligns with political priorities. Grants or sponsorships are available for the development of new, innovative programs that address the needs of specific target groups such as at-risk youth, new immigrants, seniors, etc. Staff could aid in identifying and applying for funding opportunities.

Need: To develop more suitable facilities

Strategies:

- Full-size Gym Space: Full-size gyms are important because full-size gyms can be used in a variety of ways, sport and non-sport. With limited access to high school gyms it may be necessary to build new full-size gyms at key community centre locations.
- Sport Fields: Consideration needs to be given to ensuring access to outdoor fields that can accommodate existing sports together with new emerging sport and

recreation activities (without increasing overall costs). This can begin by adding outdoor amenities such as beach volleyball, basketball, etc.

- Priority Upgrades: The emphasis in this District may not be on the introduction of additional facilities but rather on enhancing and expanding the quality of existing space to create more usable, flexible spaces.
- Wellness and Active Living: The trend toward wellness and active living (adult and family oriented fitness activities) can be supported through the conversion of spaces to meet these needs.
- Utilization Plans: Cluster-wide utilization plans can be developed to promote the optimum utilization of space, matching users to time of day and appropriate space. The plans should include the exploration of alternative uses for traditionally single use facilities such as arenas.

Need: To strengthen governance

Strategies:

- Role Definition: It is important to recognize that not every community centre can meet every need. Role differentiation will be the key. For example, local centres might concentrate on drop-in and leisure activities while the larger centres could offer the traditional sports.
- Governance Sharing: With a large mix of community centres and city-run facilities in parts of the District, a strong collaborative relationship needs to be forged with the City. Who governs and runs a particular facility is less important than ensuring the needs of the community are met. A staff-run model may also be appropriate in some instances.
- Continuity: With the rapid pace of change, Board continuity becomes an important factor Governance reviews may be required to ensure such things as proper orientation of new Board members, overlapping terms of office, alignment with long term plans, etc.

Need: To improve communications

Strategies:

- Promotion: Sustaining volunteers at a Board level and general operational program leadership level can be pursued through an intense promotion of the benefits of community centres to the general population in order to enhance awareness of the role of community centres, the fact that they are volunteer-run, and the importance of providing volunteer support. A District-wide strategy could be developed.
- Web Sites: The GCWCC web site has been updated and contains a significant amount of information although centres may not be aware that it is available. As well, shared web sites among centres could aid in communications to the community.

4. Past and Current Project Proposals

Synopsis

District 4 is a community split geographically east and west into two large areas: the East Kildonan (River East) community and the Transcona community. These communities have been largely independent from one another. But times may be changing. New residential developments underway and proposed in the Regent West area will help bridge the two, creating some continuity of development and presenting the opportunity for collaborative efforts in planning the future of the western part of Transcona with the eastern part of East Kildonan (River East East).

Across the District, there are different demographic characteristics at work as well. In this case the split is more one of north/south as opposed to east/west. The southern portion of the District (River East South) includes a series of older neighbourhoods that tend to exhibit some inner city characteristics with declining household size, a greater percentage of seniors, and more low income households. The remaining parts of the District (the northern portion of East Kildonan and Transcona) contain the bulk of the District's population and exhibit a strongly working class profile with stable households, more children, and moderate education and income.

The District is relatively well served with the amount of recreation space and facilities tend to be reasonably well distributed. The higher needs area of River East South has a higher proportion of space and the area that has experienced the most growth over recent years, River East East, has lagged in space relative to the other areas. Planning for growth and change to the year 2025 can result in no more than 10,500 sq ft of additional square footage. As a result, rationalization of existing space, including possible mergers and closures of community centres and/or City-owned facilities, must be considered.

Project Proposals

The 2006 GCWCC report entitled "Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement" identified a number of proposals as candidates for funding. The Bronx Park Community Centre redevelopment was approved and is currently under construction. Other proposals have been reintroduced as development scenarios in Plan 2025.

Bronx Park Project Update

Bronx Park Community Centre and Good Neighbours Senior Centre are partnering in a new 25,000 sq ft community centre, currently under construction at the original Bronx Park Community Centre site. The new facility includes a regulation size gym, computer lab, games room, creative arts lab, and wood shop.

Also, since 2005, there has been one community centre closure in District 4.

Kelvin Closure

Kelvin Community Centre has been declared surplus and has since been closed and demolished. The fields and a field house remain and are governed by Bronx Park. The

portion of the site fronting onto Henderson may be sold with the proceeds directed toward the Community Centre Investment Fund.

5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios

Map 6 identifies a number of possible scenarios that could be pursued. These scenarios are intended to provide options that would assist in meeting the District's needs.

NOTE:
The following scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation. They are not in priority order.

NOTE: Not all centres are, or need be, included in the scenarios. It was contemplated that those centres not specifically identified for possible change would carry on as status quo. However, these centres may still be involved in collaborative programming and governance reviews. Also, for the purpose of developing these planning scenarios, River East East and River East West were combined into a cluster called River East North (see Map 6).

Scenario 1: Relocate Valley Gardens and Explore Amalgamation with Morse Place

What: a) Have Valley Gardens Community Centre relocate to the Terry Sawchuk arena site, adding on a community centre component to the facility and taking over management of the arena. (This proposal was initially brought forward through the 2006 "Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement" report.) This Scenario could unfold on its own. However, there is merit in exploring an additional dimension as follows.

b) Explore amalgamating Morse Place with Valley Gardens, retaining the sport fields and a field house at the Morse Place site.

Why: a) Valley Gardens Community Centre requires a more suitable set of facilities as its current site (Joint Use Facility – Valley Gardens School) can no longer support the broad range of programming required. There has been considerable growth in the area over the past few decades, to the point where the current facility is unable to meet local needs. The Day Care operation dominates the current facility which then compromises and complicates the use of the existing main hall facility. Connecting with the Terry Sawchuk arena could help address the concerns.

b) Morse Place faces challenges of limited programming and low levels of volunteerism but has excellent grounds. As a result it tends to provide mainly outdoor programming. Amalgamating with Valley Gardens could allow for a more substantial redevelopment project, providing an enhanced facility for this cluster area.

How: a) Given the location of Terry Sawchuk Arena which is adjacent to Valley Gardens CC (shared by athletic fields), there is the distinct potential to have the Valley Gardens CC merge with the arena. This would allow for potential facility development that would meet the current and future needs of the River East cluster areas. The new facility would be more sustainable given the range of program opportunities.

b) Morse Place could consider the closure of its facility, replacing it with a new field house. The merged community centres could operate from a redeveloped Terry Sawchuk site, while running the Morse Place site as a satellite.

Scenario 2: Explore Amalgamation of Chalmers CC and East Kildonan Seniors Centre

What: Explore the amalgamation of the Chalmers Community Centre and the East Kildonan Senior Centre currently occupying a city-leased facility.

Why: There is capacity at Chalmers to accommodate additional programming, primarily during day-time hours. The amalgamation would make better use of existing space while freeing up recreational space that could be used elsewhere in the District.

How: Discussions would need to take place between the two centres to explore the possibility of closing the City-leased facility while transferring its programming to Chalmers.

Scenario 3: Park City West Community Centre Expansion

What: Expand Park City West Community Centre to accommodate an indoor arena and an Active Living Centre. (This proposal was initially brought forward through the 2006 “Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement” report.)

Why: Park City West CC requires a major expansion to satisfy the current population requirement and meet the program requirements of their neighbourhood. Furthermore, the largest portion of anticipated growth for the District will occur immediately to the west and north-west of the centre. This scenario would allow for the development of an Active Living Centre with increased adult and seniors programming as well as general multi-use space for recreation/sport programming. With the possible closure or conversion of Roland Michener Arena into an alternative use, the Transcona area would lose an ice surface. This proposal would ensure that the community continues to be served with three ice surfaces while substituting an arena that is nearing the end of its life cycle with a new facility better capable of meeting community needs including non-ice programming during summer months (lacrosse, roller-hockey, etc.).

How: The expansion would be enabled through the allocation of a portion of the growth space, perhaps with additional space made available through mergers. The City could consider decommissioning the Roland Michener Arena upon completion of the new Park City arena. Pre-design drawings have been prepared and community consultation has been undertaken.



Map 6 - District 4: East Kildonan - Transcona
Proposed Development Scenarios

Legend

- Community Centres
- Recreation Facilities
- Increase in Facility Size
- Decrease in Facility Size
- Facility Closure
- Proposed Grouping of Facilities
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

February 27, 2009

Scenario 4: Oxford Heights Community Centre Expansion

What: Expand the Oxford Heights CC to accommodate the conversion of its current gym to a full-size gym.

Why: Access to full-size gym space is at a premium in the Transcona area. Because Oxford Heights currently has a small gym, only a modest expansion would be needed to convert its current gym into a full-size gym capable of serving the broader community. This minimizes the allocation of additional square footage.

How: The feasibility of expansion would need to be tested and the additional space would need to be rationalized within the RLLF policy.

Scenario 5: East End Community Centre Expansion

What: Expand the East End CC consistent with the second phase of their development plan, including the addition of two floors adjoining their Rink 1 surface to accommodate dressing rooms, canteen, washrooms, skate shop, a meeting room, youth drop-in, weight room, and fitness area together with the expansion of their storage facility.

Why: With two indoor rinks, the East End CC accommodates sport teams from well beyond its catchment area and beyond the District. Furthermore, it is anticipated that Canterbury Park, immediately to the east of the centre, will continue to grow, adding population to the catchment area. This expansion would alleviate a number of current concerns with the facility.

How: Plans have been developed. The additional space would need to be rationalized within the RLLF policy.

Scenario 6: South Transcona Community Centre Expansion

What: Expand the South Transcona CC.

Why: Should residential development occur in the South Transcona area, the existing community centre would require an addition for multi-purpose and gym space. This would allow for enhanced programming for children and youth along with family activities. This particular neighbourhood is isolated due to major transportation systems and there are no other facilities available for programming purposes. However, given the small catchment population currently served, a substantial increase in population would be necessary to trigger an expansion.

How: This would be accommodated through the allocation of all or a portion of the space identified for population growth. It is recognized that this scenario would likely apply only toward the tail end of this planning time frame in response to population growth.

6. Moving Forward on Scenarios

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District

toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested. This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres. This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (eg. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

Reviewing Boundaries

When any of the scenarios becomes a real project, it may be necessary for the GCWCC to undertake a boundary review in light of the changes to facilities (closures, mergers, expansions) or in response to population growth and the addition of a new facility.

7. Addressing Overall Priorities

Priority No. 1: Enhance volunteer and staff recruitment and retention

Although Transcona has significant volunteer support, the District has less than the city average. Efforts could focus on inventive recruitment, seeking to attract non-traditional volunteers such as youth and seniors and forging alliances with resident associations. Overall, it would be beneficial for the GCWCC to offer "How to Recruit a Volunteer" seminars and to offer 'job descriptions' and proper training. However, greater promotion and communication may be the single most effective option. The key is to inform local residents about the vital role that community centres play and the need to sustain operations through volunteer support.

As well, greater involvement by the City in program development would ease the burden placed on volunteers as would the pursuit of shared staff to assist with programming needs. Staff sharing among centres and between centres and other service providers will need to be explored. It is possible that the development of newer more contemporary facilities could facilitate volunteer and staff recruitment as could a boundary review.

Priority No.2: Secure sustainable program funding

This priority was identified partly in response to the fact that registration fees for soccer are currently used to subsidize other programs. There is a desire to provide a broader range of programs but, to the greatest degree possible, funding for these programs should be self-sufficient. Efforts can focus on enhanced fundraising that is coordinated either at the cluster level or District level. Foundations, corporations, and governments can be targeted to support the development and delivery of new programs that are aligned with their mandates.

Resources can also be secured for program development and delivery through savings elsewhere. This can occur through greater cooperation between centres and between

centres and the GCWCC in areas such as staff sharing, bulk purchasing, and enhanced maintenance programs.

Priority No. 3: Enhance facilities and fields

While it is recognized that facilities and fields, generally, are in need of repair and enhancement, one of the single most critical areas of concern is the lack of full-size gyms. With the closure of some schools over the years, access to school gyms has become increasingly difficult to the point of impossibility. Most of the development scenarios outlined in the previous section address the need for enhanced facilities to one degree or another. Scenario 4 would directly address the need for adding full-size gym space.

APPENDIX

Summary of Other Service Providers

District Wide Providers:

- City of Winnipeg – Community Services Department
- River East Transcona School Division – Continuing Education Department – for all age groups plus after school programs
- Winnipeg School Division – Community Support Workers – ESL Program – Teen Moms
- YMCA – children, youth and family programs
- Winnipeg Regional Health Authority – Healthy Child Program; Parenting Programs
- Youth For Christ – children & youth programs
- Scouts programs
- Phoenix Soccer Programs
- Kildonan Tennis Programs
- Rossmere Golf and Curling Club
- ECRCC- literacy programs
- COW Police Services – Cadet Program

River East – West:

- YMCA – EK "Y" – comprehensive programming – aquatic and so forth
- Church Groups – NK Boys Club; Pioneer Girls
- Kildonan Tennis Club
- Rossmere Golf & Curling Club
- Chief Peguis Fitness Centre
- Good Neighbours Seniors Centre
- Knowles Centre – Recreation Programs; Aboriginal Learnings; Sweatlodge; and Drumming

River East – East:

- East End Culture and Leisure Centre
- Elmwood Seniors Group – Popular Seniors Centre

River East South:

Transcona:

- Transcona Senior Centre
- Whittier Seniors Club

URBANEDGE
consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 2

RIEL DISTRICT PLAN



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

FINAL - MARCH 10, 2009

GCWCC Plan 2025

OVERVIEW AND DIRECTION

Contents

Executive Summary **4**

A. Direction and Parameters **7**
1. Plan 2025 7
2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy 7
3. The Starting Point 7
4. The Planning Model 8
5. People Overview 8
6. Programs Overview 8
7. Facilities Overview 9
8. The Vision 9
9. District Plans 9

B. Current Situation **10**
1. Riel District and Neighbourhood Clusters 10
2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities 14
3. Demographic Make-up 16
4. Overview of Current Programs 18
5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers 20
6. Overview of Current Facilities 22
7. Current Issues and Concerns 25

C. Needs Assessment **28**
1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025 28
2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term 29
3. Assessing Future Needs 31

D. Moving Forward **33**
1. Defining Success 33
2. Planning Limitations 35
3. Planning Strategies 36
4. Past and Current Project Proposals 40
5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios 43
6. Moving Forward on the Scenarios 45
7. Addressing Overall Priorities 46

Appendix **47**

List of Maps

Map 1: District and Cluster Boundaries 10
Map 2: Community Centres 11
Map 3: City-Managed Facilities 12
Map 4: Combined Community Centres and City-Managed Facilities 13
Map 5: Growth Areas for the District 30
Map 6: Potential Development Scenarios to 2025 44

List of Tables

Table 1: All Recreation and Leisure Facilities (as of 2005) 14
Table 2: Demographic Overview 2001 and 2006 16
Table 3: Summary of Community Centre Programs 19
Table 4: Summary of Community Centre Volunteers 20
Table 5: Summary of Community Centre Staff 21
Table 6: Facility Condition and Preservation Needs (as of 2004) 23
Table 7: Summary of Community Centre Amenities 24
Table 8: Space to Population Ratios 25
Table 9: Estimated Growth to 2025 – All Districts 28
Table 10: Amount of Space to Plan For to 2025 by District 36

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

This Plan was developed under the guidance of a Planning Committee established by the Community Centre Board for District 5 Riel.

KGM Consultants Inc. and Marian Leech Planning and GIS Specialist were sub-consultants.

GCWCC Plan 2025
RIEL DISTRICT PLAN

Executive Summary

Current Recreation Space

The Riel District is served by 15 community centres, including six indoor arenas. One of these centres also runs a satellite facility. In total, there are 22 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. As well, there is 1 city governed facility that provides complementary services in the District.

In total, there is 260,000 sq ft of recreation space to serve a population of 152,000, or 1.71 sq ft per person. With the city average being 1.88 sq ft of recreation space per person, the Riel District overall has access to less space than other areas of the city.

Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of St. Boniface West have access to considerably more space than do residents elsewhere in the District. St. Boniface East, where much of the City's growth has been concentrated over recent years, is the least well served, by a considerable margin, relative to other areas of the District.

Demographics

Generally, the District provides a good cross-section of the city with about average numbers of children and seniors, average unemployment and income. However, it has fewer aboriginals and immigrants than the rest of the city and has higher education.

Within the District, the St. Boniface West and St. Vital North areas are somewhat different than the suburban areas, showing a population loss over recent years, lower household income, and smaller household size.

Programs

The District overall appears to be well programmed in terms of hours of offerings relative to the rest of the city. Only one area, Fort Garry South, at 0.28 hours per person, is below the city average of 0.33. At 0.57, St. Vital South is considerably above the average.

The District appears to provide a wide range of programs, including a significant amount of special programs, but its main emphasis (similar to other areas of the city) tends to be on the provision of sport programs directed toward children and youth.

Winakwa and Southdale provide the most program hours and place considerable emphasis on pre-school programs. St. Boniface West and St. Vital North have above average number of seniors, but this is not strongly reflected in programs offered to that age group (although the City-governed Club Eclipse '79 is located in St. Boniface West).

Staff and Volunteers

While the District overall is well served by volunteers with a stronger volunteer base than the rest of the city, there are significant discrepancies within the District. St. Vital North

and South, for example, have 50% greater volunteer support per capita than Fort Garry South. One reason may be that Fort Garry South is relatively better served with staff. Also, from a staffing perspective, Dakota is a dominant centre with 44 full and part time staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest number of program hours.

Facilities

Relative to other areas of the city, St. Boniface West has considerably more recreation space per capita while St. Boniface East has a lot less (less than half the city average).

All centres have a small range of amenities including access to a few different programmable spaces within their facility, however, some shortages stand out that may need to be addressed. A lack of gyms in Fort Garry South is one example.

Overall, facilities in District 5 are in a considerably better state of repair than the city average. No single facility is in a terrible state of repair.

Primary Issues and Concerns

The biggest concern, and highest priority for the District overall, is the challenge of developing facilities to meet the current and future needs of the community. In doing this, the role and use of satellite facilities may need to be reconsidered. A new incremental model of governance may be appropriate to address new, emerging neighbourhoods.

Programming will need to evolve over time to meet the needs and pressures of a growing population together with the changing demographic make-up of the community (new Canadians, visible minorities, seniors). As well, recruitment and retention of volunteers in leadership positions and arena staff is a high priority for the District.

For any change to be successful, it is critical that all centres work together to establish a common understanding and direction and to communicate that effectively.

Growth and Its Impact

It is possible that District 5 could increase in population by nearly 70,000 to the year 2025. The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.

In the nearer term the growth areas will be in the southern part of St. Boniface East (Royalwood, Sage Creek, and Southland Park) together with Waverley West in Fort Garry South. Longer term, it is likely that development will be directed south of the perimeter into South St. Vital. The growth in St. Boniface East will put increased pressure on an area that already has the lowest amount of recreation space per population.

It will be important in the future to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community. While children and youth are the mainstay, adults and seniors need to be accommodated.

More contemporary and flexible facilities will be needed in the future to ensure that a diversity of programs can be offered. Single-use facilities may need to be converted. Community centres will need to work more collaboratively with each other and with other service providers in terms of program delivery, communications, and resource sharing.

Vision

The community centre model of the future should continue to have a combination of small local centres, mid-size neighbourhood centres, and large district centres. The vision for community centres is intended to help all three types of centres address the challenges many of them are facing.

It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space. Respecting this goal, plans for District 5 can add space to address current imbalances while also planning for a large increase in population to the year 2025. This translates into 125,000 sq ft of additional community centre space.

Development Scenarios

Already approved or under way*:*

Norberry/Glenlee Merger: Construction is currently underway on upgrades and expansion of the Norberry facility, to include a full-size gymnasium and a new multi-purpose room. Once complete, the Glenlee facility will be declared surplus.

Notre Dame Vestibule: Approval was given to adding a 1,400 sq ft vestibule connecting the community centre to the arena. This will begin once funding has been secured.

Winakwa Front Entrance: Approval was given for a 400 sq. ft front entrance. This will begin once funding has been secured.

Potential new developments*:*

Winakwa Expansion: This scenario would accommodate an expansion including a full-size gym, change rooms, second floor viewing area/hall, and new front entrance.

Radisson Healthy Living Centre: This scenario would see the development of a central site (possibly Maginot) into a district centre with 2 indoor arenas, 2 indoor soccer pitches, 2 gyms, a running track, medical space, commercial space, and support space.

Southdale Expansion: This scenario is to expand the facility by focusing primarily on two priorities, the need for a second arena and a full size gymnasium.

Dakota Expansion: This scenario is intended to expand the facility with the addition of an indoor arena and a multi-purpose gymnasium/fieldhouse.

Notre Dame and Club Eclipse '79 Merger: Given the recent renovation of the Notre Dame facility, the seniors programming could be accommodated within the centre without the need for additional expansion.

Close the Richmond Kings Ryerson Satellite Site: This scenario would result in the closure of the Ryerson satellite while relocating the outdoor rinks to the main site.

To consider as population grows:

New Facilities in Sage Creek, Waverley West, and South St. Vital

NOTE: The development scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they represent areas of exploration, suggestions of what could be pursued over the coming years should there be consensus through community consultation.

GCWCC Plan 2025

RIEL DISTRICT PLAN

A. Direction and Parameters

This section generally repeats the Executive Summary of the Plan 2025 Phase 1 report. For a more detailed explanation of the Direction and Parameters provided to this plan, refer to the report. It can be found on the GCWCC web site at www.gcwcc.mb.ca.

1. Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

2. The Recreation, Leisure and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

This restriction was adopted because it was recognized by the City of Winnipeg that the current system was unsustainable. The Public Use Facilities Study (PUFS) showed that many of the city's community centres were inadequate to deliver the types of programs required by the community. Furthermore, as of 2004, nearly $40 million for capital and maintenance was required to be invested over 10 years just to get the city's inventory of community centres into reasonable condition. (Those estimates would be considerably higher today.)

The RLLF policy translated the PUFS concerns into direction for facility development. The policy is intended to lead to a more contemporary set of facilities over time while ensuring a more sustainable system.

3. The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005. Therefore, 2005 serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of recreation space using the 'heated square footage' definition.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres, facilities which are very similar to community centres in terms of nature of programs delivered to the community. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of recreation space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

4. The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



5. People Overview

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 to the year 2025 which would result in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of just slightly over 1% per year, modest in terms of many of the country's large urban centres, but more than double the rate experienced in Winnipeg over the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, many of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, often with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's projected population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, specifically, 25.6 versus 39.2 as of 2005.
- Over 40% of the total projected increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500, will be in the age group of 60-74, which translates into 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50% of the projected 137,500 increase in population, followed by Districts 2 with 20% and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

6. Programs Overview

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. With this support, community centres provide over 1,100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging, from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listings and third party agreements.

7. Facilities Overview

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have gymnasiums, major athletic fields, change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. As these centres offer specialized services, they tend to serve a much larger population.

8. The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

9. District Plans

This District Plan contains:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC reflective of Phase One of Plan 2025.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, recreation programs offered, volunteer support provided, and community centre facilities.
- A summary of issues and concerns identified by community centre representatives.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- A series of strategies to address the needs over the long term.
- An overview of scenarios showing how changes could manifest themselves over time through possible expansions, mergers, closures, and the construction of new facilities.
- A short list of projects deemed to be of highest priority in meeting community needs.
- Selected strategies to address the most critical issues and concerns.
- An action plan to guide decision-making over the short term.

B. Current Situation

1. Riel District and Neighbourhood Clusters

The Riel District, or District 5, covers the south and south-east end of Winnipeg, including the entire area of the City east of the Red River south of Dugald Road together with the area west of the Red River south of Bishop Grandin Boulevard. The District is generally (but not exactly) aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political boundaries that make up the Riel Community Committee.

The reason for the differences is that the Community Centre District must consider appropriate catchment areas around each of its community centres to ensure residents are well served while the political boundaries have more to do with the even distribution of population by ward. Even so, efforts have been made to keep the community centre boundaries as consistent as possible with political boundaries.

