CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE

The Executive Policy Committee has had before it the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992, has concurred in the recommendations contained therein and submits same to Council for approval and adoption.

On motion of Councillor Gilroy, the Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992, was considered clause by clause.

North Committee Room,
Council Building, Winnipeg.
March 30th, 1992.

His Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture submits the following Report and recommends:

Memorial to those who wore pink triangles to their deaths in Nazi Concentration Camps and others who have been victims of homophobic violence
Files G(P) and P

792 1. On February 12th, 1992, Council referred the following motion to your Committee, namely:-

"WHEREAS there is no memorial in the City or within the Province for the nearly half million gay people killed in the holocaust;

AND WHEREAS there is a strong desire from many members of the community to see a memorial;

AND WHEREAS the City owns parkland in the area of where other anti-violence memorials exist and where most of the attacks on gays and those so labelled has occurred;

BE IT RESOLVED that Council approve in principle a memorial to the people who wore pink triangles to their deaths in Nazi concentration camps and others who have been victims of homophobic violence;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture be asked to consult with concerned groups and recommend an appropriate location."

In this regard, Council also referred the following proposed amendment to the above motion, namely:-

"WHEREAS there has been confusion over the financial implications of establishing a memorial to those who died wearing pink triangles;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the motion regarding a memorial site be amended, as follows:-

a) the words "space for" be inserted in the first line of the fourth paragraph immediately before the words "a memorial";
b) approval in principal be understood not to involve commitment of any city funds."

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture has requested that the administration communicate with the delegations who appeared at Council and enter into discussions regarding an appropriate memorial and estimated cost, location, wording and associated maintenance.

Inasmuch as your Committee has referred this matter to the administration, an extension of 90 days is requested in which to report back to Council.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Restoration of Waddell Fountain in Central ParkFiles PR-7(22), FC(1992) and FC-1(1993-1997)

793 2. The Waddell Fountain was built in 1914 to commemorate Emily Margaret Waddell, who bequeathed $10,000.00 in her will for the construction of a fountain. The design was based on a large Gothic Revival monument to Scotland's poet Sir Walter Scott. This fountain was designed by local architect John Manuel who directed construction of such projects as the University of Manitoba Science Laboratory Building and the Canadian Pacific Railway hotels at Banff and Lake Louise.

The fountain was constructed from Indiana limestone on a granite base. Over the years, the soft limestone surface deteriorated from freeze/thaw action and from the action of acidic precipitation from fossil fuels. The many ornate pinnacles and the large number of smaller stone pieces are missing and other sections were patched with concrete in order to keep the fountain functioning.

In 1988, the City of Winnipeg Historical Building Committee recognized the historical significance of the structure and listed the fountain as a grade II Historical Structure. This designation means that all future repairs must be approved by the Historical Building Committee.

In 1989, a conservation report was prepared by Martin Weaver Conservation Consultants Inc. which outlined repair techniques and provided full size drawings which were intended to aid in duplicating the missing pinnacles.

Some individual stones over the lower water basin must be totally replaced as they have completely deteriorated from the action caused by the soil movement under the shallow foundation.

Due to the various damage suffered over the last 50 years, it may be more desirable to rebuild certain sections of the fountain with more durable materials such as fibreglass reinforced concrete or a harder stone. The original Indiana limestone is very porous and is easily damaged by the freeze/thaw action, particularly in the area of the water basins. To replace the bottom basin would mean the entire fountain would have to be dismantled or raised in mass to replace the bottom section. Regardless of the restoration techniques, the problem with the 1 ½ inch tilt of the fountain base must be addressed. This structure was designed to be perfectly level as the upper basins act as overflow pools. Preliminary investigation indicates that it will be necessary to stabilize the foundation prior to attempting any restoration of the fountain structure. Stabilizing could involve underpinning of the existing fountain or constructing a new piled foundation.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

If the foundation must be rebuilt, it would be beneficial to relocate the fountain about 100 feet south of the present location which would be further from the walkways and playground. With a new foundation, it would be easier to duplicate the water basin with durable concrete and reassemble the undamaged sections. The individual damaged stones can be taken to a shop for repairs or duplication with like pieces of Indiana limestone. This structure is actually composed of 36 horizontal stone courses with several separate stones making up each course. The stones are held together with mortar and brass dowels. In 1990, two restoration estimates were received, ranging from $55,000.00 to $115,000.00; however, the cost of the fountain repairs and repairs to the lower basin were not addressed. At this time, without more details, it is impossible to determine the accuracy of the currently proposed $200,000.00 estimate recommended for the 1993 Capital Budget. If the provincial restoration grant of $75,000.00 is approved for this project, the City Capital could be reduced. However, in order to qualify for the Provincial grant, it will be necessary to get Provincial Historical Designation.

