

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE  
DESIGN OF PUBLIC SPACES  
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
1:00 P.M. – 3:00 P.M., FRIDAY, MAY 3, 2019  
SECOND FLOOR EXECUTIVE BOARDROOM  
NORQUAY BUILDING, 401 YORK AVENUE**

There a review of Action items from the previous meeting.

**Action:** Government Co-chair will speak with Manitoba's representative to these discussions. He will also inquire about timelines for any action as it relates to OFC/NBC.

**Result:** The discussion did not take place. According to Office of the Fire Commissioner, there was a meshing on April 12 meeting. It is a priority of the governments, but there are no timelines for a resolution.

All other Action items from previous Minutes (April 18, 2019) completed.

A Committee member received an email saying that the National Research Council (NRC) would receive government funding to secure operations, allowing them to make their reports available on-line at no cost. CSA is interested in making a similar arrangement with the government, forgoing the costs of the public purchasing their materials on-line. If this proceeds, it will solve the problem of including cross-reference to these other documents in the DOPS standard.

Public event will be held May 14 at the Viscount Gort, between 1:30 and 3:30. All information related to the event has been posted on the Disabilities Issues Office website. Invitations have been mailed to more than 3000 organizations in our contact list.

**Action:** Members send additional contact lists to the Secretary for circulation ensuring we are reaching out to all potential stakeholders and interested parties.

The Co-chairs and select members will be at the front table for the event. The government Co-chair will serve as the government representative on the committee and speak to questions related to the Manitoba Building Code (MBC). A question that is likely come up is when the MBC will adopt, with or without amendments, the 2015 edition of the National Building Code. It was suggested that if there are questions about technicalities regarding the MBC, we do not try to address them then. The MBC is a highly technical document, and this would not be the proper forum to address those questions.

**Action:** The Secretary will draft introductory remarks and house-keeping note for the Co-chair. Indicating length of the public event, washrooms, no break etc.

**Action:** The Secretary and members of the front table will meet at 1:00 p.m. Monday at the Second Floor Boardroom of the Norquay to do a dry run of slides and confirm any last minute details.

Committee members were forwarded Word documents for the separate sections for each of the Design standard sections they have been assigned. The assignment is to edit the recommended value column to be the text we might move forward with and providing comments for the group to consider.

The first statements in the section fall into application – a definition of what they are. We have started a definition section and we have to determine if what is written makes sense in the current context. We have to define trails by function and geographical location and intent.

Parking is an area in the MBC. The Co-chair asked if we have to follow the requirements of the MBC or can we aim for something higher. The government Co-chair suggested that establishing a requirement above the MBC would be a problem. A committee member pointed out that if there is nothing in the MBC regarding a particular aspect of parking in the MBC, then we are not in violation. An example of this would be City of Winnipeg building projects. City building have to meet code, but they must also meet the City of Winnipeg Accessible Design Standard (CWAD).

Other points regarding Section 3.2

- They talk about the width of the parking stall but never the length
- They are a number of exclusions in this section. Where will they be listed
- Ontario lists two types of accessible parking stalls. Do we differentiate and define what each of them

A committee member says that individuals who are blind refer to parking lots as concrete deserts. There are no indicators of the route these individuals should take. He stresses that there has to be continuity from parking stalls to exterior trails or buildings pick-up locations. This same problem is present in routes to and from play areas.

There were a lot of redundancies in this section that have been removed. We should add a blank statement at the front or the back of the section where reference is made that all ramps will comply with MBC requirements. CWAD speaks to unexpected drop-offs, which will be included, because MBC speaks only to building ramps, not those in the broader exterior environment.

Any elevators or mechanical lifts in the scope this standard will comply with CWAD. Elevators in the MBC are within building and not referred to in exterior spaces. One of the requirements could be that if the elevation is beyond x or a pre-determined height, it requires an elevator or a lift.

There are challenges to the upkeep of elevators in unmonitored areas. What are minimum dimensions of the area outside the elevator that are level? How can we ensure that snow is cleared and that there is proper drainage of that area? Mechanical lifts do not hold up well in winter elements.

There should also be additional line in the Applications section about features of the DOPS standard being compliant with MBC recognized elevator standards “as amended from time to time”.

We can use Ontario’s standard (AODA) as the requirement of where they are located, but a lot of the language comes from CSA. What is the font that is used? Sans serif is AODA requirement. Signage doesn’t preclude the use of graphic design, but the information should be essential and not extraneous. Colour contrast varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Brian mentioned this is a very difficult area of accessibility and being constantly re-evaluated. We need some guidance in this area. Glen also to refer to CNIB “Clearing Our Path” requirements.

AODA says that a minimum of 20 percent of tables should be accessible. Members say that the 20 percent should be in response to accessible “seating”, not tables. Is the 20 percent determined by the numbers of tables in set area? Public spaces may not have a numbers of tables gathered close together. Percentage may not be the best way to determine this accessibility feature. Perhaps we have a table where accessible seating work in a similar manner as accessible parking with the number being adjusted according to the total number of seating or parking spaces. It was suggested we have a paragraph in the intent section setting out how we determine accessible seating.

**Action:** Committee members will make changes to their sections based on the suggested comments.

The next meeting of the DOPS Standard Development Committee is Friday, May 17 at 1:00 p.m. in the Second Floor Executive Boardroom of the Norquay Building, 401 York Avenue. Please note the earlier start time.