For planning purposes the District has been split into five areas called neighbourhood clusters. These units are used because research information provided by the City of Winnipeg is available by neighbourhood cluster. The clusters include St. Boniface West, St. Boniface East, St. Vital North, St. Vital South, and Fort Garry South.

Map 1 shows the boundaries of the District in black outline together with the five neighbourhood clusters in various shades.



Map 1: District Boundaries and Cluster Areas



Map 2 - District 5: Riel
Community Centres - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- District 5 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 3 - District 5: Riel
Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 5 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008



Map 4 - District 5: Riel
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- District 5 - Community Centres Boundary
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

CC - Community Centre

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

September 1, 2008

2. Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Facilities

The previous **Maps 2, 3, and 4** show the distribution of Community Centres, the distribution of City-Managed Facilities, and the combined distribution of all facilities.

Table 1 provides the list of all facilities for the District by neighbourhood cluster as of 2005.

Table 1: ALLRECREATION AND LEISURE FACILITIES (as of 2005)

Cluster	Type	Facility Name	Heated Sq Ft
St. Boniface West 3 community centres 1 recreation centre Pop: 14,860	Community Centre	Notre Dame	6,740
	Arena	Notre Dame - Arena	6,756
	Community Centre	Norwood	12,394
	Community Centre	Champlain	11,572
		Total Community Centres	37,462
	Recreation Centre	Club Eclipse '79 (Senior Centre)	4,681
		Total City-Managed Facilities	4,681
		Total for Cluster	**42,143**
St. Boniface East 3 community centres 0 recreation centres Pop: 51,450	Community Centre	Archwood	11,316
	Community Centre	Winakwa	13,316
	Community Centre	Southdale	17,992
	Arena	Southdale - Arena	590
		Total Community Centres	43,214
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**43,214**
St. Vital North 4 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop: 26,330	Community Centre	Glenwood	10,507
	Arena	Glenwood - Arena	4,078
	Community Centre	Windsor	12,802
	Community Centre	Norberry	11,187
	Community Centre	Glenlee	14,261
		Total Community Centres	52,835
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**52,835**
St. Vital South 2 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop: 35,530	Community Centre	Greendell	17,892
	Community Centre	Dakota	31,001
	Arena	Dakota – Arena (2)	16,633
		Total Community Centres	65,526
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**65,526**
Fort Garry South 3 community centres 0 recreation centre Pop: 34,580	Community Centre	Waverley Heights	14,200
	Community Centre	Richmond Kings	11,549
	Satellite	Richmond Kings - Arena	4,060
	Arena	Richmond Kings - Ryerson	2,590
	Community Centre	St. Norbert	15,835
		St. Norbert - Arena	8,738
		Total Community Centres	56,972
		Total City-Managed Facilities	0
		Total for Cluster	**56,972**
District 5 Riel 15 community centres 1 recreation centres Pop: 152,300*	**22 cc facilities**	**District 5 Community Centre Sub-Total**	**256,009**
	1 city-run facility	**District 5 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total**	**4,681**
	23 facilities	**DISTRICT 5 TOTAL**	**260,690**

Source: GCWCC and City of Winnipeg

** The District population is different than the sum of each cluster because of an adjustment made based on the Census undercount as determined by Statistics Canada.*

NOTE: The list of city-run facilities was developed with input from the City of Winnipeg and includes those facilities that provide recreational programming that is relatively

consistent with what is provided by community centres. In this case, it is one facility, a senior centre. It does not include single sport facilities, aquatic facilities, or stand-alone arenas. The combined list represents all those facilities that are subject to the restriction imposed by the RLLF policy.

NOTE: Table 1 lists all facilities as of 2005, the starting point for this plan because it was the point in time when the RLLF policy was adopted. Since that time, Norberry and Glenlee have chosen to merge, the first merger under the RLLF policy. Throughout the remainder of this document the merged facility will be referenced.

As of 2005, the Riel District was served by 15 community centres with one of these centres running a satellite facility and six centres running indoor arenas (including one with two). In total, there were 22 facilities governed and managed through the community centre system. Since then, two facilities, Norberry and Glenlee have merged in to a single facility called Norberry-Glenlee.

Throughout the city residents are also served through a number of city-run facilities that, for all intents and purposes, are similar to community centres in the services they provide, but for historical reasons have evolved through into a system of split jurisdiction. To properly plan for the needs of the District, these city-run facilities need to be considered alongside the community centres. There is but one of these facilities in the District.

Table 1 shows the Riel District is served by approximately 260,000 sq ft of combined recreation space. As shown in the first column of the Table, the population as of 2006 is estimated to be 152,300 for the District with 14,860 in St. Boniface West, 51,450 in St. Boniface East, 26,330 in St. Vital North, 35,530 in St. Vital South, and 34,580 in Fort Garry South. This translates into a ratio of combined recreation space per person or Space to Population Ratio (SPR) as follows:

St. Boniface West:	2.84 square feet per person
St. Boniface East:	0.84 square feet per person
St. Vital North:	2.01 square feet per person
St. Vital South:	1.84 square feet per person
Fort Garry South:	1.65 square feet per person
Riel District	**1.71 square feet per person**
City Average	**1.88 square feet per person**

Main Points

- *Strictly in terms of distribution of space (not considering other factors such as quality of space or need, etc.) residents of St. Boniface West have access to considerably more space than do residents elsewhere in the District.*
- *St. Boniface East, where much of the City's growth has been concentrated over recent years, is the least well served, by a considerable margin, relative to other areas of the District.*
- *With the city average being 1.88 square feet of combined recreation space per person, the Riel District overall has access to somewhat less space than other areas*

of the city. This could be attributed to the lack of city-run facilities relative to other areas of the city.

3. Demographic Make-up

Table 2 provides an overview of the demographic make-up of the District using selected information from the 2001 Census as provided by the City of Winnipeg together with 2006 Census data derived from the Statistics Canada website.

Table 2: DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW 2001 and 2006						
2001 Census Info	**St.Bon. West**	**St.Bon. East**	**St.Vital North**	**St.Vital South**	**Ft. Garry South**	**CITY**
Total Population	15,150	30,445	26,700	33,140	34,750	619,544
Population Change 86-01	-10.4%	+18.5%	-5.9%	+42.7%	+12.7%	+4.2%
Children 5-19	17.2%	20.9%	16.3%	24.4%	20.9%	19.8%
Seniors 55+	24.9%	22.0%	27.2%	16.1%	18.6%	22.1%
Aboriginal Identity	10.5%	5.5%	8.2%	4.3%	4.9%	8.6%
Immigrant	7.9%	11.7%	12.8%	12.0%	20.1%	17.3%
Married & Common Law	37.6%	59.4%	45.7%	60.6%	52.6%	48.8%
Hold University Degree	19.0%	19.5%	16.0%	21.8%	32.5%	18.3%
Unemployment	5.6%	4.4%	5.1%	4.2%	5.7%	5.7%
Low Income Households	27.3%	10.7%	21.6%	8.7%	17.6%	20.3%
Average Household Income	$41,410	$66,695	$41.178	$71,627	$60,413	$53,176
Household Size	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.8	2.6	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	45%-55%	80%-20%	55%-45%	88%-12%	64%-36%	64%-36%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	54.2%	62.4%	55.0%	62.8%	53.2%	57.7%
2006 Census Info	**St.Bon. West**	**St.Bon. East**	**St.Vital North**	**St.Vital South**	**Ft. Garry South**	**CITY**
Total Population	14,860	51,450	26,330	35,530	34,580	633,451
Population Change 01-06	-1.9%	+69.0%	-1.4%	+7.2	-0.5%	+2.2%
Children 5-19	15.3%	20.8%	16.1%	21.8%	19.3%	19.0%
Seniors 55+	27.3%	23.5%	29.3%	22.5%	21.9%	25.2%
Aboriginal Identity	12.5%	7.3%	9.6%	6.1%	5.7%	10.1%
Immigrant	8.9%	11.4%	12.7%	13.3%	23.1%	18.4%
Married & Common Law	37.8%	52.3%	44.3%	50.5%	46.9%	44.4%
Lone Parent Families	22.9%	13.4%	19.4%	13.2%	15.2%	19.5%
Household Size	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.8	2.7	2.4
Tenure – Own vs Rent	51%-49%	84%-16%	56%-44%	88%-12%	67%-33%	65%-35%
Did Not Move Last 5 Years	51.1%	58.0%	54.9%	60.8%	52.1%	55.2%

Source: City of Winnipeg and Statistics Canada

From these data, a few observations can be made:

Population Change

St. Boniface West and St. Vital North exhibit the tell-tale signs of older, more established city neighbourhoods with a population loss over the past two decades: over 12% loss for

St. Boniface West from 1986 to 2006 and over 7% loss over the same time period for St. Vital North. Meanwhile the other two clusters east of the Red River, St. Vital South and St. Boniface East have gone in the opposite direction, capturing a considerable amount of the city's growth over that period with 50% growth in the former and almost 90% growth in the latter. Over that same 20 year period, the city overall grew by 6.6%. Fort Garry South has been pretty stable, though a pattern of modest growth (12.7% from 1986-2001) appears to have stopped.

Children, Seniors, and Household Size

The District overall has about the same breakdown of children and seniors as the rest of the city population, approximately 19% children 5-19 and 25% seniors over 55. All clusters show an aging pattern over time with an increased number of seniors from 2001. Comparing clusters, St. Vital North stands out with almost 30% of the population over the age of 55. Of note, St. Vital South increased its seniors population from 16.1% to 22.5% from 2001-06. St. Boniface West has the fewest children with 15%. St. Boniface East, St. Vital South, and Fort Garry South all have more children aged 5-19 than the city average. This pattern is reflected in the household size as well with St. Boniface West and St. Vital North both having a smaller than average household size (2.0 and 2.1 versus the city average of 2.4) while the other three clusters sit at 2.7 to 2.8 people per household.

Aboriginals and Immigrants

The District overall appears to be relatively homogenous with only one cluster, St. Boniface West, having an aboriginal population higher than the city average (12.5% for St. Boniface West versus 10.1% for the city) and one other cluster, Fort Garry South, having an immigrant population higher than the city average (23.1% for Fort Garry South versus 18.4% for the city). This pattern is consistent with what it was in 2001. In all clusters the number of aboriginals is growing.

Education

The 2001 figures (2006 not yet available) show only one cluster with lower than average education (that is, fewer numbers of people with university degrees), namely, St. Vital North (16.0%) compared to the city overall (18.3%). Meanwhile Fort Garry South appears highly educated with almost a third of the population holding a university degree. This is likely due to having the University of Manitoba within this cluster, assuming many who attend or work there, choose to live nearby.

Employment, Income, and Need

Again using 2001 numbers because 2006 were not yet released, three clusters are relatively close to the city average in terms of unemployment (5.6%, 5.1%, and 5.7% for St. Boniface West, St. Vital North, and Fort Garry South versus 5.7% for the city) while the St. Boniface East and St. Vital South clusters are considerably lower at 4.4 and 4.2%. There is a clear differentiation in terms of household income. St. Boniface West and St. Vital North are considerably below the city average of $53,176 for 2001 while the other three clusters are considerably above the city average with St. Vital South the highest at $71,627. St. Vital South and St. Boniface East have half the number of low income

households than the city average of $20.3% while St. Boniface West has 27.3% perhaps reflective of its high number of seniors.

Tenure and Mobility

Across the city, approximately two thirds of the population own their home while one third rent. Home ownership provides some insight into neighbourhood stability. The numbers overall have been quite consistent from 2001 to 2006. St. Boniface West has the lowest percentage of home owners at 51% though this has increased from 45% in 2001. St. Vital North is below the average as well with 57%. Mobility is expressed by the number of people who have not moved in the past 5 years. The city average is 55%, essentially the same as what is seen in all five clusters.

Main Points

- *Generally, the District overall, when averaged among clusters, is a good cross-section of the city with about average numbers of children and seniors, average unemployment and income. However, it has fewer aboriginals and immigrants than the rest of the city and has higher education.*
- *Within the District, the St. Boniface West and St. Vital North clusters are somewhat different than the three suburban clusters, showing a population loss over recent years, lower household income, and smaller household size.*

4. Overview of Current Programs

Table 3 provides a summary of programming hours and programs offered by each centre and by each cluster based upon information provided by the centres themselves. The 14 community centres together offer 281 programs accounting for over 60,000 hours of recreation programming. This ranges from an estimated 1,100 programming hours provided through Champlain Community Centre to over 15,000 estimated programming hours provided through the Dakota Community Centre.

In relation to population, the number of program hours per person works out to be:

St. Boniface West:	0.42 hours per person
St. Boniface East:	0.37 hours per person
St. Vital North:	0.34 hours per person
St. Vital South:	0.57 hours per person
Fort Garry South:	0.28 hours per person
Riel District:	**0.42 hours per person**
City Average:	**0.33 hours per person**

Within the District, the greatest emphasis is on children and youth programming with 145 of the 281 programs (52%) dedicated to that age group. This is relatively consistent with other parts of the city. Only 15 programs (6%) are directed toward seniors. It is important to note that programs tend to be delivered based upon volunteer and financial resources and that facility limitations often hamper the delivery of specific programs as well. St. Boniface East offers the most number of programs to its different user groups (78) covering all user groups, though 40 of those are directed toward children and youth. Generally, all clusters have some program offerings for all user groups.

Table 3: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAMS							
			Breakdown of Programs				
Facility	Program Hours	No. of Programs	Pre-School	Children/ Youth	Adults	Seniors	Special Events
St. Boniface West Pop: 14,860							
Notre Dame	1,596	25	1	11	7	1	5
Norwood	3,655	23	3	14	4	1	1
Champlain	1,078	11	1	5	3	-	2
Total for Cluster	**6,329**	**59**	**5**	**30**	**14**	**2**	**8**
St. Boniface East Pop: 51,450							
Archwood	1,625	8	-	5	-	2	1
Winakwa	5,154	33	5	16	6	-	6
Southdale	12,226	33	5	19	4	1	4
Total for Cluster	**19,005**	**74**	**10**	**40**	**10**	**3**	**11**
St. Vital North Pop: 26,330							
Glenwood	1,396	15	1	7	2	2	3
Windsor	2,683	24	2	7	4	-	11
Norberry-Glenlee	4,855*	19*	2	9	3	2	3
Total for Cluster	**8,934**	**58**	**5**	**23**	**9**	**4**	**17**
St. Vital South Pop: 33,530							
Greendell	4,078	21	2	13	2	2	2
Dakota	15,588	14	1	7	1	1	4
Total for Cluster	**19,666**	**35**	**3**	**20**	**3**	**3**	**6**
Fort Garry South Pop: 34,580							
Waverley Heights	4,294	18	1	11	1	1	4
Richmond Kings	3,147	17	1	10	3	1	2
St. Norbert	2,388	20	2	11	4	1	2
Total for Cluster	**9,829**	**55**	**4**	**32**	**8**	**3**	**8**
District 5 Riel Pop: 152,300	**63,763**	**281**	27 10%	145 52%	44 16%	15 5%	50 18%

Source: Community Centre Profiles

In St. Vital North, Windsor places considerable effort (45%) on the provision of special events. Special events can be important because they tend to attract a broader base of participants. Having events for the entire family has a positive impact on the operations of the centres, facilitating the recruitment of volunteers among other benefits.

Looking more closely at individual centres, Dakota and Southdale are clearly the dominant facilities in terms of program hours. Those two facilities combined account for close to 45% the total program hours for the District. Dakota has the most program hours at over 15,000 but offers relatively few programs. With its two arenas, the emphasis would appear to be on children and youth ice sports.

Champlain, Glenwood, Notre Dame, and Archwood offer the fewest program hours (all below 2,000). Of these, Archwood offers the fewest number of programs at 8 followed by Champlain with 11.

West of the Red River, in the Fort Garry South cluster, all three community centres share very similar profiles in terms of program hours, number of programs, and range of offerings – all in the range of average for the District.

Main Points

- The District overall appears to be well programmed in terms of hours of offerings relative to the rest of the city. Only one cluster area, Fort Garry South at 0.28 hours per person, is below the city average of 0.33. At 0.57, St. Vital South is considerably above the average.
- The District appears to provide a wide range of programs, including a significant amount of special programs, but its main emphasis tends to be on the provision of sport programs directed toward children and youth.
- Although St. Boniface West and St. Vital North have an above average number of seniors, it is not strongly reflected in programs offered to that age group (although the City-owned Club Eclipse '79 is located in St. Boniface West).
- Both Winakwa and Southdale appear to place considerable emphasis on pre-school programs.
- Dakota and Southdale dominate the number of program hours offered to the District. However, their approach is different. Dakota offers but 14 programs while Southdale offers 33. This would indicate less variety but greater depth of participation at Dakota.

5. Overview of Current Staff and Volunteers

Table 4 provides an estimate of the number of volunteer hours and number of volunteers.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE VOLUNTEERS

Cluster	Facility Name	Volunteer Hours	Number of Volunteers
St. Boniface West 3 community centres Pop: 14,860	Notre Dame	15,000	
	Norwood	7,400	
	Champlain	6,500	
	Total for Cluster	**28,900**	**240 (est)**
St. Boniface East 3 community centres Pop: 51,450	Archwood	2,800	
	Winawka	30,600	
	Southdale	55,600	
	Total for Cluster	**89,000**	**730 (est)**
St. Vital North 4 community centres Pop: 26,330	Glenwood	11,800	
	Windsor	22,700	
	Norberry/Glenlee	29,500	
	Total for Cluster	**64,000**	**520 (est)**
St. Vital South 2 community centres Pop: 35,530	Greendell	22,000	
	Dakota	62,600	
	Total for Cluster	**84,600**	**700 (est)**
Fort Garry South 3 community centres Pop: 35,580	Waverley Heights	29,000	
	Richmond Kings	15,300	
	St. Norbert	11,000	
	Total for Cluster	**55,300**	**450 (est)**
District 5 Riel 15 community centres	**Population 152,300**	**321,800**	**2,600 (estimate)**

Source: Community Centre Profiles and derivation from national averages on volunteerism.
** Norberry and Glenlee have merged; the figure is a combined total.*

NOTE: The volunteer hours have been provided by the individual community centres and not all centres monitor this information with the same degree of accuracy. The number of volunteers is a rough estimate based upon the fact that, on average, each volunteer in Canada commits 122 hours of their time. Given the range of potential error, these figures should be viewed as representing an order of magnitude only.

It is estimated that the District overall is served by over 2,600 volunteers committing over 320,000 hours of time to the community centre system. In relation to population, the number of volunteer hours works out to be:

St. Boniface West:	1.9 hours per person
St. Boniface East:	1.7 hours per person
St. Vital North:	2.4 hours per person
St. Vital South	2.4 hours per person
Fort Garry South	1.6 hours per person
Riel District:	**2.1 hours per person**
City Average:	**1.9 hours per person**

The community centre system city-wide is supported by approximately 1.9 volunteer hours per person. The pattern is one of higher support (approximately 2.3 hours per person) in the suburban areas versus approximately 1.5 hours per person in the inner city. Therefore, overall, the Riel District is consistent with other areas of the city in terms of volunteer support, given that it is primarily suburban in nature with some inner city characteristics at the north end of the District.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE STAFF

Cluster	Facility Name	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Green Team, etc	Seasonal
St. Boniface West 3 community centres Pop: 14,860	Notre Dame	2	1	-	1	2
	Norwood	1	-	-	1	2
	Champlain	1	-	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**4**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**4**
St. Boniface East 3 community centres Pop: 51,450	Archwood	1	-	-	-	-
	Winawka	2	10	1	1	-
	Southdale	6	3	10	2	-
	Total for Cluster	**9**	**13**	**11**	**3**	**0**
St. Vital North 4 community centres Pop: 26,330	Glenwood	2	4	-	1	-
	Windsor	-	2	-	1	-
	Norberry-Glenlee	3	-	2	2	2
	Total for Cluster	**5**	**6**	**2**	**4**	**2**
St. Vital South 2 community centres Pop: 35,530	Greendell	1	5	-	2	-
	Dakota	9	35	-	-	-
	Total for Cluster	**10**	**40**	**0**	**2**	**0**
Fort Garry South 3 community centres Pop: 35,580	Waverley Heights	1	3	7	2	1
	Richmond Kings	2	1	4	2	2
	St. Norbert	5	1	18	1	-
	Total for Cluster	**8**	**5**	**29**	**5**	**3**
District 5 Riel 15 community centres	**Population 152,300**	**36**	**65**	**42**	**16**	**9**

Source: Community Centre Profiles

Within the District, St. Vital North and South appear to well supported, having the greatest number of volunteer hours to serve the 5 community centres. The Fort Garry South cluster is somewhat less well served with approximately 1.6 volunteer hours committed per person to the community centre system.

As shown in **Table 5**, the District's 14 community centres are operated on a day-to-day basis through a combined 36 full-time staff and an additional 132 part-time, casual, and seasonal staff. The two dominant centres in the District, Dakota and Southdale (with 3 indoor arenas between them), have the greatest number of full-time staff at 9 and 6 respectively. Of note, Champlain and Archwood operate with but one staff person each, placing a heavy burden of responsibility on volunteer support. Windsor is not much different; it operates with the help of two part-time staff.

Main Points

- *While the District overall is well served by volunteers with a stronger volunteer base than the rest of the city, there are significant discrepancies within the District. The cluster areas of St. Vital North and South, for example, have 50% greater volunteer support per capita than Fort Garry South.*
- *One of the likely reasons Fort Garry South has less volunteer support than St. Vital North is that it is relatively better served with staff.*
- *From a staffing perspective, Dakota is clearly a dominant community centre with 9 full time and 35 part time staff. This is consistent with the facility offering the greatest number of program hours.*
- *All of the centres in the District are relatively large, over 10,000 square feet, which is reflected in the number of staff required throughout the District to keep these facilities operating.*

6. Overview of Current Facilities

In 2004, a comprehensive study of recreation facilities in Winnipeg evaluated each of the City's recreation facilities in terms of their overall condition using what was called a Facility Condition Index or FCI. The FCI represented the amount of money it would have taken to get the facility to an average level of upkeep. This amount was provided in relation to the replacement cost of the facility so the lower the number the better. An FCI of .50, then, meant that an investment of 50% of the replacement cost of the facility was needed at that time to get the facility into respectable condition. If that investment had been made, then an ongoing average maintenance program would have been able to keep it in that condition.

Table 6 shows the FCI rating for the District's facilities. It also translates the FCI into a dollar figure identified as the preservation need (as of 2004). The FCI of 0.18 indicates that the District's community centres overall are in considerably better shape in relation to the city average of 0.34 for community centres and 0.41 when the city-run recreation facilities are included. As of 2004, the preservation funds needed were identified at more than $8 M. Such an investment at that time would have brought the facilities up to reasonable condition.

No single facility stands out as being in significantly poorer condition than the others. Dakota has the highest FCI at 0.34, marginally higher than the rest.