The greatest difficulty to date with this project is the lack of local expertise necessary to assess the various alternatives for this project. The only known local conservation experts are employed by the Federal Government for Parks Canada. They have the experience with working on similar projects throughout Canada and know the availability of a skilled stone craftsman. If the City cannot secure the services of Parks Canada, it may be necessary to carry out some exploratory restoration, utilizing City staff and local stone tradesmen. Although there are no stone carvers listed locally, there are a number of known local craftsmen, originally from Europe, working in other trades in the city.

If the recommendations outlined below are approved, it will take a further eight (8) months to prepare a detailed program for the restoration of the Waddell Fountain, along with alternatives and cost estimates. This type of restoration is new to this city as previous work involved mostly exterior cleaning of historical buildings, not the carving of new stones.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, recommends as follows:

1. That $200,000.00 (preliminary estimate) be included in the 1993 Capital Budget for restoration and/or rebuilding of the Waddell Fountain (Special Project - City at Large 03118XXX-64932507XX).
2. That the Parks and Recreation Department apply to the Province of Manitoba for a Provincial Historic Designation of the fountain in order to qualify for a $75,000.00 restoration grant.
3. That the City of Winnipeg request Parks Canada of the Federal Government to provide the services of their local expertise for assistance in preparation of restoration specifications, together with a firm cost estimate.
4. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,

Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Signage at Community Centres File PR-2

794 3. Effective signage has, and continues to be essential to Community Centres as a source of identification within the community. Dependent upon the location of the Community Centre and the proximity of the facility to the street(s), these identification signs take the form of fascia signs (attached to the building) and/or free-standing signs located closer to the flow of traffic.

More recently, Community Centres have identified the need for signs incorporating a reader board upon which upcoming events and programs can be posted. Such signage notifies the active membership of ongoing activities and provides an effective means of encouraging new participants. A survey conducted in late 1990 illustrates the diverse range of signage that currently exists at Community Centre and satellite sites throughout the City of Winnipeg (Appendix 1).

This diversity can be attributed to a number of factors. The inconsistent zoning (by reason of geographic location) of Community Centre property has resulted in a variety of restrictions/regulations pertaining to appropriate signage.

Financial resources available have impacted on the type of signage erected on Community Centre sites. The Department survey indicated that the majority of signs were funded by the Community Centre and/or the City of Winnipeg. Third party advertisers or local donations accounted for approximately 10% of existing signage. Some of the more recent signs erected were incorporated into the construction/renovation budgets for Community Centre projects.

The absence of a Department policy or established standards regulating Community Centre signage has contributed to an inconsistent approach to the question of signage over the years. In numerous situations, especially prior to the amalgamation of the Parks and Recreation Department, Community Centre volunteers took the initiative to procure the signage deemed appropriate for their needs. Many of these signs are currently located on Community Centre sites.

Signage at Community Centres becomes an issue when the signage requirements of the Community Centre do not coincide with the by-law requirements applicable to that site. Community Centre volunteers are then required too apply for zoning variances from their Community Committee to obtain approval to erect a non-conforming sign. Without established policy or standards pertaining to Community Centre signage it is difficult for Community Committees to make consistent recommendations in this regard.

As Community Centres are located on Parks and Recreation Department property, it follows that Community Centre signs are also Parks and Recreation Department property. The said Department, therefore, must assume responsibility for regulating this signage. The Planning Department supports the Parks and Recreation Department assuming a coordinating function regarding Community Centre signage as this should result in a more consistent treatment of signage proposals from individual Community Centres.

The outstanding issue at this time involves a consistent set of zoning regulations regarding such signage. The Planning Department is presently preparing a proposed revised Zoning By-law for the City. This would appear to be the most appropriate mechanism for enacting the regulatory changes necessary to accommodate consistent signage regulations because of the differences in zoning districts, zoning designations, and zoning regulations from Community Committee to Community Committee that exist at present.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

A number of factors have been outlined in terms of their impact on the types of signage available to Community Centres. The primary concerns of the Parks and Recreation Department are to ensure that signage conforms to the existing by-law(s) and does not detract from the visual image of the neighbourhood.