Table 6: FACILITY CONDITION AND PRESERVATION NEEDS (as of 2004)

Facility Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	FCI	Preservation Needs
St. Boniface West				
Community Centre	✦Notre Dame	6,740	0.25	412,000
Arena	Notre Dame Arena	6,756	0.16	500,000
Community Centre	✦Norwood	12,394	0.26	333,000
Community Centre	Champlain	11,572	0.16	171,000
	Total for Cluster	42,143	Avg 0.21	$1,416,000
St. Boniface East				
Community Centre	Archwood	11,316	0.18	275,000
Community Centre	✦Winakwa	13,316	0.13	225,000
Community Centre	✦Southdale	17,992	0.21	510,000
Arena	Southdale Arena	590	0.09	240,000
	Total for Cluster	43,214	Avg. 0.15	$1,250,000
St. Vital North				
Community Centre	Glenwood	10,507	0.14	225,000
Arena	Glenwood Arena	4,078	0.14	400,000
Community Centre	Windsor	12,802	0.08	126,000
Community Centre	*Norberry	11,187	0.30	408,000
Community Centre	*Glenlee	14,261	0.12	210,000
	Total for Cluster	52,835	Avg. 0.16	$1,369,000
St. Vital South				
Community Centre	✦Greendell	17,892	0.20	445,000
Community Centre	✦Dakota	31,001	0.34	1,025,000
Arena	Dakota Arena (2)	16,633	0.18	1,000,000
	Total for Cluster	65,526	Avg. 0.24	$2,470,000
Fort Garry South				
Community Centre	✦Waverley Heights	14,200	0.26	363,000
Community Centre	✦Richmond Kings	11,549	0.16	305,000
Arena	Richmond Kings - Arena	4,060	0.17	500,000
Satellite	Richmond Kings - Ryerson	2,590	0.29	95,000
Community Centre	St. Norbert	15,835	0.11	267,000
Arena	St. Norbert Arena	8,738	0.07	200,000
	Total for Cluster	56,972	Avg. 0.18	$1,730,000
Total: 22 facilities	**District 5 All CC Facilities**	**256,009**	**Avg. 0.18**	**$8,235,000**
City Total: 100		**972,066**	**Avg. 0.34**	**$43,460,000**

Source: City of Winnipeg

** Norberry and Glenlee have amalgamated. An expanded facility is currently under construction at Norberry.*

✦ Facilities where improvements have been made since 2004 which could have an impact on the FCI rating.

NOTE: The assessment provided in Table 6 is now 4 years old and was based upon information that was a few years old at the time. Given that few major capital investments have been made in recent years, there is still merit in the assessment although it is likely that many of the facilities are in worse shape today. Furthermore, the costs would be significantly higher than those presented. The Table should be used simply as representing an order of magnitude of the investment needed and the relative need among centres and clusters. In some instances investment has taken place leading to an improved facility today. Those facilities have been flagged in Table 6.

Table 7 itemizes the amenities that can be found in the District's community centres. District-wide, there appears to be a reasonable availability of amenities, consistent with the fact that facilities in this District tend to be newer. The distribution of amenities throughout the District, however, shows areas of potential concern. Fort Garry South, for example, has no gymnasium, St. Boniface East has no nursery school area, and St. Boniface West has no games room. Shortages of this nature inhibit the ability to provide a broad spectrum of programs to community. Given that there are no very small centres in this District in comparison with some of the other areas of the city, no single facility stands out as being in great need of programmable space.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CENTRE AMENITIES

Facility Name	Board Room	Computer Rm / Office	Canteen	Kitchen	Nursery School Area	Games Room	Gym	Hall	MPR	Indoor Arena	Other
St. Boniface West											
Notre Dame	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Norwood	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Champlain	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total for Cluster	**1**	**3**	**3**	**5**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**0**
St. Boniface East											
Archwood	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Winakwa	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Southdale	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
Total for Cluster	**2**	**4**	**3**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**0**
St. Vital North											
Glenwood	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0
Windsor	1	2	1	2	2	1	0	2	1	0	0
Norberry-Glenlee*	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Total for Cluster	**2**	**4**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**0**
St. Vital South											
Greendell	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Dakota	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	3	2	1
Total for Cluster	**2**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Fort Garry South											
Waverley Heights	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Richmond Kings	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
St. Norbert	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0
Total for Cluster	**3**	**6**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**2**	**0**
Total for District	**10**	**20**	**16**	**20**	**8**	**6**	**7**	**10**	**16**	**7**	**1**

Source: Community Centre profiles.
** Reflects what is currently under construction following the merger of the two centres.*

Shown in **Table 8** are the Space to Population Ratios (SPR). This is a measure of how well served an area of the city is relative to other areas of the city. It measures the amount of heated square footage of recreation space available per person. It should be kept in mind there is no universal standard by which to compare. This is a relative measure only.

Relative to the rest of the city, residents of District 5 have access to more *community centre space* than the city average (1.68 square feet of space per person versus 1.50 square feet city-wide). However, with the exception of a single city-run facility in St. Boniface West, the District has no additional city-run facilities to complement the space provided by community centres. As a result, when the combined space is considered, the District has a lower SPR than the rest of the city (1.71 square feet of space per person versus 1.88 square feet city-wide).

Table 8: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS (SPR)

Cluster	Population	CCs + Sat	Space (sq ft)	SPR	City-run Centres	Space (sq ft)	SPR	Combined SPR
St. Boniface West	14,860	3	37,462	2.52	1	4,681	0.32	**2.84**
St. Boniface East	51,450	3	43,214	0.84	0	0	0.00	**0.84**
St. Vital North	26,330	4	52,835	2.01	0	0	0.00	**2.01**
St. Vital South	35,530	2	65,526	1.84	0	0	0.00	**1.84**
Fort Garry South	35,580	3+1	56,972	1.60	0	0	0.00	**1.60**
District 5: Riel	**152,100**	**15+1**	**256,009**	**1.68**	**1**	**4,681**	**0.03**	**1.71**
City	**647,600**	**71+14**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**31**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1.88**

Within the District, there are considerable discrepancies. St. Boniface West, with a small population and three community centres (plus the City-owned Club Eclipse '79), is considerably better-served than the other clusters. However, the demographic information from Table 2 would indicate it is also the cluster within the District with the highest need. St. Boniface East has the lowest SPR by far at 0.84, due to the fact that it has grown in population by nearly 70% since 2001, as indicated in Table 2.

Main Points

- *Overall, facilities in District 5 are in a considerably better state of repair than the city average. No single facility is in a terrible state of repair.*
- *All centres have a small range of amenities including access to a few different programmable spaces within their facility, however, cluster-wide some shortages stand out that may need to be addressed.*
- *Relative to other areas of the city, St. Boniface West has considerably more recreation space per capita while St. Boniface East has a lot less (less than half the city average).*

7. Summary of Current Issues and Concerns

The planning model used in this exercise is one that examines the inter-relationship among people, programs, and facilities with the underlying assumption that one must understand the needs of the people in order to develop relevant programs and, in turn, it

is the nature of the programs that will dictate the types of facilities needed. Issues and concerns were identified in all three areas.

People

A high priority is the need to support mergers between facilities. There is a need to establish a common understanding of the community centre movement – what it represents currently and where it is going in the future. The various philosophies of programming and service delivery by which individual centres currently operate need to be combined into a common approach.

Sharing is essential to the future of the community centre movement. There is a need for a shared approach to staffing, program delivery, and facility use. There needs to be understanding and support in the community to move beyond a parochial approach to one of cooperation. Public education is important.

Recruitment and retention of volunteers and staff is another significant priority for the District both in terms of volunteers, especially those volunteers in leadership positions such as Board members, and in terms of staff, particularly arena staff. These challenges need to be addressed if the system is to be sustainable over the long term. This will be more of a challenge as the District is expecting to be subject to a large amount of growth over the next two decades. It needs to be recognized that youth are an excellent source for casual and seasonal staff requirements.

Demographic changes will need to be addressed. The number of visible minorities and new Canadians will rise and will need to be considered in terms of program participation and volunteer recruitment. Similarly, the seniors demographic provides opportunities for volunteer recruitment while creating a need for more direct programming.

Coordination of services across the District is a concern. Community networks such as Healthy St. Boniface can be a very valuable resource to educate and promote the community centre movement as well as take advantage of potential sharing of resources.

Programs

Developing and sustaining programs is one of the biggest challenges facing the District.

Given the District is expected to experience tremendous growth over the next couple decades it is a high priority to align programs with the emerging needs of the community. It will be important that the community centre offers programs for all age groups. The pressure for programming for children and youth, which is a major function of community centres, will need to be balanced with more adult and seniors programming. This latter demographic emphasis could help address the challenge of volunteer recruitment.

Programming for special population groups will become increasingly important.

Partnerships with other community organizations and the school divisions will become a priority for community centres in order to provide a full range of programs. The role of sport associations in relation to community centre program operations will need to be clarified.

It must be noted that the District overall enjoys a good relationship with its school divisions in terms of access to school gyms. Community centres are given priority for permits. However, it is difficult to make plans because the decisions are made with short notice times and cancellations can occur. Access to full-size high school gyms remains a concern.

Program re-alignment is required when facility mergers are considered. Programming out of satellite sites needs to be examined in light of the limited number of amenities they offer and the increased operating costs associated with an off-site facility.

Hockey participation is trending downward for some time and the challenge for community centres is to adapt to the evolution by offering more than sport opportunities to children and youth.

Web-site development would increase the accessibility of community centre programming. This would open community centres programs to a larger demographic and could increase both participation and a volunteer recruitment.

Each community centre board should undertake a strategic planning exercise.

Facilities

The biggest concern, and highest priority for the District overall, is the challenge of developing facilities to meet the current and future needs of the community and to make better use of existing facilities through shared use.

New trends in facility development need to be examined to ensure contemporary, long-lasting solutions. It is important that programming trends determine facility requirements. A key consideration is the need for gymnasium and multi-use space. While a good relationship exists with School Divisions providing access to gym space, it will not be enough to meet future needs for sport and multi-use space.

There is a concern that some of the best facilities may not be in the most appropriate locations. Archwood, for example, is a good facility but there isn't a significant population to ensure its sustainability. The challenge is to determine what can be done with such a facility to realize its full potential.

There are significant demands on existing centres such as Winakwa and Southdale due to population growth within surrounding neighbourhoods. As new residential neighbourhoods emerge in areas such as Sage Creek and Waverley West, a modified governance model may need to be considered to address the needs of those residents. The model could be one that evolves incrementally from a satellite operation into a stand alone operation as the population grows and the complexity of operations and programming increases.

Vandalism and graffiti are significant concerns along with drug and gang activity. This is not an isolated issue but one that runs through the District affecting all centres and their satellites.

Accommodating recreation facilities into new developments, i.e. designating recreational space, was identified as a concern.

Main Points

- *For any change to be successful, it is critical that all centres work together to establish a common understanding and direction and to communicate that effectively in the community.*
- *Recruitment and retention of volunteers in leadership positions and arena/specialized staff is a high priority for the District overall that may require inventive solutions.*
- *Programming will need to evolve over time to meet the needs and pressures of a growing population together with the changing demographic make-up of the community (new Canadians, visible minorities, seniors).*
- *The biggest concern, and highest priority for the District overall, is the challenge of developing facilities to meet the current and future needs of the community. In doing this, the role and use of satellite facilities may need to be reconsidered. A new incremental model of governance may be appropriate to address new, emerging neighbourhoods.*

C. Needs Assessment

1. Growth and Demographic Projections to 2025

The Phase 1 Report that accompanies this study outlined in some detail the anticipated growth over the next twenty years and the impact of this growth on the City's demographic make-up. In short, Winnipeg is expected to experience significant growth averaging approximately 1% per year after a period of near stagnation over the past decade.

Natural growth in population, that is, birth minus deaths, will account for very little of this growth. The bulk of the growth will be attributable to increases in net migration. It is anticipated that fewer people will leave Winnipeg for ex-urban areas, fewer people will leave the Province for other Provinces, and more international migrants will be coming to the Province, especially to Winnipeg. This latter point is the most significant and is the result of an aggressive campaign on the part of the provincial government to increase international immigration through its Nominee Program.

Table 9: ESTIMATED GROWTH to 2025 – ALL DISTRICTS

	Est. Pop. 2005	Growth Allocation	Est. Pop. Increase	Est. Pop. 2025
District 1: City Centre	149,600	10%	13,650	163,250
District 2: Assiniboia	95,125	20%	27,800	122,925
District 3: Lord Selkirk W Kildonan	136,125	10%	13,150	149,275
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,450	10%	13,650	128,100
District 5: Riel	152,300	50%	69,250	221,550
Winnipeg	647,600	100%	137,500	785,100

Source: Derived from Statistics Canada and City of Winnipeg information

As shown in **Table 9**, the population of Winnipeg is expected to grow by 137,500 by 2025. Given the areas in the city where growth can be accommodated, it is expected that

as much as 50% of the growth will occur in District 5. This translates into a potential increase of nearly 70,000 people. It is estimated that since the time of the 2005 population estimate used in Table 9, the population of Riel has already increased by more than 5,000.

While the population may grow significantly, there will also be a shift in demographic make-up. In particular, the seniors population will increase, especially the 'younger' seniors, aged 60-75. Where this group now comprises 17% of the population, that percentage will grow to 23% by the year 2025.

Additionally, the aboriginal population is expected to grow at a faster rate than the general population. While the city overall is expected to grow by 21% to the year 2025, the aboriginal population in itself could increase by over 60% if current growth rates hold true into the future. (See Phase 1 report for more detail.)

Main Points

- *Winnipeg is expected to grow by more than 20% to the year 2025, an increase in population of 137,500. It is possible that District 5 could increase in population by nearly 70,000 over that period.*
- *The population will continue to get older and there will be more aboriginals and new immigrants. These factors will influence future programming needs.*

2. Growth Areas: Shorter Term and Longer Term

With significant growth anticipated for the city it is critical for the planning of programs and facilities to understand where that growth is likely to occur. **Map 5** identifies the potential areas of growth.

Areas identified as 1 to 4 are those areas where growth is more likely to occur in the shorter term, that is, over the next 10 years, perhaps a bit longer. These 'shorter-term' growth areas include:

1. Southland Park – there remains a portion of this site to be developed which could capture approximately 2,500 of the growth in population.
2. Sage Creek – this development, currently underway, could accommodate an additional population of approximately 10,000.
3. Royalwood – it is estimated that further development of this site could include an additional 5,000 people.
4. Waverley West – by far the most significant development in the south is Waverley West. The first phase is currently under way. The entire site could accommodate approximately 25,000 people.

While there are many factors that could influence the timing of these developments, they are, generally speaking, reasonably likely to occur over the twenty year period anticipated in this plan. Should these proposed developments come to fruition, they would account for an increase in population of approximately 40,000 - 45,000 people.

Additionally, it is anticipated that policies promoting residential intensification could result in additional infill development and higher density redevelopment of existing properties throughout the District, particularly in areas such as Pembina Highway in Fort Garry South where a pattern of intense development could be triggered by the introduction of a rapid transit system.

5. South St. Vital – should the long-term projections hold true, there will be additional pressure for residential accommodation which could trigger development south of the perimeter. This area is very large and could easily accommodate the additional 20,000 - 25,000 people identified in the projections.

Map 5: ANTICIPATED GROWTH AREAS FOR DISTRICT 5



Virtually all the growth anticipated for the District will find its way south of Bishop Grandin. Three clusters are expected to see a sharp rise in population: St. Boniface East, St. Vital South, and Fort Garry South. This will put increasing pressure on existing facilities in these clusters, which, as shown in **Table 8**, already have the lowest SPRs of the District. The growth will trigger the need for expansions and/or new facilities over time.

3. Assessing Future Needs

In light of current issues facing the community centre system in District 5 and in order to be well positioned to address forecasted population growth and anticipated changes in demographics, a number of needs have been identified.

Programming for all age groups

While it is recognized that children and youth should continue to be the priority, there is a need to ensure a broad range of programs, including more non-sport programming for children and youth and fitness and social programs for adults and seniors during the day. This provides an opportunity for recruiting new volunteers which, in turn, provides role models for youth. There is a need to recognize and support the hierarchy of program delivery that begins with the role of small local centres that provide unstructured, drop-in opportunities for recreation to more sophisticated programs at the neighbourhood level and on to elite/multi-plex offerings at the district level. The model should be continuous allowing a family to make use of each type of service and facility as its needs change.

Reaching out to non-traditional users

The community centre should be a welcoming place for all. There is a need to understand the changing nature of the community – to recognize and respond to socio-demographic trends by reaching out to portions of the population that currently are not strongly attached to community centres and demonstrating that the community centre is there for them as well. This requires a better understanding of the program needs of visible minority groups such as French Africans, the aboriginal community, and the disenfranchised. Community centres may need to re-think traditional programming.

Partnership and collaboration

There is a need to develop a more holistic view, working collaboratively with other community service providers to develop and provide complementary programming. This must begin with an enhanced awareness of the services provided by other organizations and a willingness to share communication strategies and programming information. As well, community centres themselves need to work more closely with each other. There is the potential to share resources among centres, to combine purchasing power, and to plan at the cluster level with reciprocal arrangements between centres for program delivery and access to space. There is a need as well to work more closely with School Divisions who are undergoing their own district planning process.

Sustaining a volunteer base and staff resources

Recruitment efforts need to be enhanced to ensure an ongoing commitment to volunteerism by all members of the community including adults, seniors, youth, and

minority groups. There is a need to ensure the sustainability of community centre boards with committed volunteers acting in leadership roles. As well, there will be continued pressure to attract and retain qualified staff both in terms of technical staff such as arena operators and program staff such as recreation technicians. Furthermore, there is a need to attract volunteers to help support non-sport related activities.

Developing more contemporary facilities while optimizing current space

There is a need to develop more flexible, multi-purpose space that is able to meet the changing needs of the community. It may be necessary to convert space that currently tends to be geared toward a single use. For example, arenas could be more broadly used for programs other than ice sports. As well, there is a need to ensure the optimal use of existing space. For example, non-sport activities need not occupy gymnasium space if multi-purpose space is available. As well, some user groups may be more flexible and could be directed toward times when facilities are less busy. This can be approached cluster-wide or district-wide, encouraging the shared use of facilities to ensure that, overall, residents of the District have access to all the space that is available.

Learning from merger experience

There is an opportunity to learn from the amalgamation of Norberry-Glenlee. This project demonstrated that the District is progressive and able to change with the times for the betterment of the community. It was a win-win situation that addressed weaknesses and built upon strengths. There is a need to share this experience among centres and to build a knowledge base to ensure that similar initiatives can benefit from experience. This experience can also be used to encourage additional funding in support of proposed amalgamations. Mergers of facilities may require the exploration of new forms of governance.

Accommodating population growth

There is a need to carefully plan for, and accommodate, recent and forecasted growth. There is a need generally for full-size gym space, whether in terms of access to school gyms or through the provision of new facilities. As well, a regional facility is needed somewhere within the District. New facilities will be required to support the development in Sage Creek and Waverley West neighbourhoods. However, another challenge is to ensure better utilization of existing facilities. For example, some centres such as Archwood, are not used to capacity, especially during daytime.

Main Points

- *While children and youth are the mainstay, adults and seniors need to be accommodated.*
- *It will be important in the future to introduce new programs that are reflective of the changing nature of the community and to ensure that barriers are not inhibiting access to programs. The community centre should be a welcoming place for everyone.*

- *More contemporary and flexible facilities will be needed in the future to ensure that a diversity of programs can be offered. Single-use facilities may need to be converted.*
- *Use of existing space can be better optimized from a cluster or district perspective.*
- *Community centres will need to work more collaboratively with each other and with other service providers in terms of program delivery, communications, and resource sharing.*

D. Moving Forward

1. Defining Success

The Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base and high maintenance needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by the City. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to

meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple amenities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the specialized services they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

In the case of all the above models, the District Planning Committee agrees that a successful community centre is one that provides relevant programming for all age groups, in a well-maintained, multi-functional space that is open to the public both day and evening.

Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- Healthy Living: The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.
- Community-led: The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.
- Volunteer-driven: The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.
- Affordable and Accessible: The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.

- Collaborative: The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.
- Safe and Respectful: The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.
- Equitable: The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

Defining Success

The following definition is derived from the Community Centre Review Task Force Report, created by Community Centre presidents in 2004. It is intended to reflect the desires of the community.

A successful community centre is deemed to have the following characteristics.

- The community centre is a focal point of the community.
- The community centre makes an important contribution to the quality of life of a neighbourhood or community.
- The community centre serves the immediate population of the neighbourhood.
- The community centre relies on, and benefits from, dedicated volunteers and staff.
- The community centre offer diverse programming and provides a good balance of sport and non-sport programs.
- The community centre has well-maintained facilities.
- The community centre builds partnerships that enhance the pursuit of its mandate.

Main Points

- *The community centre model of the future must consider and respond to community needs at the local level, the neighbourhood level, and the district level.*
- *The community centre model of the future must reflect the guiding principles upon which the system was founded and must strive to achieve success as defined by the community.*

2. Planning Limitations

Overall, the City of Winnipeg is expected to increase in population by 137,500 people to the year 2025. The RLLF Policy allows for the current Space to Population Ratio to be maintained. This means that the current SPR of 1.88 square feet of space per person can be carried forward. To accommodate the projected growth, 258,000 square feet of additional space can be planned for.

However, there are current imbalances in the system with some areas of the city having a higher SPR than others. The primary directive provided by the GCWCC as guidance for this planning exercise is to strive to get all areas of the city to parity, that is, to get all areas of the city as close as possible to the city average of 1.88 square feet of space per person over time.

Given that District 5 currently holds the lowest SPR and is expected to receive the bulk of the city's growth, it has the greatest ability to add new space into the system. **Table 10** shows the amount of space allocated to each district for planning purposes.

Table 10: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR TO 2025 BY DISTRICT					
	Current Combined SPR	Space to Plan for	Resulting SPR	Allotted CC Space	Allotted City-Run Space
District 1: City Centre	1.74	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	2.42	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	1.74	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	2.01	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	1.71	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
City Total	**1.88**	**258,000 sf**	**1.88**	206,000 sf	52,000 sf

Source: Derived from previous tables.

It has been calculated that District 5 could add 156,000 square feet of additional space. Should the population increase in the District by 69,250 people to the year 2025 as projected, the District's SPR would rise from its current city-low of 1.71 to 1.88 with the addition of this new space.

The basis for this allocation is the City's RLLF policy. The policy covers community centres and similar city-run recreation, leisure and senior centres. If the current city-wide ratio of community centre space to city-run space was to hold in the future, the 156,000 sq ft of new space would include 125,000 sq. ft. of community centre space and an additional 31,000 sq. ft. of city-run space. This breakdown of space is a critical point of future discussions with the City of Winnipeg.

The challenge for the District is to distribute this space in a way that acknowledges current imbalances in the system while also ensuring that anticipated growth is addressed properly and fairly.

Main Points

- *It is the goal of the GCWCC to have facility space evenly distributed throughout the city over time. In this way, people in all areas of the city would have access to the same amount of recreation space.*
- *Respecting the GCWCC's goal, plans for District 5 must accommodate a potential increase in population of nearly 70,000 people to the year 2025 while adding 156,000 square feet of additional space into the system over time.*
- *The 156,000 sq. ft. of new space includes a potential 125,000 of community centre space together with a potential 31,000 sq. ft. of city-run space. This breakdown can, and should, be discussed and negotiated with the City of Winnipeg because the critical point as determined by the policy is the total amount of space, not who governs its use.*

3. Planning Strategies

In light of the long-term vision and values that define the community centre movement and in recognition of the limitations that restrict the introduction of new space into the system, the following strategies can be explored to address the needs of the District identified earlier.

Need: To meet the programming needs of all age groups

Strategies:

- Shared Staff: New, innovative programs are difficult to introduce however the challenges can be overcome by working together and sharing resources among community centres to get new programs developed and operational (eg. hiring a program developer).
- Shared Volunteers: It may be possible to share key volunteers such as sport convenors, having a single, district-wide (or cluster-wide) convenor for a particular age group.
- Time Management: Not all centres are utilized to the extent they could be, particularly during the daytime. There is capacity for program development that meets the needs of daytime users such as seniors at times that do not encroach on other users.
- Life-long Relationships: The community centre should strive to establish and maintain a relationship that supports resident needs over the course of their lives from children to youth to adults to seniors. This would be reflected in a continuum of programs from informal drop-in to elite sport to fitness to social engagement.
- Web Site Enhancement: Community centre web sites can be used to enhance communications and share information. It can also provide registration forms that can be filled in advance to facilitate the on-site registration process.

Need: To reach out to non-traditional users

Strategies:

- New Canadians: With growing immigration it will be important to better understand the needs of new Canadians. Research and consultation will be necessary to understand changing programming trends as a foundation for adapting future programs.
- Web Site Outreach: Community centres can enhance their respective websites, to better promote their programs, services and facilities. The sites can be used to reflect cultural diversity and to promote the concept of community centres as a welcoming place for all.
- Promotion: Additional program brochures and promotion blitzes are required to make residents aware of the diversity of programs as well as to make them aware of volunteer opportunities. Community centres can promote each other's unique programs and events.

Need: To collaborate and build partnerships

Strategies:

- Outreach: Community centres should reach out to community agencies and create new partnerships in terms of offering programs. Consideration should be given to partnering with daycares, churches, schools, senior centres, and senior housing

developments. City staff (Community Resource Coordinators) are well connected and can assist with networking. They can be invited to attend CCB meetings.

- Sport Associations: Programming for children and youth must be sustained in the development of a clarified role with Sport Associations which can be pursued through the existing GCWCC Sports Committee. It is critical to the success of Community Centres that an effective and mutually supportive relationship be established with Sport Associations.
- Staff Sharing: Sharing of staff among community centres may be a solution as there would be sufficient work to support competitive and attractive salary and benefits. Pooling the resources used for part-time staff can translate into full-time positions which are often more desirable for the most qualified employees.
- Cluster Programming: Community centres can enhance their effectiveness by collaborating at a cluster level in the delivery of programs. Having each centre take 'ownership' of a given sport is an example that is currently being applied among Norwood, Champlain, Glenwood, and Windsor.
- Buying Power: Collectively, community centres have significant purchasing power which can help reduce costs, especially for large equipment. A district-wide purchasing strategy can be developed.

Need: To sustain a volunteer base and staff resources

Strategies:

- Volunteer Support: To encourage ongoing commitment from volunteers a support structure could be established to ensure that volunteers in key positions have access to the training they require and that legal liability and workplace health requirements are addressed. As well, volunteer appreciation events can be held on a cluster or district basis to help promote the broader community commitment.
- Youth: Volunteer recruitment from the youth sector can help sustain the community centre movement into the future and could be pursued through a mentorship program and by working with School Division officials to take advantage of the school credit program for volunteerism. Many community centres are adjacent to schools which facilitates the implementation of this strategy.
- Senior Recruitment: Accessing the seniors population through a number of existing community organizations such as Club Eclipse '79, Prendergast Seniors, Age and Opportunity could be a viable recruitment strategy. Another option is to seek volunteer support among grandparents of youth program participants. Providing programming for both adults and older adults enhances the sense of belonging which improves chances of volunteering.
- Promotion: Sustaining volunteers at a Board level and general operational program leadership level can be pursued through an intense promotion of the benefits of community centres to the general population in order to enhance awareness and encourage participation. A District-wide strategy could be developed.

- Representation: Recruitment of volunteers should be directed toward representation, striving to include new Canadians, visible minorities, aboriginals, youth, and seniors as a key to sustaining the community centre movement into the future.

Need: To develop more contemporary facilities while optimizing current space

Strategies:

- New Facilities: With the large growth in this District new facilities will need to be built. There may be opportunities to address this in an incremental fashion, perhaps initially as satellites of existing facilities which become autonomous operations as they grow and mature.
- Non-traditional Facilities: Consideration needs to be given to accommodating new emerging sport and recreation activities. This can begin by adding outdoor amenities such as beach volleyball, basketball, etc.
- Full-size Gyms: Gym space is important because gyms can be used in a variety of ways, sport and non-sport. With limited access to high school gyms it may be necessary to build new full-size gyms at key community centre locations.
- Priority Upgrades: A move toward more contemporary facilities includes upgrading existing facilities. Winakwa and Southdale have been identified as being in significant need of facility renovations to sustain program operations.
- Utilization Plan: A district-wide utilization plan can be developed to promote the optimum utilization of space, matching users to time of day and appropriate space. The plan should include the exploration of alternative uses for traditionally single use facilities such as arenas.
- Boundary Review: A review of catchment boundaries by the GCWCC could help optimize the use of facilities while addressing changes in population that have occurred through recent growth.

Need: To learn from merger experience

Strategies:

- Common Philosophy: The Norberry/Glenlee experience shows the importance of establishing a common philosophy and strategic plan for the community centre movement as a prerequisite before considering the possibility of mergers.
- Win/Win: The merging of facilities needs to be pursued from a win/win perspective where resources are shared in order to maximize program operations and services for the betterment of the community.
- Strategic Use: Mergers need to be examined from a strategic point of view looking particularly at cases where limited population creates challenges for enrolment and pressures to maintain a volunteer base.
- Funding: Amalgamations can only occur when a community is prepared to make a considerable concession. This must be a win-win situation that results in a more

contemporary facility. Funding strategies must support the hard work required to make amalgamations successful.

- Alternative Governance: Mergers and amalgamations can take many forms and there is merit in exploring new and innovative forms of governance that provide a range of autonomy. Various forms of co-dependency can build upon the strengths while addressing the weaknesses of individual centres.

Need: To accommodate population growth

Strategies:

- District Facility: With the current large population and projected growth (including many young families) the development of a major recreation complex that includes a pool, indoor soccer, hockey and large multi-use space needs to be pursued. The best location needs to be determined as well as an appropriate governance model that includes all community centres in the District (perhaps similar to Calgary).
- Boundary Review: Community centre boundaries for catchment areas will need to be reviewed in light of population growth and new residential developments.
- New Areas: Need to ensure that the subdivision designs for the new emerging neighbourhoods in the south-east (Sage Creek) and south-west (Waverley West) properly accommodate community centre needs. New facilities will likely have to be built.
- University: The relationship between community centres and the University of Manitoba needs to be discussed now that the University is establishing itself as a hub for large scale recreation facilities (soccer complex, possible stadium).

4. Past and Current Project Proposals

Synopsis

District 5 is a dynamic community with three very different characteristics at work. The north part of the District includes a series of older neighbourhoods including St. Boniface West, a large French community, and St. Vital North. These neighbourhoods tend to exhibit some inner city characteristics with declining household size, a greater percentage of seniors, more low income households. Nonetheless, some significant rejuvenation efforts are underway in these areas.

The south part of the District, east of the Red River, has seen the bulk of the city's growth in recent years. It is characterized by many new homes, young, affluent families and larger household size. The area is projected to continue to capture most of the city's growth over the next couple of decades which will put pressure on service provision to keep up with demand. To date, it would appear the growth of recreation facilities has lagged behind population growth; the area includes some of the lowest space to population ratios in the city.

The southern portion of the District that lies west of the Red River is quite divorced from the east, having a closer alignment with the District 1 which lies to the north of it. This area is generally well established and stable. Having the University of Manitoba in the

heart of this area tends to skew the demographics in favour of university workers and students. The biggest factor to consider is the onset of Waverley West, an enormous new development that could, over time, result in an increase of 25,000 residents.

Project Proposals

The 2006 GCWCC report entitled “Plan for a Renewed and Vibrant Community Centre Movement” identified a number of proposals as candidates for funding. Five projects from District 5 were considered. Two were approved: the Norberry-Glenlee amalgamation, which is currently underway and the Notre Dame Vestibule which awaits funding confirmation.

Norberry-Glenlee Merger

Project Update: The merger of the two community centres has been approved and funding has been allocated to the project. Construction is currently underway on upgrades and expansion of the Norberry facility, to include a full-size gymnasium and a new multi-purpose room. Once complete, the Glenlee facility will be declared surplus to the Community Centre inventory.

NOTE: Phase 2 of this project is proposed to be a new indoor soccer facility.

Square Footage: The two sites combined accounted for 25,448 heated square feet of space. The renovated Norberry facility is expected to result in 20,000 heated square feet of space. Meanwhile, the Walter Jennings Fieldhouse at the Glenlee site would remain. That accounts for an additional 5,361 square feet. A new soccer facility would need to be discussed within the context of the RLLF Policy.

Notre Dame Vestibule

Project Update: In 2007, the addition of a 1,400 sq. ft. vestibule was approved that will connect the community centre to the arena. At present, the community centre and its arena are awkwardly joined with separate entrances. This would enhance the connectivity between the two. The 1,400 sq. ft. addition will begin once funding has been secured.

The three remaining proposals serve as the starting point for inclusion here. Note: these are listed in the order by which they were prioritized in the report, with the exception of proposal 1b, which was presented at a later date.

Proposal No.1a: Winakwa Expansion

What: The proposal is to expand Winakwa Community Centre to accommodate a full-size gym, change rooms, second floor viewing area/hall, and new front entrance. Renovation of existing space is also proposed. Conceptual drawings have been developed and some site work has been done, including rink relocation, in order to accommodate the expansion.

Why: St. Boniface East has, by far, the lowest SPR in the District. Population growth over the years has not been matched by growth in recreation space. A survey of residents has identified a gym as a high priority.

How: An issue to resolve is the rationalization of the expansion with the RLLF policy.

Update: Winakwa chose to go forward with the front entrance as a component of the larger project. The 400 sq. ft. addition was approved through the District Planning Process in 2007 and will begin once funding has been secured.

Proposal No. 1b: Radisson Healthy Living Centre

What: In 2007, Winakwa also presented the Radisson Healthy Living Centre, a proposal which would see the development of the Maginot Arena site into a district centre, comprised of 2 indoor arenas (to replace Maginot and Bertrand), 2 indoor soccer pitches, 2 gyms, a running track, medical space (eg Winnipeg Regional Health Authority), commercial space, and support space. Governance of the facility would adhere to a district-wide model with shared decision-making processes.

Why: St. Boniface East has, by far, the lowest SPR in the District. Population growth over the years has not been matched by growth in recreation space. This would provide the cluster with a large district centre serving a broad population with structured sport and wellness. While district-wide facilities tend to be located in newer areas of the city where land is more readily available, this location is more central and would facilitate access by all residents of the District.

How: This is an ambitious proposal that requires significant research and development. Rationalization of this space with the RLLF Policy is an outstanding issue. There is a need to enter into discussions with the City regarding the replacement of Bertrand and Maginot arenas. While the Maginot site has the right characteristics for a project of this magnitude, other sites can be considered. This would not compromise the relevance of the project.

Proposal No. 2: Southdale Expansion

What: The proposal is to expand Southdale Community Centre by focusing primarily on two priorities: the need for a second arena and a full size gymnasium. (Broader plans have been developed that include an indoor soccer pitch/multi-purpose facility, indoor running track, a permanent full-time daycare centre, and the reconfiguration of existing space. These plans will be reviewed in the future.)

Why: St. Boniface East has, by far, the lowest SPR in the District. Much of Winnipeg's population growth over the years has occurred in this area of the city and this growth has not been matched by complementary growth in recreation space. As a result, expansion is amply justified even without considering the additional growth anticipated in the future.

How: Conceptual drawings have been completed. Community consultation is taking place to confirm the priorities. Issues to resolve include rationalization with the RLLF policy and site restrictions.

Proposal No. 3: Dakota Expansion

What: The proposal is similar to the Southdale proposal and is intended to expand Dakota Community Centre with the addition of an indoor arena and a multi-purpose gymnasium/fieldhouse to accommodate indoor soccer and other uses.

Why: St. Vital South has an SPR slightly below the City average. Anticipated population growth in this area will only aggravate the disparity. This expansion would create a district-scale facility that could serve the broad needs of the population with regards to structured sport.

How: A preliminary business plan has been developed. Issues to resolve include rationalization with the RLLF policy, some existing structural problems, and some environmental concerns.

5. Possible Additional Development Scenarios

Map 6 identifies a number of additional scenarios that could be considered and pursued. These scenarios are intended to provide reconfiguration options that would assist in meeting the District's needs, over and above those presented in the previous section.

Scenario: *New Sage Creek Facility*

What: Build a new facility somewhere in the south-east corner of the city to accommodate the residential expansion associated with Royalwood, Sage Creek, Island Lakes, and Southland Park.

Why: Island Lakes, Southland Park, and Royalwood have captured much of the City's growth over recent years. It is expected that Royalwood could accommodate an additional 5,000 residents and the emerging Sage Creek neighbourhood could add 10,000 more. All this growth justifies the addition of a substantial neighbourhood size community centre. A facility along Lagimodiere between Bishop Grandin and the perimeter could serve these areas. A new facility in this location would take some of the burden off Southdale and Winakwa.

How: Working with the Planning, Property and Development Department at the City of Winnipeg, an appropriate site would need to be identified and a plan would need to be developed to determine what type of facility ought to be accommodated and how it can be developed over time as the population grows.

Scenario: *Close the Richmond Kings Ryerson Satellite Site*

What: Declare the Richmond Kings Ryerson site as surplus to the Community Centre inventory. Move the outdoor rinks from Ryerson to the main site.

Why: The Ryerson satellite site is very small with limited capacity for programming. As well, at 0.29, it has one of the highest FCI ratings in the District and is subject to a high degree of vandalism.

How: Allocate the space freed up through the closure of Ryerson to a new project in Waverley West. The Waverly West project will enhance recreation services to the South Fort Garry cluster area.



Legend

- Community Centres
- Recreation Facilities
- Increase in Facility Size
- Decrease in Facility Size
- Facility Closures
- Proposed Grouping of Facilities
- Community Centres Catchment Boundary

Map 6 - District 5: Riel
Proposed Development Scenarios

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

February 25, 2009

Scenario: *New Waverley West Facility*

What: Build a new facility in Waverley West.

Why: It is expected that the Waverley West development will be able to accommodate close to 25,000 new residents. A population base of that size could justify the development of approximately 45,000 square feet of space.

How: Working with the Planning, Property and Development Department at the City of Winnipeg, an appropriate site needs to be identified within the development and a plan needs to be developed to determine what type of facility ought to be accommodated and how it can be developed over time as the population grows.

Scenario: *Notre Dame and Club Eclipse '79 Merger*

What: Merge Notre Dame with Club Eclipse '79.

Why: The development of shared space could enhance programming and better serve the population with both organizations housed within one centre. Given the recent renovation of the Notre Dame facility, the seniors programming could be accommodated within the centre without the need for additional expansion.

How: Discussions need to take place between the two organizations.

Scenario: *New South St. Vital Facility*

What: Build a new facility somewhere in the south central area of the city to accommodate the residential expansion associated with South St. Vital.

Why: It is expected that following the completion of Royalwood and Sage Creek developments there will be pressure to accommodate additional growth south of the perimeter in South St. Vital. Development of a facility in this location could also serve the Fort Garry South area. However, it is recognized that this may be well toward the tail end of the study period.

How: Working with the Planning, Property and Development Department at the City of Winnipeg, the GCWCC should express its desire to be included in any long range development planning associated with this end of the city.

6. Moving Forward on Scenarios

Testing Feasibility

The scenarios are by no means certainties. Rather, they are early development proposals that have the potential to address areas of concern and move the District toward a more sustainable future with more contemporary facilities. At present, they represent areas of exploration. The feasibility of these scenarios remains to be tested. This could include anything from engineering studies to public consultation. Furthermore, rationalization with the City's RLLF Policy is required in most cases.

Sharing Governance

Decisions on the scenarios have been made in the context of what is best for the District as a whole. In many cases, it is anticipated that facilities would be shared among centres.

This remains to be resolved but may take the form of a shared governance model for District facilities or a shared use agreement among centres to ensure equitable access to a new facility (eg. a full-size gym, an indoor soccer pitch, etc.).

Reviewing Boundaries

When any of the scenarios becomes a real project, it may be necessary for the GCWCC to undertake a boundary review in light of the changes to facilities (closures, mergers, expansions) or in response to population growth and the addition of a new facility.

7. Addressing Overall Priorities

Priority No.1: Develop facilities to meet current and future needs

This priority is primarily in response to the rapid growth that has occurred in the District over the past decade or so, particularly in East St. Boniface and South St. Vital, and the projections for continued rapid growth over the next two decades in those two clusters plus Fort Garry South. There is a sense that current facilities have not kept pace and continued growth will only exacerbate the problem. The very low SPR, at least in East St. Boniface (0.84), validates the point. The three project proposals brought forward in 2006 to expand Winakwa, Southdale, and Dakota each intended to address this concern as do the four additional proposals described introduced in this District Plan.

Priority No. 2: Support mergers between facilities

The success of the Norberry-Glenlee merger has paved the way for additional, similar considerations. The result will show how the community can be better served with a newer, more contemporary facility while respecting the City's RLLF policy that is intended to promote the long-term sustainability of the community centre model in Winnipeg. The Plan 2025 process has promoted dialogue among centres and the District Community Centre Board is now in a position to play a leadership role in the promotion of a common philosophy and vision as the foundation for possible merger discussions.

Priority No. 3: Develop and sustain programs that meet community needs

The approach could be to pool resources on a district-wide basis to engage the services of a full-time qualified program development officer(s) that can lay the groundwork for more expansive programming to the point where volunteers can then deliver the programs. The planning work could be extensive, involving consultation with community groups, demographic research, and marketing.

APPENDIX

Summary of Other Service Providers (work in progress)

- Accueil Columbien
- Accueil Francophone
- Air Cadets
- Archwood School Family Centre
- Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain
- Cercle Molière
- Club Vive La Joie
- Collège Universitaire de Saint-Boniface
- Conseil Jeunesse
- Directorat de l'activité sportive du Manitoba
- École Precieux-Sang
- Ensemble de la folklorique Rivière-Rouge
- Féderation des ainés franco-manitobains
- Féderation provinciale des comités de parents Manitoba
- Frontenac School Family Centre
- Marion School Family Centre
- Marquis Dance Academy
- Panthers Gymnastics Club
- Parent Council Committees
- Prince of Peace Lutheran Church
- Promenade Dance Academy
- Scouts Canada
- Sportex
- St. Bartholomew Church
- Willowlake Baptist Church
- Windsor Park United Church

URBANEDGE
consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

PLAN 2025 PHASE 1

OVERVIEW AND DIRECTION



URBANEDGE consulting inc.

KGM CONSULTANTS INC.

FINAL JUNE 2, 2008

GCWCC Plan 2025

OVERVIEW AND DIRECTION

Contents

Executive Summary 5

A. Purpose and Background 9

1. The GCWCC 9
2. The RLLF Policy 9
3. The Plan 2025 Process and Philosophy 10
   a. Phase 1: Overview and Direction 10
   b. Phase 2: District Plans 11
4. The Planning Model 12
5. Planning Scope 12
   a. Facilities 12
   b. Population 14
6. Intended Outcomes 15

B. Planning Context 15

1. The Evolution of Recreation Services 15
   a. The Early Years – Early 1900s to 50s 15
   b. The Inputs Era – the 1960s and 70s 15
   c. The Outputs Era – the 1980s to mid 90s 16
   d. The Benefits Era – the mid 90s to the present 16
   e. The Outcomes Era – 2006 to 2016 and beyond 16
   f. Today's Reality 17
2. The Community Centre Model in Winnipeg 17
   a. Three Tiers of Community Centres 17
   b. The Governance Model 18
   c. Catchment Areas 19
3. Complementary Service Provision 19
   a. The City of Winnipeg 19
   b. Other Service Providers 20
4. Overview of Volunteers 20
   a. National Trends in Volunteerism 20
   b. Winnipeg Community Centre Volunteers 21
5. Overview of Programs 21
   a. Current Program Offerings 21
   b. Sport Participation 22
6. Overview of Facilities 22
   a. Community Centres 22
   b. City-run Facilities 24

C. Research and Analysis **24**
1. Demographics 24
   a. Population Growth 24
   b. Population Projections 25
   c. Net Migration 26
   d. Aboriginal Population 27
   e. Age Distribution 27
2. Space Planning 28
   a. Geographic Distribution 29
   b. Space to Population Ratios 31

D. Direction for District Planning **32**
1. A Vision for Community Centre Service Delivery 32
   a. Local Community Centres 32
   b. Neighbourhood Community Centres 32
   c. District Community Centres 33
   d. Guiding Principles 33
2. Targets for District Plans 34
3. Expectations for Process and Products 36
4. Addressing 2006 and 2007 37
5. Decision-making Model 38

List of Tables

Table 1: Community Centre Facilities by District (2005) 14
Table 2: Combined Facility Space as of 2005 14
Table 3: Eras of Recreation Services 15
Table 4: Summary of Volunteer Hours 21
Table 5: Summary of Program Offerings 22
Table 6: Participation in Community Centre Sport 22
Table 7: Community Centre Facility Overview 23
Table 8: Combined Facility Overview (GCWCC and City) 24
Table 9: Aboriginal Population in Winnipeg 2005 and 2025 27
Table 10: Age Distribution 2005, 2015, 2025 28
Table 11: Dwelling Unit and Population Forecast 2005-2025 29
Table 12: Accommodating Population Growth to 2025 30
Table 13: Space to Population Ratios as of 2005 31
Table 14: Amount of Space to Plan For City-Wide to 2025 34
Table 15: Current and Projected Space to Population Ratios 35
Table 16: Amount of Space to Plan For by District to 2025 36
Table 17: Community Centre Facilities 2005 and 2008 37

List of Charts

Chart 1: Winnipeg Population Growth 1987 to 2005 25
Chart 2: Winnipeg Population Growth and Forecast 1987 to 2025 25

Chart 3: Winnipeg Migration Actual and Forecast 1987 to 2025 26
Chart 4: Decision-Making Model 39

List of Maps

Map 1: Community Centre Districts 11
Map 2: Combined Facility Distribution 2005 13

List of Appendices

Appendix A: The Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy 41
Appendix B: Process and Timeline: Phase 1 and Phase 2 49
Appendix C: Comprehensive Facility List by District, 2005 50
Appendix D: Changes in Facilities Since 2005 by District 54
Appendix E: Future Residential Growth Scenario 2008-2020 (DRAFT) 57
Appendix F: Map of Neighbourhood Clusters and Catchment Areas 58

Abbreviations

GCWCC – General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
RLLF Policy – The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy (2005)
PUFS – Public Use Facilities Study (2004)
StatsCan – Statistics Canada
MBS – Manitoba Bureau of Statistics
UFF – Universal Funding Formula
L/S-W/K – Lord Selkirk West Kildonan
E/K-T – East Kildonan Transcona
CSD – Community Services Department, City of Winnipeg
FCI – Facilities Condition Index
SPR – Space to Population Ratio

Acknowledgement

While responsibility for planning for community centres rests with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), the work was greatly facilitated through the cooperation of the City of Winnipeg. The Departments of Community Services and Planning, Property and Development, as well as the Chief Administrative Officer's Secretariat contributed significantly to this effort. Additional assistance was provided by the Departments of Public Works and Corporate Services.

GCWCC Plan 2025
OVERVIEW AND DIRECTION

Executive Summary

Plan 2025

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to help:

- support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- guide the delivery of recreation programs
- direct the development of recreation facilities

for this, and the next, generation of users.

The RLLF Policy

One of the primary drivers of Plan 2025 is the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. The Policy states that the amount of square footage of recreation and leisure space per capita as of 2005 cannot be increased, recognizing that the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases.

The Starting Point

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005 and that year serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. At that time, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. These centres managed 100 facilities in total including 14 satellites, 13 indoor arenas, and 2 indoor soccer pitches. This translates into 972,066 square feet of space.

The restriction on square footage also applies to the City's 23 recreation and leisure facilities and 8 senior centres. This amounts to an additional 246,501 square feet of space. In order to properly plan for the community, both GCWCC governed facilities and City-run facilities have been considered.

The Planning Model

The approach taken by Plan 2025 is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



People

The base population of Winnipeg in 2005 was 647,600. This is forecasted to grow by 137,500 by the year 2025 resulting in a population of 785,100. This represents a growth rate of over 1% per year, more than double the rate experienced in the past few years.

As the population grows, it will also change. The three main considerations here are:

- The growth will be strongly influenced by a large influx in new immigrants, most of which are young adults between the ages of 25 and 44, many with young families.
- About 20% of Winnipeg's population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people with a median age significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, 25.6 versus 39.2 in 2005.
- Over 40% of the total increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500, will be in the age group of 60-74, 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

The distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50%, followed by District 2 with 20%, and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

Programs

It is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. As a result, community centres provide over 1100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listing and third party agreements.

Facilities

It can be said there are currently three types of community centres based upon the amenities they are able to provide.

- *Local Community Centres* are located in close walking proximity allowing families to take advantage of drop-in activities through the use of relatively small multi-purpose spaces. These centres tend to serve a population of under 5,000 residents.
- *Neighbourhood Community Centres* are more fully developed and may have larger gymnasiums, major athletic fields, large change rooms, multiple outdoor rinks, tennis courts, and multi-purpose space serving 5,000 to 15,000 residents.
- *District Community Centres* address the needs of structured sports while accommodating many other uses as well. Multiple outdoor athletic fields are often present. These centres tend to serve a large population of more than 15,000.