The application of consistent zoning or the imposition of stringent signage standards could penalize some Community Centres. Dependent on the geographic location of the Community Centres, requirements and considerations for signage will vary. Issues such as the lighting, size and height of signs have a greater impact in residential areas, as opposed to industrial to commercial areas. Some Community Centres are located off major thoroughfares with lane access only. In such situations, additional signage may be justified to provide adequate identification of the facility.

Because of the wide range of locations occupied by Community Centres, the Planning Department is presently considering an approach whereby a minimum level of permitted signage would be allowed for any Community Centre, with greater coverage perhaps being allowed depending on location. Minimum permitted signage would likely include a free-standing site identification sign, a reader board panel and some fascia identification signage. The intent of a minimum standard relative to Community Centre signage is to provide a consistent basis for signage requirements while still allowing some consideration for specific Community Centre needs.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

The Parks and Recreation Department does not have the financial resources to supply signage for Community Centres. Therefore, the responsibility for providing effective signage continues to lie with Community Centre volunteers. Signs incorporating a reader board are expensive items, (ranging from approximately $4,000 - $10,000) often beyond the operating budgets for Community Centres. Alternative funding methods to obtain signage are often required.

The Parks and Recreation Department recommends that Community Centres retain the freedom to negotiate with advertisers as a means of obtaining signage for their facilities. To restrict this opportunity would be considered detrimental to the autonomy of these volunteer boards. Although the Parks and Recreation Department could attempt to negotiate for signage with advertisers on behalf of Community Centres, this action would also be considered intrusive by Community Centre volunteers. In addition, the Concessions and Revenue Officer for the Department has indicated that the current economic climate is not conducive to negotiations for corporate donations in exchange for exclusivity of supply (i.e. beverage companies). The volume of product utilized at many Community Centre sites would not be considered adequate to enter into such negotiations.

The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (G.C.W.C.C.) has also been consulted with regard to the acquisition of third party advertising as a means of funding Community Centre signs. The Executive Board of the G.C.W.C.C. strongly supports the rights of Community Centre Executives to independently negotiate and fundraise for Community Centre projects such as signage (Appendix 2).

The Planning Department has concerns regarding product advertising signage on non-residential property as the absence of restrictions can easily result in a proliferation of non-essential signage unrelated to the site(s) in question. However, should political consensus indicate that such signage on Community Centre sites is desirable, the Planning Department is prepared to develop regulations regarding an appropriate percentage (eg. 10-20%) of the total sign that can be allocated for advertising purposes.

The Parks and Recreation Department will assume active involvement in any discussions/plans relative to the acquisition of third party advertising for Community Centres. Written approval must be obtained from the Department prior to Community Centres taking any further action towards erecting signs containing third party advertising. This approval will be conditional upon the following:

a) advertisement must be consistent with the regulations developed by the Planning Department.

b) product/company advertising must be considered "acceptable" by the general public.

c) advertisement must be tastefully displayed.

d) limit of one sponsor per sign.

To facilitate/reduce the variance procedures at the Community Committee level, the Parks and Recreation Department proposes the implementation of departmental procedures (as outlined in Appendix 3) defining the role of the Planning and Parks and Recreation Departments in enforcing the signage regulations as stated in the existing by-laws.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends that a policy regarding signage at Community Centre sites be implemented as follows:-

1. That the Parks and Recreation Department assume responsibility for regulating the external signage at Community Centres.

2. That signage at Community Centres conform to the by-law(s) pertinent to the site on which the Community centre is located.

3. That the proposed revised Zoning By-law for the City currently being prepared by the Planning Department address the minimum level of permitted signage for Community Centres.

4. That the use of third party advertising on external Community Centre signs be acceptable upon written approval from the Parks and Recreation Department.

5. That existing and future signage at Community Centres be reviewed in consideration of the above-stated recommendations.

6. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Adoption of the clause.

In amendment,

Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy,
Seconded by Councillor Kaufmann,

That the clause be amended by deleting the words "the Parks and Recreation Department" where they appear in Recommendations 1. and 4., and substituting therefor the words "the appropriate Community Committee."