Vision

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership. The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

Targets for Planning

In 2005, the population of Winnipeg was served by an average of 1.88 square feet of recreation space per person. This includes the total heated square footage of community centre space plus the total square footage of City of Winnipeg recreation and leisure space and senior centres. This covers all of the facilities that are restricted by the RLLF policy. In other words, the 1.88 square feet per person of combined community centre, recreation and leisure centre, and senior centre space cannot increase over time.

The 1.88 square feet of space includes 1.50 square feet attributable to community centres and 0.38 square feet attributable to City recreation and leisure and senior facilities. While this is the average, the table below shows that not all areas of the city are equally served.

SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS (SPR) as of 2005

DISTRICT	2005 Population	CC Space (sq ft)	CC SPR	City Space (sq ft)	City SPR	Total Space (sq ft)	Total SPR
D1: City Centre	149,600	204,208	1.37	56,631	0.38	260,839	1.74
D2: Assiniboia	95,125	165,969	1.74	63,997	0.67	229,966	2.42
D3: Lord Selkirk West Kild	136,125	180,813	1.33	55,949	0.41	236,762	1.74
D4: East Kild Transcona	114,450	165,067	1.44	65,243	0.57	230,310	2.01
D5: Riel	152,300	256,009	1.68	4,681	0.03	260,690	1.71
Totals	**647,600**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1,218,567**	**1.88**

With a growth forecast of 137,500 people to the year 2025, maintaining a square foot to population ratio of 1.88 square feet per person would result in an additional 258,000 square feet of space – 206,000 of community centre space and 52,000 of City space.

While Plan 2025 is intended to provide direction for the 206,000 square feet of community centre space that can be added over time, proper planning requires that it do so in consideration of the use of the City managed space. Therefore, the District Plans that support this document also include proposals for the use of the City's allowance of 52,000 square feet of additional space.

AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR CITY-WIDE TO 2025

CITY-WIDE	Community Centres	City-Run Facilities	Combined Facilities
2005 Population: **647,600**			
2005 Space (sq ft)	972,066	246,501	1,218,567
2005 Space to Population Ratio	1.50	0.38	1.88
2025 Population: **785,100**	Based on a growth forecast of **137,500** people:		
2025 Space (sq ft)	1,177,650	298,338	1,475,988
2025 Space to Population Ratio	1.50	0.38	**1.88**
Additional space to plan for (rounded to nearest 000)	**206,000 sq ft**	**52,000 sq ft**	**258,000 sq ft**

The amount of additional space to plan for can be allocated to each district in a manner that would see all areas of the city equally served by the year 2025. Targets are shown in the following table.

Table 16: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR BY DISTRICT TO 2025

	Combined Space Allocation	Resulting SPR	Community Centre Target	City-Run Space Target
District 1: City Centre	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	258,000 sq ft	**1.88**	206,000 sq ft	52,000 sq ft

District Plans

Five District Plans will be produced. Each should contain:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, the recreation programs offered, the volunteer support provided, and the community centre facilities.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- An overview of roles and responsibilities of the various service providers in meeting the anticipated needs of the community.
- A series of strategies to address:
  - the future delivery of programs,
  - volunteer recruitment and retention,
  - facility development respecting the targets established above, and
  - governance.
- A series of recommendations for implementation acknowledging projects already approved since 2005, priority initiatives for the short term, and other initiatives to be addressed over the longer term.

GCWCC Plan 2025
OVERVIEW AND DIRECTION

A. Purpose and Background

Plan 2025 is the most ambitious planning exercise ever undertaken by the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres. It is intended to chart a course for the ongoing evolution of the community centre movement in a manner that meets the needs of the current and next generation of Winnipeggers.

This document constitutes Phase One of the planning exercise. It provides a framework for planning at the city-wide level while providing general direction and parameters for a series of five district plans that follow.

1. The GCWCC

The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) was established in 1971 when the 13 autonomous municipalities and the City of Winnipeg were amalgamated to form Unicity. The GCWCC is constituted through volunteers comprising an elected Executive Committee and a Representative Board.

Originally the GCWCC was formed to promote and encourage cooperation and communication among the community centres and city administration, and to provide a central council for the exchange of ideas and consideration of solutions to common problems. Over the past decade the GCWCC has experienced changes in its mandate and the responsibilities of the Council have increased substantially in such areas as leadership development, policy positions related to all aspects of the operation of community centres, as well as the administration of Municipal and Provincial grants.

Most recently, the GCWCC's mandate has been expanded through the City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities (RLLF) Policy to provide leadership in long range planning. This includes the development of a master plan for all community centres within the City and the administration of a $10 million dollar capital fund.

2. The RLLF Policy

The City of Winnipeg adopted the Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy in May 2005. The Policy provides direction for the provision and maintenance of recreation, leisure, and library facilities owned by the City of Winnipeg. See **Appendix A**.

The Policy includes the following components:

- A facility hierarchy that provides general guidance around the provision of facilities, including guidelines for facility to population ratios.
- Direction for existing facilities and for the introduction of new facility types.
- A stronger leadership mandate for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres to optimize the community centre model in Winnipeg.
- A commitment to sustaining existing, programmable recreation and leisure square footage while encouraging a reconfiguration of facilities over time.

- A commitment to consultation.
- A commitment to a 'managed care' level of maintenance for new facilities and, where possible, for existing facilities.
- A reinvestment strategy.

As stated in the Policy, the outcome is intended to be:
"…a community empowered to reconfigure its recreation, leisure, and library facilities in a way that is more responsive to local needs, leading to a more contemporary and financially sustainable mix of facilities."

For long-range planning purposes, the most important concept within the Policy is the commitment to sustain existing, programmable recreation and leisure square footage. The concept of sustainability is explained to mean the amount of recreation and leisure space currently provided, per capita, to the citizens of Winnipeg will not be increased. So, if a community centre has plans to increase in size, other space of equal size elsewhere within the system must be given up in return.

This concept is intended to encourage the rationalization of space in order to promote the long-term financial sustainability of the system overall. It applies to all community centres as well as the City-run recreation and leisure facilities and senior centres. Consequently, these facilities are addressed jointly within Plan 2025.

The exception to the rule is to allow an increase in space in proportion to 'real' population growth. 'Real' population growth is understood to mean the net overall increase in population for the City of Winnipeg. While the amount of square footage of space per capita is to be sustained over time, the amount of actual space will increase as the population increases. This point is a significant driver for the plan that follows.

To meet the intent of the Policy, it must be determined:
- how much square footage of recreation and leisure space is currently available per capita in Winnipeg;
- what is the anticipated growth for the city over the length of the plan;
- how much additional space can be planned for in the system as a result of this growth; and
- how and where should this additional space be accommodated to best serve the needs of the community.

The RLLF Policy provides the GCWCC with a leadership mandate in implementing the policy, essentially empowering the GCWCC to address these questions through long-term planning. As stated in the policy, the GCWCC's mandate is to strengthen and optimize the community centre model in Winnipeg.

3. The Plan 2025 Process and Philosophy

a. Phase One: Overview and Direction

The planning process has been divided into two phases. Phase One, resulting in this document, provides an overview of the task and direction for more detailed planning by

district. It provides background information, establishes parameters, and clarifies expectations for more detailed planning that follows in Phase Two.

The Phase One process was guided by a Steering Committee comprising three representatives of the GCWCC and three representatives of the City of Winnipeg. This was done to ensure that planning efforts acknowledged both jurisdictions when reviewing the people, programs, and facilities that drive the provision of recreation services to the citizens of Winnipeg. The Steering Committee acted in an advisory capacity to the GCWCC Executive and Board, recommending approval of the Phase One Report. An outline of the Process and Timeline is attached as **Appendix B**.

b. Phase Two: District Plans

As shown in Map 1, the boundaries of the Community Centre Districts (shown in colour) are quite closely aligned with the City of Winnipeg's political community boundaries (outlined with black lines). It should be noted that there are large tracts of industrial and undeveloped lands within these boundaries that are not allocated to the districts. However, for the purposes of Plan 2025, the entire city is considered in order to properly consider growth over the next twenty years.

Map 1: COMMUNITY CENTRE DISTRICTS



The five District Plans that accompany this report were undertaken simultaneously. Each District Plan includes a comprehensive review of the current situation within the district including an examination of the breadth of programs offered, an assessment of the volunteer base, and a facility review, centre by centre and for the district overall. The needs of the district to the year 2025 are determined and strategies are put in place for

addressing these needs considering current service levels, anticipated growth, societal trends, and demographic changes.

Each District Plan concludes with recommendations for program distribution, volunteer recruitment and retention, and facility development, acknowledging current projects and initiatives while identifying new ones on a priority basis.

4. The Planning Model

The philosophy behind the following research is simple: people drive programs and programs drive facilities. That is, one cannot plan for facilities without an understanding of the programs that are intended to be delivered through those facilities and one cannot understand the nature of the programs without understanding the needs of the people.



As a result, the plan includes demographic projections and analysis in an attempt to anticipate the needs of the next generation. It then translates the needs into new and enhanced programs and provides direction for the reconfiguration of recreation and leisure space in a manner deemed necessary to properly deliver the programs.

5. Planning Scope

a. Facilities

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005 and that year serves as the starting point for Plan 2025. In 2005, the GCWCC governed 71 community centres. Twelve of these centres operated more than one facility, identified as satellites (with 2 of the 12 operating 2 satellites each). As well, 13 community centres had indoor arenas, 3 of which have 2 ice surfaces for a total of 16 indoor rinks, and two community centres had an indoor soccer facility.

It was deemed critically important that the planning process be undertaken in concert with the City of Winnipeg.

Under the current service delivery model, the provision of recreation programs is undertaken across both jurisdictions with the GCWCC responsible for community centre programming and the City responsible for programs delivered through comparable City-run facilities. While there are presently instances of cooperation between the two, joint planning could lead to a stronger partnership in recreation programming.

Map 2: Combined Facility Distribution 2005



City of Winnipeg
Community Centres & Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg) - 2005

Legend

- Community Centre (GCWCC)
- Recreation Facilities (City of Winnipeg)
- Community Centre Catchment Boundary
- City Limit
- Rivers

0 1 2 3
Kilometers

URBANEDGE consulting inc.
KGM CONSULTANTS INC.
May 1, 2008

Table 1: COMMUNITY CENTRE FACILITIES by DISTRICT (2005)					
DISTRICT	Community Centres	Satellites	Arenas	Indoor Soccer	Total Facilities
District 1: City Centre	15	3	1	0	19
District 2: Assiniboia	13	4	2	0	19
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	15	6	2	1	24
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	13	0	2	1	16
District 5: Riel	15	1	6	0	22
Totals	**71**	**14**	**13**	**2**	**100**

Source: General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres

Both sets of facilities are intended to conform to the RLLF Policy of sustaining square footage. In the case of City-run facilities, the Policy applies to its recreation and leisure facilities and senior centres. This includes 22 recreation and leisure centres, 8 senior centres, and 1 indoor arena that also provides recreation and leisure programming. The full list of facilities is provided in **Appendix C**.

Table 2: COMBINED FACILITY SPACE as of 2005			
DISTRICT	Community Centres (sq ft)	City-Run Facilities (sq ft)	Combined Square Footage
District 1: City Centre	204,208	56,631	260,839
District 2: Assiniboia	165,969	63,997	229,966
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	180,813	55,949	236,762
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	165,067	65,243	230,310
District 5: Riel	256,009	4,681	260,690
Totals	**972,066**	**246,501**	**1,218,567**

Source: Derived from City of Winnipeg information

b. Population

The base population for planning purposes is the estimated city-wide population in 2005 as determined by the City of Winnipeg. It should be noted that the City number is obtained from Statistics Canada. The Stats Can methodology begins with the Census count and adds a calculated allowance (in this case 2.8%) to account for homeless persons as well as those individuals who did not respond to the Census.

This results in a base population of 647,600 which has been distributed across community centre districts as follows.

District 1: City Centre Fort Rouge	149,583
District 2: St. James Assiniboia	95,138
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	136,134
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,448
District 5: Riel	152,296
City Total:	*647,600*

The base population is important in that the policy guiding the planning process establishes facility space to population ratios.

6. Intended Outcomes

In the end, Plan 2025, comprising the Overview and Direction and the five District Plans, is intended to generate three significant outcomes:

- The plan should help support and sustain a volunteer base for recreation services
- The plan should help guide the delivery of recreation programs
- The plan should help direct the development of recreation facilities

…for this, and the next, generation of users.

B. Planning Context

1. The Evolution of Recreation Services

As shown in **Table 3**, recreation development in Manitoba and Canada can be captured in terms of five broad "Eras".

Table 3: ERAS OF RECREATION SERVICES

Era	Time Frame	Characteristics
The Early Years:	Early 1900s to 50s	Growing public support for recreation and parks
Inputs Era	1960s and 70s	New infrastructure and programs
Outputs Era	1980s to mid 90s	Users, efficiencies, management
Benefits Era	mid 1990s to present	Benefits messages, a broadened role, partners
Outcomes Era	2006 to 2016 and beyond	Benefit-based outcomes, public goods, integrated approaches

Source: Trends in Canada 2006, BCRPA and ARPA

a. The Early Years – Early 1900s to 50s

In the early years, recreation programming occurred in community halls, church basements, and on playing fields and parks. The vast majority of these activities were self-developed by volunteer organizations such as sport clubs, the YMCA and YWCA, churches, and ethnic organizations while governments tended to focus on the provision of parks.

By the 1950s, the development of more formal approaches to recreation services arose as the post-War birth rate soared. Early leaders, many trained as physical education instructors in the Armed Services, began to look at broader approaches to school physical education and community services.

b. The Inputs Era – the 1960s and 70s

The recreation system evolved rapidly in the 1960s as the birth rate continued to soar. The early emphasis was on children and youth services and the facilities tended to be single-purpose sport-oriented structures. The 1967 Canadian Centennial and Pan Am Games brought a major surge of facility construction projects and, by the late 1960s,

recreation services had broadened to be more inclusive of both genders and all age groups.

By the end of the 70s, most new indoor community recreation facilities combined a number of spaces within multi-purpose complexes and the diversity of programs broadened. Community leadership emerged strongly at this time with a belief that recreation services are best offered through a partnership with the community.

c. The Outputs Era – the 1980s to the mid 90s

The recession of the early 1980s led to fiscal restraint and budget reductions among all levels of government. Civic departments and not-for-profit agencies embraced strategic planning and other management tools to help them become more effective and efficient. An emphasis on the fiscal bottom line led to the elimination of some beneficial services. In many instances, recovery rates, client retention, and profit margins became the key measures to maintain or justify recreation services.

In the early 1990s, the Recreation and Parks Federation of Ontario developed the first "Benefits Catalogue" to convince elected officials that recreation and parks services provide significant personal, social, environmental, and economic benefits.

d. The Benefits Era – the mid 1990s to the present

A new Benefits Catalogue developed in 1997 included eight key outcome messages including:

- Recreation and active living are essential to personal health;
- Recreation is a key to balanced human development;
- Recreation and parks are essential to quality of life;
- Recreation reduces self-destructive and anti-social behaviour;
- Recreation and parks build strong families and healthy communities;
- Recreation reduces health care, social service, and police/justice costs;
- Recreation and parks are significant economic generators; and
- Parks, open space, and natural areas are essential to ecological survival.

The benefits message was increasingly used as a planning tool and began to form the core philosophy of parks and recreation departments.

e. The Outcomes Era – 2006 to 2016 and beyond

The 1992 and 1997 Benefits Catalogues have helped leaders become more outcomes focused and have broadened the parks and recreation mandate from the delivery of traditional services to the creation of individual and community benefits. More recently, the shift has been toward using the Benefits approach as a key planning and evaluation tool.

Political decision-makers are increasingly demanding that their departments measure and demonstrate their impact on the community. As governments continue to grapple with fiscal restraint, there is a greater focus on demonstrating that plans and resources are leading to desired results.

f. Today's Reality

The most important lesson from the past is the understanding of benefits and the associated importance of measurable outcomes in sustaining services. This lesson has shaped the recreation field today including:

- Seeing health as part of the recreation mandate and initiating active living strategies;
- Creating more partnerships around working with at-risk youth, including networking with the police, justice, and social services;
- Being more inclusive of children and families living in poverty and working with diverse cultures;
- Developing stronger internal partnerships with planning and engineering departments in creating active transportation systems, resulting in both health and environmental benefits; and
- Reaching out more proactively to other service providers to look for collaborative approaches and strategies.

2. The Community Centre Model in Winnipeg

a. Three Tiers of Community Centres

The initial intent of community centres was to provide a venue to run community sport leagues as well as to provide programming for children and youth. In the late 1970s, an emphasis was placed on the importance of community centres to provide alternative programming for all residents within the area they served. Today, we see our centres providing a diversity of programming that could include cultural, educational, fitness and sport programs, as well as a multitude of leisure and drop in activities.

Local Community Centres

A local community centre generally serves a population base of fewer than 5,000 people. The close proximity of the centre allows families to walk or bike to take part in programs. Indoor amenities might include a small hall, change rooms, washrooms and a small canteen. Outdoor amenities normally include one or two rinks, athletic fields, a play structure and perhaps a wading pool.

Neighbourhood Community Centres

A neighbourhood community centre would normally be larger than a local community centre and therefore have more amenities to provide additional programs. Neighbourhood centres ideally serve a population of approximately 15,000 people. These centres might include a gymnasium, a medium size hall or multi-purpose room and a fully operational kitchen and canteen. There may be additional site amenities that could include tennis courts, basketball courts, and sand volleyball courts.

District Community Centres

District Community Centres are a more recent phenomenon, having been developed in the past decade, with specific targets to address the needs of hockey, indoor soccer, lawn bowling, day care/nursery school space, multi-use space, and specific youth and adult

programming. Further, skateboard parks, outdoor basketball courts, tennis courts, and multiple athletic fields for baseball, soccer, and football are part of these district centres.

The centres tend to be distributed on a district basis and serve a broader population of more than 15,000. Often, transportation is required to participate at these centres due to the type of participant required and/or the nature of the programs.

Programming for District Community Centres includes ice sports and public skating, indoor soccer, indoor lawn bowling, volleyball, summer sports (football, baseball, softball), nursery school, fitness programming for adults, seniors programming (cards and floor curling), sport camps, large scale special events and carnivals, and many third party uses including Girl Guides, Boy Scouts, social functions, etc.

b. The Governance Model

Community centres are governed and operated by a volunteer Board of Directors elected by the local community. A representative of each community centre sits on a District Board of Community Centres. The District Board also includes a representative from the City of Winnipeg's Community Services Department, ex-officio.

The major purpose of the District Board is to discuss common concerns of the community centres and to react to new policies, procedures, reports, as well as facilitate leadership/training development. The District Board has representation on the GCWCC Board.

Community centres are funded via the City of Winnipeg's policy called the Universal Funding Formula (UFF) and supported through a grant established for programming. The essence of the UFF grant is to pay for 'heated square footage' of community centres and establishes responsibilities for first line maintenance to be provided by the community centre while acknowledging second line maintenance to be provided by the City of Winnipeg. The UFF also considers the population served by each centre and provides funding for the operation of outdoor rinks.

While the community centre facilities are governed by volunteer boards, the City of Winnipeg owns and insures the facilities. The role and responsibilities of the City and the individual community centres regarding facility maintenance and operation is outlined in a Management Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and the GCWCC/Community Centres and further defined in the UFF.

c. Catchment Areas

Each community centre has specific geographic boundaries that comprise their respective membership. Generally speaking, these 'catchment areas' are defined by major transportation routes, rivers, and/or historical neighbourhood areas. As a result there is considerable discrepancy in relative size. Catchment areas range in size from a population base of 585 and 1,100 in South Transcona and Wildwood respectively, to 22,975 and 17,975 in Maples and Dakota respectively. The 71 community centres (as of 2005) and their associated catchment areas cover the entire residential portion of the city.

Catchment areas are regularly revisited. If a community centre closes, the population comprising its catchment area is redistributed to neighbouring centres. If a new residential area emerges, its population is assigned to an adjoining catchment area which may trigger further adjustments to other catchments.

While there is not a hard and fast rule to this effect, it is generally recognized that a catchment area with 15,000 residents provides a solid base from which to build a core volunteer base, support the delivery of a variety of programs, and sustain a good quality facility. Of Winnipeg's 71 community centres, 60 had a catchment of less than 15,000 and 11 had a catchment area greater than 15,000. The average catchment size is 8,569 residents. For more detail, refer to **Appendix C**.

The boundaries of each community centre are recommended by the District Community Centre Board and approved by the GCWCC and are endorsed by the City of Winnipeg's Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. The boundaries of the five districts, meanwhile, are expected to align with the City of Winnipeg's political community boundaries. This is in accordance with a policy adopted by the City's Executive Policy Committee.

3. Complementary Service Provision

a. The City of Winnipeg

Many City-run facilities mirror community centre operations governed by the GCWCC. For example, the operations of the City-run Fort Rouge Leisure Centre are very similar to the volunteer-operated River Heights Community Centre (with a rink, gymnasium, seniors area, culture program area). These are the facilities that will be looked at most closely through the Plan 2025 process and generally include recreation and leisure centres and senior centres, 31 facilities altogether.

This parallel service delivery model has evolved over time, without any formal agreement between the GCWCC and the City. Generally speaking, though not always the case, facilities run by the City tend to be those in higher needs areas, often where it is difficult to sustain a community governance model.

Both organizations are committed to working cooperatively in meeting the expanding need of community residents and strive to avoid duplication. For example, there are cases (eg. Weston CC) where the GCWCC has had to take over operations of a community centre because the community centre could no longer sustain a volunteer base.

b. Other Service Providers

There are a number of other major organizations that provide sport and recreational services including the YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, Seniors Groups, Churches, Cultural Associations, School Divisions, Universities, private not-for-profit agencies, and private for-profit organizations. Through the District Planning process, efforts will be made to identify and acknowledge the roles of these various organizations in delivering recreation and leisure programs to the community particularly where there is a potential impact on services delivered through community centres.

Sport programming is generally managed by the sport association while being programmed through the community centre facility. This partnership can be mutually beneficial. Of note are the Winnipeg Minor Basketball Association,, the Winnipeg Minor Volleyball Association and the Winnipeg Youth Soccer Association. These associations have had a tremendously positive impact in providing alternative activities to hockey and ringette during the winter months.

4. Overview of Volunteers

a. National Trends in Volunteerism

The following outlines a number of trends and statistics reported by Imagine Canada as part of their "National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating":

- 11% of Canadians account for 77% of all volunteer hours
- 27% of Canadians (ages 15 and over) volunteer
- 18% of volunteer efforts (1.7 million volunteers) are in sport and recreation, the highest area of commitment for all volunteer efforts
- on average, each volunteer provides 122 hours per year
- 7% of volunteers provide 73% of the volunteer time and effort
- 95% volunteer because they "believe in the cause", the #1 motivator
- 81% volunteer to make use of their skills and experiences, the #2 motivator
- 69% of Canadians who don't volunteer say it is due to lack of time.

Some trends include:

- More specific tasks along with shorter duration is key; further skill acquisition and potential 'resume-building' is a focus for younger adults entering into the job market.
- New requirements concerning some volunteering (police checks, First Aid and Safety training; cultural sensitivity, etc.)
- Greater liability concerns, eg. legal and fiduciary responsibilities as a Board Director.

b. Winnipeg Community Centre Volunteers

Winnipeg is known as the volunteer capital of Canada and volunteers have been the backbone of the community centre movement since the Post War Era. As shown in **Table 4**, it is estimated that approximately 10,000 volunteers devoted over 1.2 million hours to the community centre movement in 2005. That has been the standard, sustained effort since the early 60s.

Taking the national averages for volunteering, how does Winnipeg measure up and what may be the implications to the Community Centre movement?

- some 175,500 residents (27%) could be involved in volunteer efforts overall;
- some 31,500 residents (18% of volunteers) could be volunteering in sport and recreation; and
- some 700 community centre volunteers (7%) of volunteers give 73% of volunteer effort.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF VOLUNTEER HOURS				
District	**Population**	**# of Centres**	**Volunteer Hours**	**Estimated Volunteers** (derived from national avg.)
District 1: City Centre	149,583	15	250,123	2,050
District 2: Assiniboia	95,138	13	213,478	1,750
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	136,134	15	150,932	1,250
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,448	13	283,799	2,350
District 5: Riel	152,296	15	318,529	2,600
Total	**647,600**	**71**	**1,216,861**	**10,000**

Source: General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres

The sustainability of the community centre movement clearly rests on the shoulders of the volunteer boards of the community centres. To promote sound practices, the GCWCC has developed programs and services that provide leadership development, financial accountability and training, governance support with standard constitutions, board orientation and training, workplace health and safety, as well as support with administrative matters such as job descriptions, labour relations, and so forth.

5. Overview of Programs

a. Current Program Offerings

Combined, community centres provide over 1100 programs to the citizens of Winnipeg. The program offerings are wide-ranging from sport to recreation, spanning all ages from "cradle to grave", including indoor and outdoor programs, cultural programs, social programs, fitness programs, as well as a comprehensive special events listing and third party agreements.

Table 5 provides a snapshot of programs by District based on self-reporting for the 2005-06 programming year.

Table 5: SUMMARY OF PROGRAM OFFERINGS (05-06)					
District	**Population**	**# of Centres**	**# of Programs**	**Avg Programs per CC**	**Program Hours**
District 1: City Centre	149,583	15	350	23	52,534
District 2: Assiniboia	95,138	13	163	13	29,929
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	136,134	15	198	14	39,002
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	114,448	13	157	12	25,737
District 5: Riel	152,296	15	277	18	65,663
Total	**647,600**	**71**	**1,145**	**16**	**213,865**

Source: General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres

b. Sport Participation

At all community centre levels, sport leagues govern the operation of most sports including hockey, soccer, baseball, softball, ringette, and lacrosse. Community centres

assist with the operation of sport leagues by facilitating registration and access to facilities including athletic fields, ice rinks, soccer complexes, and dry-land training spaces. Perhaps more importantly, the volunteers that drive the sport leagues are generally community centre volunteers. **Table 6** shows those figures as they apply to sports that tend to operate out of community centres.

Table 6: PARTICPATION IN COMMUNITY CENTRE SPORT

	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
SPORT	Participants	Volunteers	Participants	Volunteers	Participants	Volunteers	Participants	Volunteers
Baseball	2,747	757	2,924	795	2,869	746	2,824	767
Basketball	9,337	1,130	8,551	1,155	8,551	1,155	10,075	1,266
Hockey	12,406	2,552	12,904	2,552	12,094	2,552	12,904	2,552
Lacrosse	1,397	204	1,426	207	1,388	195	1,322	164
Ringette	9,633	521	6,574	533	6,574	559	1,678	528
Soccer	28,192	1,762	31,190	1,725	28,643	1,552	31,661	2,139
Softball	58,903	859	51,285	878	49,525	979	55,196	885
Tennis	2,092	89	1,665	82	1,660	46	1,721	42
Volleyball	9,880	244	10,030	252	10,349	252	9,705	256
TOTALS	**134,554**	**8,118**	**126,549**	**8,179**	**121,653**	**8,036**	**127,086**	**8,599**

Source: Sport Manitoba

6. Overview of Facilities

   a. Community Centres

In each of the 13 municipalities that existed prior to Unicity there were different standards and different opportunities for facilities to be developed as community centres. As a result, large discrepancies among centres arose.

The variance in facility space to population ratio along with funding requirements was acknowledged by the City in the 1980s. An extensive process was undertaken in cooperation with the GCWCC to address these challenges. However, the report produced was never adopted and the discrepancies among centres continued to grow. While many community centres struggled to maintain their existing facility, other centres with strong volunteer capacity pursued extensive redevelopment and expansion plans which only served to exacerbate the inconsistent approach to program delivery.

The square footage shown in **Table 7** is the heated square footage of the facilities. This does not include such things as outdoor storage sheds, nor does it include indoor ice surfaces, indoor soccer pitches or adjacent stands., (although the change rooms and washrooms are included). The full list of community centre facilities with Facility Condition Index and Preservation Needs is provided as **Appendix C**.

The space to population ratio simply divides the amount of heated square footage by the population of the district. The result shows the amount of community centre space per person and ranges from a high of 1.74 square feet per person in District 2 to a low of 1.33

square feet per person in District 3. The city average is 1.50 square feet per person of community centre space.

Table 7: COMMUNITY CENTRE FACILITY OVERVIEW

District	# of Centres	# of Facilities	Heated Square Footage	Space to Pop Ratio	Facility Condition Index	Preservation Needs (2004)
District 1: City Centre	15	19	204,208	1.37	0.34	$7.835
District 2: Assiniboia	13	19	165,969	1.74	0.49	$8.949
District 3: L/S-W/K	15	24	180,813	1.33	0.39	$11.052
District 4: E/K-T	13	16	165,067	1.44	0.34	$7.389
District 5: Riel	15	22	256,009	1.68	0.18	$8.235
Total	**71**	**100**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**0.34**	**$43.460 M**

Source: General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres and the City of Winnipeg (Public Use Facilities Study)

The RLLF Policy requires that this average number remain constant into the future which means the amount of heated square feet of space in the system can only increase in proportion to population increase.

Preservation needs refer to the capital and maintenance costs required for the facility over a 10 year period, that is, from 2004-2014. This was based on a 'managed care' scenario which is best described as bringing the facilities to a reasonable or average state of repair. It should be noted that construction costs have risen significantly since 2004 when these estimates were done.

The Facility Condition Index (FCI) represents a ratio that takes the preservation needs and divides it by the replacement value. The lower the number, the better. An FCI of 0.50 would mean that the investment required in the facility over the next 10 years would equal half the replacement value of the facility.

According to the PUFS, the average Facility Condition Index (FCI) for these facilities was 0.34 in 2004 requiring some $43,460,000 of preservation needs to be addressed. This ranged from a low of 0.18 in District 5 (Riel) to a high of 0.49 in District 2 (Assiniboia).

b. City-run Facilities

For planning purposes, it must be recognized that each district is serviced by more than its community centres. The complementary facilities and programs run by the City of Winnipeg should be considered when planning for the long-term needs of the community. While Plan 2025 is intended to provide direction for community centres, proper planning requires that it do so in consideration of the use of the City managed space.

In 2005, the population of Winnipeg was served by an average of 1.88 square feet of recreation space per person. This includes the total heated square footage of community centre space plus the total square footage of City of Winnipeg recreation and leisure space and senior centres. This covers all of the facilities that are restricted by the RLLF

policy. In other words, the 1.88 square feet per person of combined community centre, recreation and leisure centre, and senior centre space cannot increase over time.

Table 8: COMBINED FACILITY SPACE as of 2005

DISTRICT	Community Centres	City-Run Facilities	Combined Square Footage	Combined Space to Pop Ratio
District 1: City Centre	204,208	56,631	260,839	1.74
District 2: Assiniboia	165,969	63,997	229,966	2.42
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	180,813	55,949	236,762	1.74
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	165,067	65,243	230,310	2.01
District 5: Riel	256,009	4,681	260,690	1.71
Totals	**972,066**	**246,501**	**1,218,567**	**1.88**

Source: City of Winnipeg

As shown in **Table 8** the 1.88 square feet of space includes 972,066 square feet attributable to community centres and 246,501 square feet attributable to City recreation and leisure and senior facilities. The table also shows that not all areas of the city are equally served. From this combined view, the amount of space per person changes considerably in each of the districts ranging now from a high of 2.42 square feet per person in District 2 to a low of 1.71 square feet per person in District 5.

C. Research and Analysis

This research attempts to provide a basic understanding of the variable nature of the community over the next twenty years (the planning horizon) and translates that understanding into general parameters for program delivery. This information will be fine-tuned district by district through the district planning process.

The RLLF Policy was adopted in 2005. Therefore, the following research and analysis uses that date, 2005, as the base year wherever possible. The twenty-year planning horizon (a generation of time) extends from that point to the year 2025.

1. Demographics

The profile of the Winnipeg community is expected to look considerably different in the year 2025 from what it looked like in 2005. The nature of these differences provides insight into the delivery of recreation services to the community in the future. These changes in particular need to be examined in some detail: the magnitude and distribution of the population growth over the next twenty years, the cultural make-up of the population as a result of a growing immigrant and aboriginal population, and the age distribution within the population.

a. Population Growth

Through the 1980s, Winnipeg's population grew by an average of 0.9% per year. During the 1990s, however, things changed. From 1991 to 2001, Winnipeg's population grew from 615,215 to 619,544, a near stagnant growth rate of less than one tenth of one percent per year, the result of the decline in natural growth (births minus deaths) together with a negative trend in net migration (more people leaving the city than coming to it).

Chart 1: Winnipeg Population Growth 1987-2005
Source: The City of Winnipeg



As shown in **Chart 1**, Winnipeg appears to have resumed its pattern of modest population growth. From 2001 to 2006, the population has grown at a rate of just under 0.5% per year. While this is a very modest growth rate, it is a significant turnaround from the rate experienced in the 1990s. The City of Winnipeg estimates the City's population to be 647,600 in 2005, our base year.

b. Population Projections

As shown in **Chart 2**, the latest projections predict the trend of resumed growth for Winnipeg will become more pronounced in the years ahead with an average annual growth rate of just over 1.0% over the next twenty years.

Chart 2: Winnipeg Population Growth and Forecast 1987-2025
Source: City of Winnipeg



Growth is a function of the natural increase in population (births minus deaths) and net migration (the result of people moving in and out of Winnipeg). The fertility rate across the country has been in decline for decades and now sits at approximately 1.5 children per woman (higher in Manitoba at approximately 1.8). As a result, it is

projected there will be a continued decline in natural increase (births minus deaths). However, this loss will be offset by rising net migration.

By the year 2025, the population of Winnipeg is expected to reach 785,100 which represents an increase of 137,500 or 21.2%. Not only is Winnipeg expected to grow at more than double the rate of the past few years, the growth will be attributed almost exclusively to net migration.

c. Net Migration

Net migration is the sum total of intra-provincial migration, that is, the movement of people within the province; inter-provincial migration, the movement of people between provinces; and international migration, the movement of people between countries. In recent years, there have been positive trends in all three areas, resulting in more people moving to Winnipeg and fewer people leaving.

Chart 3: Winnipeg Migration, Actual and Forecast

Source: The City of Winnipeg 'Population, Housing and Economic Forecasts for the Winnipeg CMA and the City of Winnipeg', September 2007



As shown in **Chart 3,** intra-provincial migration is expected to level off near zero and will have little or no impact on net migration.

A positive trend is evident for inter-provincial migration although Manitoba continues to lose people to other parts of the country. Projections to 2025 show that inter-provincial migration will decrease to a net loss of less than 1,000 people annually. It should be noted that the 'dip' that occurred from 2005-07 is considered an anomaly, the 'Alberta effect', and is attributable to the spike in oil prices.

The most dramatic and important difference in migration trends is the impact of international migration. Winnipeg's population gain from other countries was less than 2,000 in 1996. The forecast shows international migration rising quickly to 10,000 annually, resulting in a net migration of more than 8,700 per year.

The Manitoba government's Provincial Nominee Program is the primary factor behind this increase. With the help of this program, the number of immigrants to Manitoba doubled over a five-year period, from 3,700 in 2001 to 7,400 in 2005. A year later, in 2006, the Province's target of 10,000 was reached. Furthermore, new targets established by the Province could see the number double to 20,000 over the next 10 years. Winnipeg has tended to become the destination for about 80% of new immigrants to Manitoba.

With immigration as the dominant contributor to Winnipeg's future population growth, it is important to understand who these people are. The two top source countries are the Philippines and Germany. In 2004, 82% of adult immigrants were between the ages of 25 and 44, many with young families.

d. Aboriginal Population

With an estimated population of 60,800 in 2005, Winnipeg is home to Canada's largest urban aboriginal population based on self-identification. This includes persons who reported identifying, as part of the Census, with at least one Aboriginal group, that is, 'North American Indian', 'Métis', or 'Inuit (Eskimo)' and/or who reported being a Treaty Indian or a Registered Indian as defined by the Indian Act of Canada.

Table 9: ABORIGINAL POPULATION IN WINNIPEG 2005 and 2025

	Registered Indian	Metis	Other Aboriginal	Total Aboriginal	Non Aboriginal	Total Pop.
2005 estimate	26,800	29,300	4,600	**60,800**	589,400	650,200
2025 projection	51,700	39,900	7,400	**99,000**	730,300	829,300
Projected Growth	24,900	10,600	2,800	**38,200**	140,900	179,100
Projected % Growth	93%	36%	61%	**63%**	24%	28%
2005 Median Age	22.7	28.2	21.3	**25.6**	39.2	37.7
2025 Median Age	26.7	33.6	27.3	**29.3**	41.3	39.9

Source: Manitoba's Aboriginal Community: A 2001 to 2006 Population & Demographic Profile, Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, June 2007

The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics (MBS) develops projections based on what would occur in the future if recent trends were to continue. **Table 9** shows that the Aboriginal population could grow by 63% over the next twenty years as compared to a 24% growth for the non-Aboriginal population. In absolute numbers, about 20% of Winnipeg's population increase to 2025 will be made up of Aboriginal people (38,200 of 179,100).

It is important to note as well that the median age of the Aboriginal population is significantly younger than that of the non-Aboriginal population, 25.6 versus 39.2 in 2005. The gap will narrow slightly by the year 2025 with a median age of 29.3 for the Aboriginal population versus 41.3 for the non-Aboriginal population.

e. Age Distribution

The median age of Winnipeggers in 2005 was 37.7. By 2025, that number is expected to be 39.9. The aging baby boom generation (individuals born between 1947 and 1966) will

ensure that the transition into a larger senior population will occur quite quickly and dramatically.

Table 10: AGE DISTRIBUTION 2005, 2015, 2025

2005			2015			Change: 2005 to 2015		
Age	People	% of Pop	Age	People	% of Pop	Age	Increase	Inc in %
0-14	114,300	18%	0-14	114,800	16%	0-14	500	0%
15-29	139,700	22%	15-29	148,200	21%	15-29	8,500	6%
30-44	142,600	22%	30-44	147,300	21%	30-44	4,700	3%
45-59	136,600	21%	45-59	145,200	21%	45-59	8,600	6%
60-74	67,900	10%	60-74	97,100	14%	60-74	29,200	43%
75+	46,500	7%	75+	47,100	7%	75+	600	1%
	647,600			**699,700**			**52,100**	**8%**

2005			2025			Change: 2005 to 2025		
Age	People	% of Pop	Age	People	% of Pop	Age	Increase	Inc in %
0-14	114,300	18%	0-14	131,600	17%	0-14	17,300	15%
15-29	139,700	22%	15-29	154,800	20%	15-29	15,100	11%
30-44	142,600	22%	30-44	173,900	22%	30-44	31,300	22%
45-59	136,600	21%	45-59	143,800	18%	45-59	7,200	5%
60-74	67,900	10%	60-74	124,400	16%	60-74	56,500	83%
75+	46,500	7%	75+	56,600	7%	75+	10,100	22%
	647,600			**785,100**			**137,500**	**21%**

Source: The City of Winnipeg, 'Population, Housing and Economic Forecasts for the Winnipeg CMA and the City of Winnipeg', September 2007, and the Conference Board of Canada, Long-Term Demographic and Economic Forecast for Winnipeg's Census Metropolitan Area, June 2007

Table 10 shows the changes that are expected to occur in age distribution comparing 2005 with 2015 and 2025. Looking firstly at the mid-term year of 2015, the population is expected to increase by 8% overall or by 52,100 people. However, more than half of this increase, 29,200 people, will be in the age group of 60-74 as many of the baby boomers begin to enter this category. And while the population is increasing, the number of children in 2015 between the ages of 0-14 will hardly change from what it was in 2005.

Looking further ahead to the year 2025, the baby boom impact continues. By then, nearly all the boomers will be in the 60+ category. Over 40% of the total increase in population, that is, 56,500 of the 137,500, will be in the age group of 60-74. This represents 83% more people in that age group than there are today.

Meanwhile, the children of the baby boomers will now be in the 30-44 age group and the 22% increase in that population reflects the mini-boom that they represent. Their children, in turn, are reflected in the rise in the 0-14 population.

2. Space Planning

The RLLF Policy includes "a commitment to sustaining existing, programmable recreation and leisure square footage while encouraging a reconfiguration of facilities over time". This component of the Policy applies not only to community centres but to the City's

recreation and leisure centres and its senior centres. Taken together, the total combined amount of space should not exceed the total square foot to population ratio in existence at the time the Policy was adopted in 2005.

Furthermore, for proper planning to be done, it must be determined how well served a community is today in order to plan appropriately for tomorrow. Current service levels are best determined by looking at both community centre and City-run programs and facilities. Consequently, the following analysis includes both community centre space and City-run space.

a. Geographic Distribution

Table 11 translates the forecasted growth of 137,500 people by the year 2025 into single family and multiple family housing units (apartments, townhouses, etc.) on a city-wide basis.

Table 11: DWELLING UNIT AND POPULATION FORECAST 2005-2025

	2006-07	2008-25	Total
Single Family Dwelling Permits	3,449	35,120	38,569
Multiple Family Dwelling Permits	466	27,260	27,726
Total Residential Units	**3,915**	**62,380**	**66,295**
Single Family Population (household = 2.4)	8,278	84,288	93,000
Multiple Family Population (household = 1.6)	746	43,616	44,500
Total Population Increase	**9,023**	**127,904**	**137,500**

Source: Derived from the Conference Board of Canada, Long-Term Demographic and Economic Forecast for Winnipeg's Census Metropolitan Area, June 2007 and from building permit summaries, the City of Winnipeg.

Because the population is aging, the Conference Board of Canada forecasts a greater demand in the future for multiple family dwellings. It estimates the demand from 2008 to 2025 to be for 35,120 single family dwellings and 27,260 multiple family dwellings for a total of 62,380 dwelling units.

Add to the forecasted demand the actual building permits for the years 2006 and 2007 and the total demand for the term of this plan (2005-25) is forecasted to be 38,569 single family dwellings and 27,726 multiple family dwellings for a total of 66, 295 dwelling units.

Using an estimated household size of 2.4 for single family dwellings and 1.6 for multiple family dwellings, the units get translated into 137,500 more people, which represent the growth forecasted for the year 2025. The next task is to estimate where and when this growth will occur.

Table 12 provides some insight. The 'Actual 06-07' column translates the building permits issued for 2006-2007 into population estimates. The next column provides an estimate of population growth in areas of the city currently designated for residential development. Draft estimates show the current amount of land designated for residential purposes could be depleted by the year 2020 (**Appendix E**).

Table 12: ACCOMMODATING POPULATION GROWTH TO 2025					
DISTRICT	Actual 06-07	Forecast to 2020	Shortfall	District Total	% of City
District 1: City Centre	650			13,650	10%
Fort Rouge Yards		700			
Pembina Corridor			2,300		
Inner City Intensification			10,000		
District 2: Assiniboia	700			27,800	20%
Kapyong Barracks		2,700			
Charleswood		2,400			
Ridgewood South		6,500			
Wilkes South			14,000		
Inner City Intensification			1,500		
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	2,300			13,150	10%
Meadows West		1,300			
Amber Trails/Leila North		1,550			
Old Kildonan/Murray			5,000		
Inner City Intensification			3,000		
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	1,600			13,650	10%
Regent West		6,900			
Canterbury Park		1,650			
Transcona South			2,500		
Inner City Intensification			1,000		
District 5: Riel	3,900			69,250	50%
Southland Park		2,400			
Sage Creek		10,350			
Royalwood		5,250			
Waverley West		24,350			
South St. Vital			20,000		
Pembina Corridor			1,000		
Inner City Intensification			2,000		
Totals	**9,150**	**66,050**	**59,300**	**137,500**	100%

Source: City of Winnipeg, Planning, Property and Development, 'Future Residential Growth Scenario 2008-2020' (DRAFT estimates) and the Conference Board of Canada, Long-Term Demographic and Economic Forecast for Winnipeg's Census Metropolitan Area, June 2007

To address the remaining demand shortfall, two things can occur: a policy of intensification to encourage infill and higher density development in existing areas, and/or a re-designation of rural land for residential use. The table assumes that both would occur and shows a possible scenario in the column entitled 'Shortfall'.

The shortfall in demand has been allocated to areas currently not yet designated for residential development (Wilkes South, Old Kildonan/Murray, Transcona South and South St. Vital). This assumes a successful political process to re-designate these lands which could occur on its own or through the Plan Winnipeg review process.

The table also assumes an aggressive policy of intensification with a particular emphasis on the construction of multiple family dwellings in accordance with the forecasts provided by the Conference Board of Canada. The 'Shortfall' column shows how a policy of intensification (with targets) could result in additional development in each of the city's districts (with an emphasis on the downtown and its shoulder neighbourhoods).

Further, an estimate of additional multiple family development is shown for the Pembina Highway corridor under the assumption that over the next twenty years, a program of rapid transit could be implemented along that route triggering a corresponding demand for higher density development at transit nodes.

While the table is based on major policy assumptions, it reflects the 'best guess' scenario at this point in time. In this scenario, the distribution of growth throughout the city is expected to be led by District 5 with 50%, followed by District 2 with 20%, and Districts 1, 3, and 4 with 10% each.

b. Space to Population (SPR) Ratios

The space to population ratio is *the* critical element in facility planning and will serve to guide development decisions in each of the districts. The ratio reflects the amount of recreation space available per person as of 2005. To plan appropriately, it is necessary to determine the relative level of service throughout the city. A fair evaluation must consider access to facilities regardless of who governs them. **Table 13**, therefore, is a fair indicator of relative level of service because it includes all facilities governed by the RLLF Policy's clause regarding restrictions to existing square footage.

Table 13: SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS as of 2005

DISTRICT	2005 Population	CC Space (sq ft)	CC SPR	City Space (sq ft)	City SPR	Total Space (sq ft)	Total SPR
D1: City Centre	149,600	204,208	1.37	56,631	0.38	260,839	1.74
D2: Assiniboia	95,125	165,969	1.74	63,997	0.67	229,966	2.42
D3: Lord Selkirk West Kild	136,125	180,813	1.33	55,949	0.41	236,762	1.74
D4: East Kild Transcona	114,450	165,067	1.44	65,243	0.57	230,310	2.01
D5: Riel	152,300	256,009	1.68	4,681	0.03	260,690	1.71
Totals	**647,600**	**972,066**	**1.50**	**246,501**	**0.38**	**1,218,567**	**1.88**

Source: Derived from previous tables.

It is important to remember that while the RLLF Policy requires the overall city-wide recreation space to population ratio be maintained, the GCWCC can only apply this Policy in the planning of the space for which it has governance responsibilities, that is, for community centres. However, by including the City-run facilities space to population ratio and the overall combined facilities ratio, it is possible to engage in broader discussions that may lead to coordinated plans.

In other words, if the GCWCC undergoes plans on its own it must adhere to the **1.50** ratio of space to population; if the City undergoes plans on its own it must adhere to the **0.38** ratio of space to population; however if joint planning is undertaken then the combined

effort must respect the **1.88** ratio of space to population. In this latter scenario, trade-offs between the City and the GCWCC could be contemplated, opening the door to a wider range of possibilities.

D. Direction for District Planning

1. A Vision for Community Centre Service Delivery

The GCWCC envisions a community centre model that builds upon its proud legacy of volunteerism and community leadership.

The model will continue to offer a variety of programs that meet the unique needs of its constituents through a combination of small walk-up local centres where appropriate, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres for more detailed programming, and larger district community centres for highly structured programs.

The service model of the future will be collaborative in nature. The goal will be to ensure the broad needs of the community are met with less concern paid to who delivers the service. The model will also demonstrate flexibility with a variety of governance and management options aimed to ensure its long-term sustainability while maximizing the use of resources.