Moved by Councillor Demare,
That the clause and proposed amendment be referred to the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Dutch Elm Disease Control File PB-2

795 4. On March 25th, 1992, Council referred the following motion to your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture; namely:-

"WHEREAS the Provincial Minister of Natural Resources has stated he was prepared to sit down with the City of Winnipeg to reconsider the level of funding in the fight against Dutch Elm Disease;

AND WHEREAS both the City Forester and the Chief of Forest Protection for the Province have both stated the elm losses would be catastrophic if the cutbacks remain;

BE IT RESOLVED that Council instruct the Official Delegation to meet with provincial officials about the Province's level of funding to the City's Dutch Elm Disease Program."

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture concurs in the above resolution and submits same for favourable consideration by Council.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Five Star Community Awards Program File GC-8

796 5. On January 22nd, 1992, Council referred the following motion to your Committee, namely:-

"WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg will, on June 1st, 1992, host the 'Official Kick-Off' ceremonies and other events for the year's 'National Access Awareness Week' in Canada;

AND WHEREAS National Access Awareness Week is an opportunity for Canadians to bring attention to needed improvements in access to transportation, housing, employment, recreation, and education for all people with disabilities;

AND WHEREAS National Access Awareness Week provides an opportunity for the development of a network and the establishment of partnerships between persons with disabilities and those traditionally not involved with disability issues;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has established an objective to be 'An Accessible City' by 1993;

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

AND WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Secretariat of State for the Federal Government have created a 'Five-Star Community Awards' Program which has three main objectives, namely:-

1) to recognize significant achievements by communities that have improved access for disabled people in five theme or "star" areas:-

- transportation
- housing
- employment
- recreation
- education;

2) to highlight models of programs, services and ideas that other communities can use;

3) to inspire more communities to find ways of insuring the integration of disabled persons into community life;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has made much progress of which its citizens can be justifiably proud and can have particular pride with its progress in the provision of recreation services;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture be requested to prepare a submission for recognition of the City of Winnipeg within the 'Five Star Community Awards' area of 'Recreation' to the selection committee responsible for these awards."

On February 17th, 1992, your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture considered the above motion referred by Council with respect to the Five-Star Community Awards and requested an Administrative report including a submission to the Five-Star Community Awards, Recreation category, seeking recognition for the City of Winnipeg.

For your information, the City of Winnipeg in May 1990, declined an invitation to make application for the 1990 Five-Star Community Awards, following a review of the program criteria and relevant city initiatives in the categories of Transportation, Housing, Employment, Recreation and Education.

The Five-Star Community Awards offer Canadian communities an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to accessibility and integration of persons with disabilities and to be recognized for their accomplishments in these areas.

Jointly sponsored by the National Access Awareness Week Committee, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Department of the Secretary of State, these awards are difficult to attain and are the most prestigious awards a community can receive for accomplishments in integrating persons with disabilities into community life. Municipal governments apply for awards on behalf of their entire communities, as making a community accessible is a shared responsibility. Municipal representatives are expected to take a leadership role by ensuring total community input through public meetings and extensive consultations with community groups, non-profit organizations, agencies and administrative bodies serving people with disabilities.

As directed at the Committee meeting of February 17th, 1992, the Parks and Recreation Department has endeavoured to work towards the preparation of a submission to the 1992 Five-Star Community Awards, Recreation category; however, the enormity of the task has raised serious concerns relevant to the quality of the submission due to lack of total community input.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Although the submission deadline to Ottawa has been extended from March 31st, to April 30th, the time frame is inadequate to ensure a quality submission. As Winnipeg will be competing for recognition in the largest population category of the awards, a six to eight month time frame would be a more reasonable period to prepare a comprehensive submission worthy of consideration.

Relevant information pertaining to "Winnipeg, an Accessible City by 1993" and other initiatives of the municipal government pertinent to the award have been gathered within the time frames necessary to meet the 1992 submission deadline. Total community input, however, has not been possible as community groups are faced with two major hurdles in responding to requests with severe time constraints. Firstly, persons with disabilities face barriers in securing transportation and the service of an attendant to facilitate participation in meetings arranged on short notice. Secondly, many community groups serving people with disabilities are unable to respond quickly, as input is required from their volunteer boards and/or membership. The Parks and Recreation Department facilitated an informational meeting and requested input from community groups within a compressed time frame, resulting in less than a thirty percent response. Lack of time negated the opportunity for an extensive consultation process to occur. As part of the decision-making process in selecting award winners, the national selection committee conducts extensive interviews with appropriate members of the community; therefore, it is critical to have total community input and support. Several written responses from these groups have indicated a 1992 submission would be premature.