Ultimately, the community of the future should be served with relevant, desirable programs delivered through well-maintained, contemporary facilities. This can include a combination of small local community centres, mid-sized neighbourhood community centres, and large district community centres.

a. Local Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their accessibility to the local population, providing an opportunity for informal drop-in and unstructured use of the facilities. However, they may be hampered by a small volunteer base, transient communities, and high maintenance needs. As well, the type and quality of programming can fluctuate depending on the interest and commitment of one or two individuals.

In the future, these centres may have to consider operating as satellites of larger centres to maximize governance capability or they may have to consider the alternative option of being run by the City. Depending on local needs, a measure of social or cultural programming may need to be blended with recreation and leisure programming. Facing ongoing challenges, flexibility will be the key to making local community centres successful in the future.

b. Neighbourhood Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres tends to be their emphasis on youth programming and meeting the needs of young families, although efforts are made to meet broader needs as well. They have a higher degree of complexity, with paid staff, a core of committed volunteers, multiple facilities (at times including satellite sites), and more intricate governance structures.

In the future, these centres, perhaps more than the others because of their geographic locations, will have to address the needs of a changing demographic, particularly the needs of an immigrant population and an aging population. Given the expected pressures on the smaller local centres, the neighbourhood centres may have more satellites to operate, putting pressure on staff and volunteers. Operating within a very different environment, adaptability will be the key to making neighbourhood community centres successful in the future.

c. District Community Centres

At present, the strength of these centres is their ability to service multiple needs within a large population base, including organized sports and a large variety of specialized leisure programs. They have a high degree of complexity with multiple staff, a solid base of volunteers, and the ability to fundraise to address the needs for facility enhancement or expansion.

In the future, there will be increased pressure to have regional facilities in all areas of the city, given the variety of programs they are able to offer. It is likely that the breadth of services offered will grow through partnerships with other service providers such as libraries, day cares, etc. in order to address the desire for one-stop convenience. To minimize overlaps in service provision, collaboration will be the key to making district community centres successful in the future.

d. Guiding Principles

Decisions regarding the future of community centres will be guided by the following principles.

- *Healthy Living*

  The community centre model will promote healthy living for all members of the community through the provision of both structured and unstructured activities.

- *Community-led*

  The community centre model is committed to grass roots involvement and leadership ensuring responsiveness to the diverse communities it serves.

- *Volunteer-driven*

  The community centre model will continue to promote and support a strong base of volunteers to meet its service needs while providing role models for youth.

- *Affordable and Accessible*

  The community centre model will strive to eliminate barriers that impede access to its programs and facilities.

- *Collaborative*

  The community centre model will encourage partnerships (within and outside the system) in recognition of overlapping responsibilities and the need by all to maximize the use of resources.

- *Safe and Respectful*

  The community centre model will provide safe and respectful environments for the community to enjoy without fear or intimidation.

- *Equitable*

  The community centre model will balance the needs of individual centres with the need to optimize the system overall and will do so in an equitable fashion.

2. Targets for District Plans

The vision for community centres will be the driving force behind Phase Two of Plan 2025, the development of five district plans. The vision allows each district to determine the appropriate mix of local, neighbourhood, and district facilities while accommodating growth and change.

Following the planning model of 'people-programs-facilities' each district will need to address the following questions:

- What is the current demographic make-up of their district? How is it expected to change to the year 2025,in terms of composition and growth?
- What programs are needed to serve that population? What is the role of community centres in delivering those programs?
- What facilities are needed to properly deliver those programs? Where should they be located in consideration of anticipated growth and changing demographics?

With regard to the last point, the RLLF Policy must be respected. To reiterate, the policy states the space to population ratio must remain consistent over time. Therefore, the following must be considered:

- How much square footage of recreation and leisure space is currently available per capita in Winnipeg?
- What is the anticipated growth for the city over the length of the plan?
- How much additional space can be planned for as a result of this growth?
- How and where should this additional space be allocated to best serve the needs of the community?

Table 14: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR CITY-WIDE TO 2025

CITY-WIDE	Community Centres	City-Run Facilities	Combined Facilities
2005 Population: **647,600**			
2005 Space (sq ft)	972,066	246,501	1,218,567
2005 Space to Population Ratio	1.50	0.38	1.88
2025 Population: **785,100**	Based on a growth forecast of **137,500** people:		
2025 Space (sq ft)	1,177,650	298,338	1,475,988
2025 Space to Population Ratio	1.50	0.38	**1.88**
Additional space to plan for (rounded to nearest 000)	**206,000 sq ft**	**52,000 sq ft**	**258,000 sq ft**

Source: Derived from previous tables.

Table 14 summarizes the answers to the first three questions, showing there is nearly 1 million square feet of community centre space in the system as of 2005 and another quarter million in similar space administered by the City of Winnipeg. The community centre space translates into 1.50 square feet of space per person with an additional 0.38 square feet per person of city-managed space for a combined total of 1.88 square feet per person. To be true to the policy the combined figure of 1.88 square feet per person must remain constant over time.

The forecasted growth to 2025 is 137,500 people. This translates into an additional 258,000 square feet of space that can be added to the system – 206,000 in community centre space and 52,000 in city-managed space.

The allocation of additional space is the most challenging task. **Table 15** compares the space to population ratios (SPRs) of 2005 with the projected SPRs for 2025, given the forecasted growth in population and assuming no new space is added to the system. In this scenario, the overall average SPR of 1.88 in 2005 would drop to 1.55. The highest 2005 SPR of 2.42 in District 2 would drop to 1.87, very near the 2005 average SPR. Meanwhile, the lowest 2005 SPRs of 1.71 in District 5 would fall further to 1.18.

Table 15: CURRENT AND PROJECTED SPACE TO POPULATION RATIOS

	Community Centres		City-Run Facilities		Combined Facilities	
	SPR 2005	SPR 2025	SPR 2005	SPR 2025	SPR 2005	SPR 2025
District 1: City Centre	1.37	1.25	0.38	0.35	1.74	1.60
District 2: Assiniboia	1.74	1.35	0.67	0.52	2.42	1.87
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	1.33	1.21	0.41	0.37	1.74	1.59
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	1.44	1.29	0.57	0.51	2.01	1.80
District 5: Riel	1.68	1.16	0.03	0.02	1.71	1.18
	1.50	1.24	0.38	0.31	**1.88**	1.55

Source: Derived from previous tables.

It must be noted that the RLLF Policy allows new space to be added in proportion to population growth.It has been determined this amounts to 206,000 sq ft. of community centre space and 52,000 sq. ft. of city-run space for a total of 258,000 additional square feet that can be planned for to the year 2025.

Table 16 shows how this additional space can be allocated in a way that would bring full parity into the system, allowing all citizens to have access to the same amount of recreation and leisure space. Under this scenario, each of the five districts would be at the city average.

It would mean District 2, the highest served district as of 2005, would be required to accommodate a forecasted increase in population of 27,800 people (from Table 12) while adding only 1,500 square feet in new space. Meanwhile, District 5 would plan for an additional 156,000 square feet of space to accommodate the largest percentage of population increase.

Table 16: AMOUNT OF SPACE TO PLAN FOR BY DISTRICT TO 2025				
	Combined Space Allocation	**Resulting SPR**	**Community Centre Component**	**City-Run Space Component**
District 1: City Centre	46,000	1.88	36,000	10,000
District 2: Assiniboia	1,500	1.88	1,500	0
District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	44,000	1.88	35,000	9,000
District 4: East Kildonan Transcona	10,500	1.88	8,500	2,000
District 5: Riel	156,000	1.88	125,000	31,000
	258,000 sq ft	**1.88**	206,000 sq ft	52,000 sq ft

Source: Derived from previous information.

3. Expectations for Process and Products

It is expected that each District Board will establish a planning sub-committee to lead the planning initiative. The planning committee will engage in a series of discussions and tasks leading to a draft plan. It is expected that the planning committee will report regularly to the District Board and seek their input into the process as required.

At the discretion of the planning committee and/or the District Board, additional discussions and input can be solicited from each of the community centres within the district. A draft plan will be developed by the planning committee and sent along to the District Board for their endorsement. The district plan will not be passed on to the GCWCC Board without this endorsement.

The plan should contain:

- An understanding of the task and direction provided by the GCWCC.
- An assessment of the present state of the district as it relates to the demographic make-up of the community, the recreation programs offered, the volunteer support provided, and the community centre facilities.
- A needs assessment based on forecasts of growth and demographic changes anticipated to the year 2025.
- An overview of roles and responsibilities of the various service providers in meeting the anticipated needs of the community.
- A series of strategies to address:
  - the future delivery of programs,
  - volunteer recruitment and retention,
  - facility development respecting the targets established in Table 16, and
  - governance.
- A series of recommendations for implementation acknowledging projects already approved since 2005, priority initiatives for the short term, and other initiatives to be addressed over the longer term.

While each plan will cover the district, greater insight can be gained by focussing on smaller areas within the district. The 23 neighbourhood clusters identified by the City of Winnipeg (**Appendix F**) should be considered for this purpose.

4. Addressing 2006 and 2007

The year 2005 was established as the baseline for this study because it represents the point in time when the RLLF Policy was adopted. The Policy was intended to stimulate discussion and long-range planning leading to a more contemporary and sustainable set of recreation facilities in Winnipeg and significant progress has already been made. These changes will be recognized as the starting point for all district plans. Any facility space given up through closures will be 'credited' to the district for planning purposes where possible.

Table 17: COMMUNITY CENTRE FACILITIES 2005 and 2008

DISTRICT	Community Centres	Satellites	Arenas	Indoor Soccer	Total Facilities
D1: City Centre	15	3	1	0	19
D2: Assiniboia	13	4	2	0	19
D3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	15	6	2	1	24
D4: East Kildonan Transcona	13	0	2	1	16
D5: Riel	15	1	6	0	22
2005 Totals	**71**	**14**	**13**	**2**	**100**
DISTRICT	**Community Centres**	**Satellites**	**Arenas**	**Indoor Soccer**	**Total Facilities**
D1: City Centre	15	2	1	0	18
D2: Assiniboia	13	4	2	0	18
D3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan	14	4	2	1	21
D4: East Kildonan Transcona	12	0	2	1	15
D5: Riel	14	2	6	0	22
2008 Totals	**68**	**12**	**13**	**2**	**95**

Source: The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres.

All changes that have occurred are shown in a revised facility list in **Appendix D** and are summarized in **Table 17**. These include:

District 1: City Centre

- Victoria-Linden Woods CC and its satellite Linden Woods have separated to become two distinct centres, Victoria CC and Linden Woods CC. (No impact on square footage.)
- Westridge CC and its satellite Whyteridge have separated to become two distinct centres, Westridge CC and Whyteridge CC. (No impact on square footage.)
- Isaac Brock's satellite site on Minto was declared surplus to the Community Centre inventory (reduction of 2,141 sq. ft.).
- Isaac Brock site is being expanded by a comparable amount to include a regulation-size gymnasium (currently under construction).
- Clifton, Isaac Brock, and Orioles CCs amalgamated to become Valour Community Centre (no impact on square footage.).

District 2: Assiniboia

- Brooklands CC was declared surplus to the Community Centre inventory (reduction of 7,313 sq. ft.) and has since been demolished. The population is now being served by Weston CC.; therefore, the space has been allocated to District 3 for planning purposes.

District 3: Lord Selkirk West Kildonan

- Sinclair Park's satellite, Boyd Park, was declared surplus to the Community Centre inventory (reduction of 4,904 sq. ft.).
- Tyndall Park's satellite site on Manitoba Ave. was declared surplus (reduction of 1,839 sq. ft.).
- Sinclair Park CC has been approved for redevelopment (they will be incorporating Boyd Park's square footage with their own). The plan includes a regulation size gym.

District 4: East Kildonan Transcona

- Kelvin CC was declared surplus to the Community Centre inventory (reduction of 7,534 sq. ft.). The change building and heated garage remain (2,237 sq. ft.). The main building has been demolished.
- Bronx Park CC has partnered with Good Neighbours Senior Centre (City facility) in a new 25,000 sf building (under construction). This project was approved prior to the RLLF Policy being adopted.
- Bronx Park will operate Kelvin as a satellite site.

District 5: Riel

- Norberry CC and Glenlee CC have amalgamated to become Norberry-Glenlee CC (NGCC). The Norberry site (main site) is being expanded by approximately 8,900 sq. ft. to include a regulation-size gym. Upon completion, the main building at Glenlee will be recommended as surplus to the community centre inventory (reduction of 8,900 sq. ft.). The fieldhouse and grounds at Glenlee will be a satellite of NGCC.

5. Decision-Making Model

While basic direction for district planning is provided by the GCWCC Board, decisions made regarding the plans and recommendations are expected to be bottom-up.

As shown in **Chart 4**, each District's planning committee will be the first point of contact for planning formulation and decision-making. These committees are expected to inform, interact, and consult with their respective District Boards as the process unfolds. When the plan has been developed to their satisfaction, it will be passed on to the District Board with a recommendation for endorsement.

The District Board may choose to make changes (or not) in order to ensure their comfort with the plan. Once endorsed by the District Board, the plan will be passed along to the Plan 2025 Steering Committee appointed by the GCWCC Board.



Chart 4: DECISION-MAKING MODEL

The role of the Steering Committee in this process is simply to ensure completeness and consistency among plans – not to change any recommendations it may not agree with. When all five district plans have been submitted to the satisfaction of the Steering Committee, the plans will be passed on as a collective submission to the GCWCC for consideration and approval.

The GCWCC Board has the final say in the approval of the plans. Once the plans have been approved, the GCWCC Board will pass them along to the City of Winnipeg's Executive Policy Committee as information. EPC does not need to approve the plans but will need to approve projects emanating from the plans that require City Council funding.

List of Appendices

Appendix A: The City of Winnipeg's Recreation, Leisure, and Libraries Facilities Policy, May 2005

Appendix B: Process and Timeline: Phase 1 and Phase 2

Appendix C: Comprehensive Facility List by District, 2005

Appendix D: Changes in Facilities Since 2005 by District

Appendix E: City of Winnipeg – Future Residential Growth Scenario 2008-2020 (DRAFT)

Appendix F: Map of Neighbourhood Clusters and Catchment Areas

APPENDIX A

The City of Winnipeg

RECREATION, LEISURE, AND LIBRARY FACILITIES POLICY

OUTCOME:

The outcome of this policy will be a community empowered to reconfigure its recreation, leisure, and library facilities in a way that is more responsive to local needs, leading to a more contemporary and financially sustainable mix of facilities. In many ways, this policy is a partnership agreement between the City of Winnipeg and the community to work together in finding the solution to the challenges we face.

PURPOSE:

This policy provides direction for the provision and maintenance of recreation, leisure, and library facilities owned by the City of Winnipeg. This policy covers:

- Aquatic facilities including outdoor pools, indoor pools, and wading pools, together with new emerging aquatic facilities such as water parks, urban oases, spray parks, and spray pads.
- Sports facilities including field houses and arenas, together with relatively newer sports facilities such as indoor soccer pitches and skateboard parks.
- General multi-use facilities including community centres, recreation centres, leisure centres, senior centres, and libraries.

Over time, this policy is intended to address two primary objectives:

A. To provide Winnipeggers with more contemporary recreation, leisure, and library facilities,

B. To move toward a more financially sustainable mix of recreation, leisure, and library facilities.

SUPPORTIVE POLICY:

In *Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision*, adopted by City Council in December 2001, the City of Winnipeg acknowledges its commitment to recreation services through policy statement 5D-01 Promote Active Living and 5D-02 Provide Leisure Facilities.

In January 2004, City Council adopted the A.C.T.I.V.E. Policy Framework which includes a series of strategies structured around the following six principles:

- **A**ffordable
  - City of Winnipeg recreation and library services and its facility infrastructure must be affordable, accessible and sustainable.
  - The provision of programs and services will be supported by a combination of municipal taxes, funding mechanisms from other levels of government and Council approved user fees.
  - The City of Winnipeg will explore public-public partnership opportunities as well as public-private partnership opportunities in order to provide efficient and affordable public use facilities.
- **C**ommunity Needs-Based
  - The City of Winnipeg will provide a leadership role in the planning and delivery of recreation and library services within Winnipeg.

  - Demographic analysis, user needs and current and emerging programming trends will guide service planning and provision.

- **T**actical Approach
  - Recreation, leisure and library services and facilities will be provided based on a tiered approach – regional, community, and neighbourhood. Regional facilities will be strategically located within Winnipeg.
  - A set of established decision tools will serve as a framework for decision-making to ensure that facilities and programs continue to meet the needs of our citizens.

- **I**ntegrated Service Delivery
  - The City of Winnipeg will integrate services with every strategic opportunity in order to provide for multi-use and intergenerational facilities and services.
  - The City will actively seek strategic partnerships.

- **V**iable Solutions
  - Opportunities will be provided for citizen input that will ensure that our strategic plans are viable from a community perspective and reflects its values.

- **E**ffective Services
  - The City of Winnipeg will provide effective, contemporary and responsive recreation and library services.
  - Recreation, leisure and library facilities inventory will be maintained in accordance with sound asset/risk management standards.
  - The Asset Management strategy will include criteria for decommissioning, redevelopment or disposal.
  - Recreation, leisure and library facilities will be managed to an industry standard of care defined as 'Managed Care'.

RECREATION, LEISURE, AND LIBRARY FACILITIES POLICY:

In support of the principles in the A.C.T.I.V.E. Policy Framework, this policy on recreation, leisure, and library facilities includes the following components:

1. A facility hierarchy that provides general guidance around the provision of facilities, including guidelines for facility to population ratios.
2. Direction for existing facilities and for the introduction of new facility types.
3. A stronger leadership mandate for the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres to optimize the community centre model in Winnipeg.
4. A commitment to sustaining existing, programmable recreation and leisure square footage while encouraging a reconfiguration of facilities over time.
5. A commitment to consultation.
6. A commitment to a 'managed care' level of maintenance for new facilities and where possible for existing facilities.
7. A reinvestment strategy.

1. A Facility Hierarchy

The facility hierarchy provides a guide for decision-making. It is intended to:

- Recognize a broad range of recreation, leisure, and library facilities. The hierarchy describes facility types that currently exist as well as new facility types that may be introduced over time and which are described later in this policy.
- Recognize that the size and, as such, the focus of facilities differs. Some facilities focus on the neighbourhood level, providing services to a relatively small population base, while others focus on the community, regional, or city-wide level.

- Provide facility to population ratios that will facilitate, over time, a more sustainable mix of City owned facilities. The ratios are guidelines to ensure adequate coverage within the community while matching the scale of the facility and market demand for the programming the facility might offer. The facility to population ratio provides for an increase in facilities when there is real population growth.
- Identify the role of the City in providing recreation, leisure, and library facilities in Winnipeg (including where the City will not be a direct provider). The hierarchy highlights the full range of providers, including the private and not-for-profit sector that must be considered in assessing community needs.

The facility types, focus, and facility to population ratios are described in the table below.

This facility hierarchy will guide decisions. Rare exceptions to the distribution ratios may be necessary to address unique needs in the inner city or where there are significant geographic barriers (rivers, major thoroughfares, etc.) in communities.

2. Direction for Existing Facilities and Introduction of New Facility Types

Focus	Facility	Private or Not-for-Profit	Public Sector Governance	
			City/Community Partnership	City Run
Neighbourhood	**Neighbourhood Community Club** (1 per 12,000–15,000 people)		GCWCC	✓
	Spray Pads/ Wading Pools/ Beginner Skateboard lots (approx. 1 per 10,000 people)			✓
Community	**Community Recreation & Leisure Centres** (1 per 35,000-50,000 people)	✓ e.g. YMCA	GCWCC e.g. Dakota	✓ e.g. Sargent Park
	Spray Parks/Outdoor pools (approx. 1 per 50,000 people)			✓
	Skateboard parks (1 per 35,000-50,000 people)			✓
	Indoor soccer pitch (approx. 1 per 50,000 people)	✓	GCWCC	
	Indoor arena (1 per 15,000 - 20,000 people)	✓	GCWCC	✓
	Libraries (1 per 30,000 – 50,000 people)			✓
Regional (approx. 1 per 150,000 – 300,000 people)	**Urban Oasis/ Indoor Pools**	✓		✓
	Sports Complexes (4-plex indoor soccer, etc.)	✓		
City –wide (all citizens, tourists)	**Major Sport/ Entertainment Venues**	e.g. MTS Centre		
	Water Park	✓		

In some communities existing facilities may not be meeting the recreation, leisure, and library needs of residents. This policy intends to support those communities interested in achieving a more contemporary and sustainable mix of facilities.

The following describes new facility types. The transition to a new mix of facilities will occur over time, as opportunities arise for communities, and with consultation.

Where change is desired, the mix and number of facilities will be guided by the facility to population ratios in the facility hierarchy. Again, these ratios facilitate a match between facility size and market demand; recognize population growth, unique inner city needs, and geographic barriers; and move communities in a more sustainable direction.

In communities where change is not desired, existing facilities will be maintained as best as can be done within the confines of approved budgets.

2.1 Community Centres
Neighbourhood Community Clubs and Community Recreation and Leisure Centres

Community Centres are an important and unique component of the recreation and leisure experience in Winnipeg. Today, Community Centres are evolving, with some community centres focusing on the neighbourhood level and others focusing more broadly on the community level. This evolution will be encouraged to continue.

To differentiate between the two levels of Community Centres, the smaller centres are called Neighbourhood Community Clubs and the larger centres are called Neighbourhood Recreation and Leisure Centres. Over time, communities may want to reconfigure their Community Centre space in order to optimize their mix of smaller Neighbourhood Community Clubs and larger Community Recreation and Leisure Centres.

The following guidelines will support this interest toward a more sustainable mix of Community Centre facilities over time.

a. Neighbourhood Community Clubs will serve the local neighbourhood by providing a range of sport, culture, and 'drop-in' play, youth and seniors programs. Neighbourhood Community Clubs may have athletic fields, gyms, multi-purpose space and outdoor rinks. Neighbourhood Community Clubs are intended to serve a population of approximately 12,000-15,000 people.

b. Community Recreation and Leisure Centres will serve a broader community at a ratio of 1 per 35,000–50,000 people. These Centres will provide more extensive sport, culture, seniors, drop-in, children's play, youth, and fitness programs. Amenities may include indoor ice, indoor soccer, outdoor rinks, athletic fields, gyms, and multi-purpose space.

A new governance model, described in Section 3, will facilitate this evolution.

2.2 Wading Pools
Spray Pads

The inventory of wading pools will be rationalized over time in keeping with the facility to population ratio. Facilitating this rationalization will be the introduction of a better wading pool or Spray Pad in the vicinity, or the development of a Spray Park or Urban Oasis in the community. The City will proceed slowly in introducing Spray Pads so as to fully assess community acceptance and the impact on operating costs.

A Spray Pad is a small outdoor aquatic facility that stimulates interactive and creative play. The components of a Spay Pad may include combinations of spray columns, cannons, ground sprays, spray faces, spirals, loop-throughs, and themed structures such as flowers, trees, animals, nautical, etc. The Spray Pad structure can be any shape and size, depending on budget. With zero water depth and a flat surface, a Spray Pad is handicap accessible and eliminates the risk of drowning. A Spray Pad typically ranges between 1,000 and 3,000 sq. ft and services the 0-10 age group.

2.3 Outdoor Pools
Spray Parks

As Urban Oases and Spray Parks are developed in communities, outdoor pools will be closed.

A Spray Park replicates the concept of a Spray Pad (described above) but incorporates more components over a larger area. A Spray Park typically ranges between 3,000 and 6,000 sq. ft. and services the 0-10 age group.

2.4 Indoor Pools
Urban Oases

The existing inventory of indoor pools will either be converted into Urban Oases or rationalized in coordination with development of new Urban Oases and in keeping with facility to population ratios.

The Urban Oasis is a multi-faceted aquatic centre that combines the benefits of a traditional lap pool with a recreational leisure pool. The Urban Oasis can incorporate both an indoor and outdoor component. The indoor component combines an aquatic facility used for training and lessons, essentially a traditional indoor pool, together with many leisure pool amenities including such things as zero-depth entry, a lazy river, a water slide, spray stands, etc. The outdoor component of the Urban Oasis is essentially the same as the Spray Park (described above). It allows residents to enjoy the aquatic activity outdoors during the summer months.

2.5 Senior Centres, Recreation Centres, Leisure Centres
Community Recreation and Leisure Centres

No new stand-alone senior, recreation, and leisure centres will be added to the City's inventory. Where possible, the inventory of existing facilities will be incorporated into Community Recreation and Leisure Centres (whether these are governed by the GCWCC or run directly by the City) and rationalized over time in keeping with facility to population ratios.

2.6 Skateboard Parks

Where possible, Skateboard Parks will be co-located with Community Recreation and Leisure Centres or regional facilities to facilitate access to washrooms. Furthermore, they will be located in close proximity to transit. Because of the different age demographic generally associated with a Skateboard Park, it should not be co-located with a wading pool or Spray Pad.

A Skateboard Park is an outdoor facility designed to meet the specialized needs of skateboarders. It tends to include a concrete bowl together with a series of ramps and rails that accommodate a range of skill levels from developmental to seasoned.

In recognition of growing demand, particularly in the inner city, smaller, developmental facilities (beginner skateboard lots) consisting of 1 or 2 ramps and rails could be integrated into park or Community Centre sites independent of the provision of a Skateboard Park.

2.7 Arenas

The City will review the provision of arenas with the intent to eliminate or reduce its role as a direct provider over time, while ensuring that the number of arenas remains within the facility to population ratio.

2.8 Indoor Soccer

The City will support the development of indoor soccer pitches in line with the facility to population ratio identified in the facility hierarchy. The City will not be a direct provider.

2.9 Libraries

There will be no net increase in the number of libraries unless there is real population growth.

Where possible, a new library will be co-located within a Community Recreation and Leisure Centre in order to take full advantage of joint programming opportunities. However, in doing so, the new library should replace at least one existing facility. Where it may not be possible to incorporate a new library within a Community Recreation and Leisure Centre, a new stand-alone library will be developed only if it results in a consolidation of two or more branches or if there is a positive business case supporting the replacement of an existing facility.

2.10 Joint Use Agreements with the School Divisions

Joint Use Agreements with the School Divisions should continue to be pursued in order to provide drop-in facilities for basketball, volleyball, and other gym oriented sports. However, to the greatest degree possible, the agreements and their implementation will be standardized across the City in order to ensure equitable access. It may be possible, if supported by a positive business case, to share in the costs of enhancing existing or proposed school facilities in order to better accommodate local demand for recreation and leisure space.

3. The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC)

To facilitate a strong and more sustainable Community Centre model in Winnipeg, the following parameters will form the basis for a more detailed Management Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and the GCWCC.

3.1 Governance

i. GCWCC will have a leadership mandate to strengthen and optimize the Community Centre model in Winnipeg.

ii. GCWCC will operate through district boundaries that match the City's Community Committee boundaries.

iii. GCWCC will be governed by a Board representing Community Centres and the Board will include City appointed community representatives that will ensure financial, asset management, and legal expertise.

iv. GCWCC will report to Council through Executive Policy Committee (EPC).

v. GCWCC will provide to Council an annual 3 year business plan and audited financial statements.

vi. GCWCC will be authorized to run those Neighbourhood Community Clubs and Community Recreation and Leisure Centres that are within its mandate where it is not possible to sustain a volunteer board and programming.

vii. GCWCC will work in close collaboration with the City to ensure that efforts regarding programming and facility operations are complementary.

3.2 Capital Investments

viii. GCWCC will facilitate consultation processes regarding opportunities to reconfigure and optimize centres within the limitation of maintaining existing square footage of Community Centre space as set out in section 4. GCWCC will consult with Community Centres to identify and prioritize capital investments, considering the needs of the local community, the district, the city overall, and in keeping with their mandate and the parameters of this policy.

ix. GCWCC will keep Councillors informed as to consultation activities and project proposals in their respective wards.

x. GCWCC will make recommendations for new capital projects once a year as part of its annual business plan, reporting to Council through EPC.

xi. GCWCC will advise on, and coordinate, infrastructure grant applications.

3.3 Operations

xii. GCWCC will assist in providing day-to-day administrative support to Community Centres and will collaborate with the City to optimize the support provided to Community Centres.

3.4 Programming

xiii. GCWCC will facilitate the coordination of Community Centre programming to maximize coverage and minimize duplication in efforts.

4. Sustaining Square Footage

The net square footage of City owned space for general recreational and leisure programming will be sustained at the current level (city-wide) but will not be increased. This limitation applies to those facilities identified in sections 2.1 and 2.5 and generally equates to 'heated square footage' as defined in the Universal Funding Formula. Pool areas, arena ice, indoor soccer pitches, and libraries are not included in this component of the policy.

Recreation and leisure space can be reconfigured to better serve the needs of the community, provided the amount of net square footage of space on a city-wide basis does not increase. The net square footage of recreation and leisure space will be increased only when there is real population growth and, then, in keeping with the facility to population ratios.

5. A Commitment to Consultation

Moving toward more contemporary and sustainable facilities is a challenge shared by the community and the City. Ideas and opportunities generated by the community will be key to finding workable solutions.

There will be consultation when decisions on recreation, leisure, and library facilities are needed (an expansion or merger, a new facility, priorities, options, and trade-offs).

While the process for consultation will vary depending on the needs of a community and the issue at hand, the goal is always to seek meaningful, timely input from the full range of people that may be affected by a decision.

Consultation processes will be designed to provide stakeholders with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way and will provide decision-makers with the information they need to make balanced, informed decisions.

Consultation processes involving the reconfiguring and optimizing of Community Centre space will be part of the leadership mandate of the GCWCC.

Communities will be encouraged to be proactive in identifying opportunities and possible solutions.

6. A Commitment to Managed Care

A 'Managed Care' level of maintenance will be required for all new facilities. Business plans are to reflect this requirement.

Council will strive to attain this level of maintenance for existing facilities. Existing capital and operating maintenance dollars may need to be prioritized for investment in existing facilities that are at, or close to, the Managed Care level so as to prevent significant decline in those facilities.

The term 'Managed Care' is derived from a maintenance hierarchy developed by a leading authority in the subject of asset management. Under a Managed Care program, the recommended facility maintenance operating budget (not including utilities) is 3.5% of Current Replacement Value (CRV), with a corresponding Facilities Condition Index (FCI) of between 0.10 and 0.20. The latter indicator means that the amount of deferred maintenance must not be greater than 20% of the current replacement value in order for the Managed Care funding level to be effective.

The Managed Care level of maintenance is considered a 3 in the spectrum of 5 maintenance levels. By comparison, level 1 maintenance investments equate to a 'Showpiece Facility' where the facility is kept in 'almost new' condition. At the other end of the spectrum, a maintenance level of 5 is considered 'Crisis Response' where normal usage and deterioration continues unabated, eventually leading to forced closure or complete replacement of the facility. Under Crisis Response, repair is basically instituted for life safety issues only.

7. Reinvestment Strategy

With respect to Neighbourhood Community Clubs and Community Recreation and Leisure Centres that are governed by the GCWCC,

- the total Universal Funding Formula grant will not be reduced if there are Community Centre mergers; and
- proceeds from property sales that may arise as a result of Community Centre mergers will be reinvested in the Community Centre system. A reserve fund will be established for such proceeds.

With respect to recreation, leisure, and library facilities that are run by the City,

- any proceeds from property sales that may arise as a result of facility rationalization will be reinvested into City-run recreation, leisure, and library facilities. A reserve fund will be established for such proceeds.

With respect to capital funds and within the parameters of this policy, the following are some of the criteria that will be considered in priority-setting:

1. Consider areas of greatest need.
2. Consider opportunities to move toward a more sustainable and more contemporary mix of facilities (i.e. investments that will facilitate the rationalization of facilities, etc.).
3. Consider community driven solutions and readiness for change.
4. Consider the degree to which other funds and efforts can be leveraged.
5. Consider the condition of facilities and immediate risks.

APPENDIX B: Process and Timeline: Phase 1 and Phase 2





APPENDIX C: Comprehensive Facility List by District, 2005

The following list accounts for all the facilities referenced in Plan 2025, including 100 governed by the GCWCC and 31 similar facilities managed by the City of Winnipeg.

DISTRICT 1: CITY CENTRE			
Recreation Space as of 2005 (for planning purposes)			
Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	Catchment Population
Community Centre	Clifton	9,403	4,820
Community Centre	Crescentwood	14,722	8,900
Community Centre	Earl Grey	17,878	7,785
Community Centre	Fort Garry	8,376	6,425
Community Centre	Isaac Brock	12,537	5,050
Satellite	Isaac Brock - Minto	2,141	-
Community Centre	Lord Roberts	16,513	5,170
Community Centre	Orioles	14,033	16,701
Community Centre	River Heights	15,647	11,240
Arena	River Heights - Arena	3,576	-
Community Centre	River Osborne	10,664	13,121
Community Centre	Riverview	15,970	4,060
Community Centre	Robert A Steen	20,566	16,926
Community Centre	Sir John Franklin	14,290	10,960
Community Centre	Victoria-Linden Woods	4,479	10,155
Satellite	Victoria-Linden Woods (Derek)	8,756	-
Community Centre	Westridge	5,613	9,595
Satellite	Whyteridge	4,834	-
Community Centre	Wildwood	4,210	1,100
19 facilities	District 1 Community Centre Sub-Total	204,208	8,801 avg
Recreation Centre	Block Parents	2,281	
Recreation Centre	Broadway Neighbourhood Centre	11,530	
Recreation Centre	Magnus Eliason Rec Centre	8,500	
Recreation Centre	Mayfair Rec Centre	1,569	
Recreation Centre	Fort Rouge Leisure Centre	25,615	
Recreation Centre	Sargent Park Rec-Plex	7,136	
6 facilities	District 1 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total	56,631	
25 facilities	**DISTRICT 1 TOTAL**	**260,839**	

DISTRICT 2: ASSINIBOIA			
Recreation Space as of 2005 (for planning purposes)			
Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	Catchment Population
Community Centre	Assinibone West	8,293	14,185
Satellite	Assiniboine West - Morgan	7,877	-
Community Centre	Bord-Aire	9,970	5,285
Community Centre	Bourkevale	7,268	2,215
Community Centre	Deer Lodge	13,591	3,835
Community Centre	Heritage-Victoria	13,469	7,890
Community Centre	Kirkfield-Westwood	16,162	10,100
Satellite	Kirkfield-Westwood - McBey	4,551	-
Arena	Kirkfield-Westwood - Arena	1,007	-
Community Centre	Roblin Park	11,228	7,455
Community Centre	Silver Heights	9,416	5,180
Community Centre	Sturgeon Creek	9,859	6,510
Community Centre	Tuxedo	9,405	6,595
Community Centre	Varsity View	11,090	11,010
Satellite/Arena	Varsity View - Marj Edey	11,570	-

Community Centre	Westdale	13,890	7,845
Satellite	Westdale - Pembina Trails	2,931	-
Community Centre	Woodhaven	4,392	3,155
19 facilities	District 2 Community Centre Sub-Total	165,969	7,020 avg
Recreation Centre	St James Cultural Centre	2,480	
Recreation Centre	Bourkevale Leisure Centre	8,585	
Recreation Centre	Eric Coy Craft Centre/Rec Centre	3,967	
Recreation Centre	St James Centennial	28,936	
Recreation Centre	St James Civic Centre	20,029	
6 facilities	District 2 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total	63,997	
25 facilities	**DISTRICT 2 TOTAL**	**229,966**	

DISTRICT 3: LORD SELKIRK WEST KILDONAN

Recreation Space as of 2005 (for planning purposes)

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	Catchment Population
Community Centre	Brooklands	7,313	2,310
Community Centre	Burton Cummings	10,459	9,675
Community Centre	Central (3 Modules in Frieght House))	20,294	8,222
Community Centre	Garden City	10,785	10,455
Soccer	Garden City - Soccer Complex	6,687	-
Community Centre	Luxton	8,162	9,340
Community Centre	Maples	9,199	22,975
Satellite	Maples - Elwick	2,266	-
Arena	Maples - Arena/Multiplex	4,557	-
Community Centre	Norquay	10,619	3,595
Community Centre	Northwood	10,339	9,495
Satellite	Northwood - Frank Whyte	1,835	-
Community Centre	Ralph Brown	3,703	4,595
Community Centre	Red River	11,270	4,765
Community Centre	Sinclair Park	13,618	15,200
Satellite	Sinclair Park - Boyd Park	4,904	-
Satellite	Sinclair Park - Robertson	1,344	-
Community Centre	Tyndall Park	6,470	16,380
Satellite	Tyndall Park - Garden Grove	1,771	-
Satellite	Tyndall Park - Manitoba	1,839	-
Community Centre	Vince Leah	12,195	6,105
Community Centre	West Kildonan Memorial	4,885	6,325
Arena	West Kildonan Memorial - Arena	3,574	-
Community Centre	Weston Memorial	12,725	5,790
24 facilities	District 3 Community Centre Sub-Total	180,813	9,015 avg
Recreation Centre	Aberdeen Rec Centre	1,876	
Recreation Centre	Turtle Island Rec Centre	12,771	
Recreation Centre	Old Ex Rec Center	3,300	
Recreation Centre	St. John's Leisure Centre	10,369	
Recreation Centre	Strathcona Rec Centre	1,728	
Recreation Centre	Freighthouse (Modules 1 & 4)	14,263	
Senior Centre	Dufferin Seniors Centre	1,500	
Senior Centre	North End Seniors Centre	2,528	
Senior Centre	Bleak House	4,000	
Senior Centre	Brookslands Pioneer Senior Citizens	3,614	
9 facilities	District 3 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total	55,949	
33 facilities	**DISTRICT 3 TOTAL**	**236,762**	

District 4: East Kildonan Transcona

Recreation Space as of 2005 (for planning purposes)

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	Catchment Population
Community Centre	Bronx Park	9,371	5,990
Community Centre	Chalmers	14,950	7,630
Community Centre	East Elmwood	7,570	5,800
Community Centre	East End	9,780	5,470
Arena	East End - Arena (2 rinks)	3,744	-
Community Centre	Gateway	15,417	17,040
Arena	Gateway - Arena (2 rinks)	9,842	-
Soccer	Gateway - Soccer Complex	10,043	-
Community Centre	Kelvin	9,771	6,395
Community Centre	Melrose Park	12,928	6,395
Community Centre	Morse Place	9,597	5,990
Community Centre	North Kildonan	11,769	12,905
Community Centre	Oxford Heights	16,601	8,300
Community Centre	Park City West	11,876	15,765
Community Centre	South Transcona	1,636	585
Community Centre	Valley Gardens	10,172	12,830
16 facilities	District 4 Community Centre Sub-Total	165,067	8,546 avg
Recreation Centre	Arts Action Centre	3,076	
Recreation Centre	Transcona Scout Hall	2,500	
Recreation Centre	East End Culture & Leisure Centre	6,268	
Recreation Centre	Elmwood Winter Club	7,704	
Recreation Centre	Transcona Optimists	12,000	
Senior Centre	Good Neighbours Seniors Centre	8,560	
Senior Centre	Elmwood EK Seniors	6,345	
Senior Centre	Transcona Seniors Centre	7,640	
Recreation Centre	Roland Michener Arena	11,150	
9 facilities	District 4 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total	65,243	
25 facilities	**DISTRICT 4 TOTAL**	**230,310**	

DISTRICT 5: RIEL

Recreation Space as of 2005 (for planning purposes)

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	Catchment Population
Community Centre	Archwood	11,316	2,530
Community Centre	Champlain	11,572	3,800
Community Centre	Dakota	31,001	17,910
Arena	Dakota - Arena (2 rinks)	16,633	-
Community Centre	Glenlee	14,261	15,375
Community Centre	Glenwood	10,507	4,175
Arena	Glenwood - Arena	4,078	-
Community Centre	Greendell	17,892	7,835
Community Centre	Norberry	11,187	9,140
Community Centre	Norwood	12,394	3,010
Community Centre	Notre Dame	6,740	7,410
Arena	Notre Dame - Arena	6,756	-
Community Centre	Richmond Kings	11,549	11,760
Satellite	Richmond Kings - Ryerson	2,590	-
Arena	Richmond Kings - Arena	4,060	-
Community Centre	St Norbert	15,835	5,835
Arena	St. Norbert - Arena	8,738	-
Community Centre	Southdale	17,992	15,535
Arena	Southdale - Arena	590	-

Community Centre	Waverley Heights	14,200	17,095
Community Centre	Winakwa	13,316	13,475
Community Centre	Windsor	12,802	3,915
22 facilities	District 5 Community Centre Sub-Total	256,009	9,253 avg
Senior Centre	Club Eclipse '79	4,681	
1 facility	District 5 City-Run Facilities Sub-Total	4,681	
23 facilities	**DISTRICT 5 TOTAL**	**260,690**	
100 facilities	**Total Community Centres**	**972,066**	**8,569 avg**
31 facilities	**Total City-run Facilities**	**246,501**	
131 facilities	**Total Combined Space**	**1,218,567**	

APPENDIX D: Changes in Facilities Since 2005 by District

The following list shows all the changes that have occurred since 2005, the time when the City's RLLF Policy was adopted.

DISTRICT 1: CITY CENTRE

CHANGES SINCE 2005
15 (-2 +2) community centres, ~~3~~ 2 (-3 +2) satellites, 1 arena

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	+/- Sq Ft	Notes
Sat	Valour - Clifton	9,403		Became satellite of Isaac Brock in 2006
CC	Crescentwood	14,722		
CC	Earl Grey	17,878		
CC	Fort Garry	8,376		
CC	Valour	14,678	+2,141	Formerly Isaac Brock, now expanding
~~Sat~~	Isaac Brock - Minto	0	-2,141	Closed in 2006
CC	Lord Roberts	16,513		
Sat	Valour - Orioles	14,033		Became satellite of Isaac Brock in 2006
CC	River Heights	15,647		
Are	River Heights Arena	3,576		
CC	River Osborne	10,664		
CC	Riverview	15,970		
CC	Robert A Steen	20,566		
CC	Sir John Franklin	14,290		
CC	Lindenwoods	4,479		New name from Victoria-Lindenwoods
CC	Victoria	8,756		Separated from VL to become Victoria
CC	Westridge	5,613		
CC	Whyteridge	4,834		Separated from Westridge
CC	Wildwood	4,210		
18	District 1 Sub-Total	204,208	0	18 total facilities, down from 19

DISTRICT 2: ASSINIBOIA

CHANGES SINCE 2005
13 community centres, 4 satellites, 2 arenas (no changes)

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	+/- Sq Ft	Notes
CC	Assinibone West	8,293		
Sat	Assiniboine West - Morgan	7,877		
CC	Bord-Aire	9,970		
CC	Bourkevale	7,268		
CC	Deer Lodge	13,591		
CC	Heritage-Victoria	13,469		
CC	Kirkfield-Westwood	16,162		
Sat	KW - McBey	4,551		
Are	KW Arena	1,007		
CC	Roblin Park	11,228		
CC	Silver Heights	9,416		
CC	Sturgeon Creek	9,859		
CC	Tuxedo	9,405		
CC	Varsity View	11,090		
Sat/Are	VV - Marj Edey	11,570		
CC	Westdale	13,890		
Sat	Westdale - Pembina Trails	2,931		
CC	Woodhaven	4,392		
19	District 2 Sub-Total	165,969	0	No changes

DISTRICT 3: LORD SELKIRK WEST KILDONAN

CHANGES SINCE 2005
~~15~~ 14 community centres, ~~6~~ 4 satellites, 2 arenas, 1 indoor soccer complex

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	+/- Sq Ft	Notes
~~Sat~~	**Brooklands**	**0**	**-7,313**	Closed and demolished (from District 2)
CC	Burton Cummings	10,459		
CC	Central (Frieght House)	20,294		
CC	Garden City	10,785		
Soc	GC - Soccer Complex	6,687		
CC	Luxton	8,162		
CC	Maples	9,199		
Sat	Maples - Elwick	2,266		
Are	Maples - Arena/Multiplex	4,557		
CC	Norquay	10,619		
CC	Northwood	10,339		
Sat	Northwood - Frank Whyte	1,835		
CC	Ralph Brown	3,703		
CC	Red River	11,270		
CC	Sinclair Park	13,618		
~~Sat~~	**Sinclair Park - Boyd Park**	**0**	**-4,904**	Closed in 2006
Sat	Sinclair Park - Robertson	1,344		
CC	Tyndall Park	6,470		
Sat	TP - Garden Grove	1,771		
~~Sat~~	**Tyndall Park - Manitoba**	**0**	**-1,839**	Closed in 2006
CC	Vince Leah	12,195		
CC	West Kildonan Memorial	4,885		
Are	WK Memorial - Arena	3,574		
CC	Weston Memorial	12,725		
21	District 3 Sub-Total	166,757	**-14,056**	**21 total facilities, down from 24**

District 4: East Kildonan Transcona

CHANGES SINCE 2005
~~13~~ 12 community centres, 0 satellites, 2 arenas, 1 indoor soccer complex

Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	+/- Sq Ft	Notes
CC	**Bronx Park**	**9,771**		Bronx P expanding with GNSC
CC	Chalmers	14,950		
CC	East Elmwood	7,570		
CC	East End	9,780		
Are	East End - Arena (2 rinks)	3,744		
CC	Gateway	15,417		
Are	Gateway - Arena (2 rinks)	9,842		
Soc	Gateway - Soccer Complex	10,043		
~~CC~~	**Kelvin**	**2,237**	**-7,534**	Closed in 2007, change facilities remain
CC	Melrose Park	12,928		
CC	Morse Place	9,597		
CC	North Kildonan	11,769		
CC	Oxford Heights	16,601		
CC	Park City West	11,876		
CC	South Transcona	1,636		
CC	Valley Gardens	10,172		
15	District 4 Sub-Total	157,533	**-7,534**	**15 total facilities, down from 16**

DISTRICT 5: RIEL				
CHANGES SINCE 2005				
~~15~~ 14 community centres, ~~1~~ 2 satellite, 6 arenas				
Type	Facility Name	Sq Ft	+/- Sq Ft	Notes
CC	Archwood	11,316		
CC	Champlain	11,572		
CC	Dakota	31,001		
Are	Dakota - Arena (2 rinks)	16,633		
Sat	**Glenlee**	14,261		Agreed in 2007 to merge with Norberry
CC	Glenwood	10,507		
Are	Glenwood - Arena	4,078		
CC	Greendell	17,892		
CC	Norberry	11,187		Agreed in 2007 to merge with Glenlee
CC	Norwood	12,394		
CC	Notre Dame	6,740		
Are	Notre Dame - Arena	6,756		
CC	Richmond Kings	11,549		
Sat	Richmond Kings - Ryerson	2,590		
Are	Richmond Kings - Arena	4,060		
CC	St Norbert	15,835		
Are	St. Norbert - Arena	8,738		
CC	Southdale	17,992		
Are	Southdale - Arena	590		
CC	Waverley Heights	14,200		
CC	Winakwa	13,316		
CC	Windsor	12,802		
22	District 5 Sub-Total	256,009	0	21 total facilities, down from 22
95	**TOTAL ALL FACILITIES**	**950,476**	**-21,590**	**From 972,066**

APPENDIX E: City of Winnipeg – Future Residential Growth Scenario 2008-2020 (DRAFT)



APPENDIX F: Map of Neighbourhood Clusters and Catchment Areas



Catchment Areas & Neighbourhood Clusters

Legend

- Community Centres (GCWCC)
- Community Centre Catchment Boundary
- Neighbourhood Cluster Boundary
- Rivers

0 4 8 12 16 20

Kilometers

N W E S

URBANEDGE consulting inc.

307 Niagara Street
Winnipeg, MB R3N 0V3

(204) 227-4526

www.urbanedgeconsulting.ca

KGM CONSULTANTS INC.

36 Southlands Drive
East St. Paul MB R2E 0B3

(204) 803-8549

gbmirecki@shaw.ca