The Parks and Recreation Department is currently conducting a comprehensive review of adapted services within the city with the intention of providing a framework for future direction by the Department. Concurrently, a review of the Department's draft Adapted Services Policy will be accomplished. As community input is critical to the success of all three initiatives - the Five-Star Community Awards program, the Adapted Services Review and the formulation of the Adapted Services Policy, efforts towards completing all initiatives by January of 1993 could further strengthen a 1993 submission to the awards program. A working relationship has been established by the Department with the Mayor's Access Advisory Committee relative to the "Winnipeg, An Accessible City by 1993" initiative. As the Five-Star Community Awards place an emphasis on Council adopted policies, the Department could work with the Mayor's Access Advisory Committee in the development of a draft Adapted Services Policy to be brought forward for consideration by City Council.

Should the City of Winnipeg be selected to receive a Five-Star Community Award in 1993, the accomplishment could be highlighted during the Department's centennial celebrations.

An alternative to the above would be that the City of Winnipeg submit an application to the 1992 Five-Star Community Awards program based on the input received to date. This alternative is not recommended due to lack of total community input and support, and insufficient time available to be seriously considered for this award.

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture therefore recommends:-

1. That the City of Winnipeg not proceed with a submission to the Five- Star Community Awards program, Recreation category, for 1992, and that a submission for recognition of the City of Winnipeg under the program be prepared for 1993.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the foregoing.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

Collection of Outstanding Parking Fines
File FR-2

797 6. On March 23rd, 1992, Council referred the following motion to your Committee, under Section 16.1 of the Procedure By-law No. 5400/90:-

"THAT if an additional amount of $500,000.00 is raised over and above the budgeted amount for the collection of outstanding parking fines; that this money, if realizable, be put into a mill rate reserve fund to keep down next year's current budget by the actual amount raised above the budgeted amount, if any."

Your Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture recommends that the motion be filed.

Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

Report of the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture, dated March 30th, 1992

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE
MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Duguid,
Seconded by Councillor Timmers,
798 WHEREAS larvaciding is an effective and generally environmentally friendly method of mosquito control;

AND WHEREAS an aggressive and enhanced larviciding program in most years will keep mosquitoes at levels where they are not a public nuisance;

AND WHEREAS all citizens deserve as much relief as possible from mosquitoes during Winnipeg's short summers;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's mosquito problems do not enhance the image or reputation of our City nationwide;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the present mosquito program be enhanced, and that the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture determine the degree of enhancement for the 1992 summer season;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City explore the utilization of the unemployed to be involved in an enhanced larvaciding program and that this be modelled on the Dutch Elm Disease Program used to train social services recipients.

Automatic Referral to Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture in accordance with Section 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

Moved by Councillor Duguid,
Seconded by Councillor Thomas,
799 WHEREAS the survival rate of replanting mature trees in the 100+ age bracket is almost nil;

AND WHEREAS the 90 lot subdivision will allow a small percentage of the trees on the Richardson property to be saved;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture direct the City Forester to provide an assessment of the following on the Richardson property:-

1) the survival probabilities of replanting mature trees; and,

2) the percentage of mature trees that can be realistically preserved in this proposed 90 lot subdivision;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this information be available for the three readings of the by-law regarding the Richardson property subdivision.

Automatic Referral to Committee on Protection, Parks and Culture in accordance with Section 16.1 of the Procedure By-law.

COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, PARKS AND CULTURE
QUESTION PERIOD

800 Councillor Kaufmann advised that at a meeting of the St. Boniface-St. Vital Community Committee held last night, a resident produced an ad for the position of Director of Parks and Recreation in which the salary was listed at $75,000.00 to $92,000.00. He asked why the salary was included when it may be possible to obtain a very qualified individual at a salary in the $60,000.00 to $70,000.00 range. He referred to similar ads in financial papers which do not specify a salary range, and asked why the City continues to do so.
Councillor Selinger rose and suggested that the question is a personnel matter and, in view of the fact that the Personnel Department reports to the Chief Commissioner, that, therefore, the question should be properly addressed to the Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Gilroy agreed with Councillor Selinger's remarks. He agreed to take the question as notice, and draw it to the attention of the Chairman of Executive Policy Committee.