

Meeting Minutes



City of Guelph

Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC)

April 16, 2019

City Hall, Meeting Room 112

From 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Chair: Julian Murphy

Attendance: Members: Sarah Mathison, Brooke Sillaby, Ted Stevens, Maddie Workman, Deborah Stienstra, Mike Greer, Julian Murphy, Malcolm McLeod, Elyse Trudell, Lynn Jeaurond, Elizabeth Lowenger, Donna Mc Murdo; Staff: Leanne Warren (AAC Liaison),

Regrets: Harold Grace, Jason Dodge

Agenda Items

Welcome to all.

3:00 to 3:05 Item 1, 2 and 3

Item 1, Approval of the Agenda

Approved by Malcolm

Seconded: Brooke

Carried

Item 2, Declaration of Conflict of Interest – None Heard

Item 3, Approval of Minutes of February 19, 2019

Approved by Sarah

Seconded: Deborah

Carried

3:05 to 3:30 Item 4

Guelph Transit Updates – **For Information** – Transit staff David Sodaro

David reported the following:

- Rideco (new name for Trapeze software) program for Mobility – Service will be more efficient so that each driver will have up to the minute ride pick up schedule. Testing will begin shortly. This will improve service.
- Trip Planner should launch shortly as Jason is in Florida meeting with the vendor for training. Transit will be looking to AAC members to help with testing.
- AAC asked how the new system will work.

- David replied that the bus will be assigned the closest passenger to pick up next as they are dropping off the previous passenger. Drivers will only see one or two trips, in other words, only about an hour of their rider schedule.
- A number of new shelters at bus stops will be installed this year. Older shelters will be replaced with new ones that include solar lights. Transit staff are auditing the bus stops without shelters or with older shelters to prepare an installation plan that is prioritized by usage.
- The locations in industrial neighborhoods without sidewalks that have a lot of passengers are included in this audit. These bus stops will not be considered accessible as in most cases there isn't a plan to install a sidewalk.
- AAC asked if the information posts could have the font larger or move the bus stop schedule signs down a bit at most bus stops. David mentioned that there seem to be differing heights and that he will ask if there is a standard height to mount the signs.

3:30 to 4:00 Item 5

Starwood Park Play Equipment – **For Engagement** – Jyoti Pathak – Park Planning

Plans for the play equipment layout and type of equipment were sent to the AAC before the meeting.

- This park is a “neighborhood” park with Eastview Community Park and Carter Park nearby and connected through a trail system. The subdivision where Starwood Park is located is still under construction. Work has been going on for nine years. Paths in park are three meters wide and connecting routes are 2.4 meters wide. Slopes are all 2 or 2-1/2 % for cross and running slopes with an exclusion in one area where the trail connects with the play structure is 3.5%. The play ground is in an area that allows for an over look.
- Neighborhood park play structures have engineered wood fiber for the surface; 100 % of the Community park play structures require rubberized surfaces according to the standards that Parks Planning use.
- Signage will have Braille and tactile text with colour contrast.
- Shade structure is designed as required in the FADM.
- Benches are located on concrete with arm rests at each end and one intermediate arm rest to increase accessibility (two arm rests to use while standing up from seated position).
- The playground equipment has been through a selection process. Play-Power and Little Tikes were selected.
- There will be both a Junior (2- 5 years old) and a Senior (5 to 12 years old) play section.

AAC asked for:

- Collaborative/integrated play between high and lower elements; this request and examples of how to achieve were voiced many times through the discussion. An example is the talk-tube connecting play between the highest platform in the senior

play structure and the ground. The AAC are requesting that all areas of the park to include accessible play in some way.

- Wanted to know which elements were considered accessible with respect to both the playability of the elements and the surfacing?
 - Power-Play replied that the surfacing will be engineered wood fiber which is loose but compacted. It is realized that rubber surface is the better surface. City Park Planner added that there is a policy for the surfaces in the parks based on the type of park, for example Community parks are budgeted to include rubberized surface. Further, another park planner is working on the design for Eastview playground park and will be considered the fully accessible playground in that part of the city.
- Staff to consider accessibility early in the design. The AAC heard that the City engaged the local neighborhood prior to design however the AAC pointed out that demographics of a neighborhood change over time; a child is born with Cerebral Palsy, a grandparent acquires a disability, a family have visiting relatives/friends with a disability. These people would be excluded from fully using the park. The AAC noted that the expectation is not to get every child up to the top of a play structure but rather create a space that has a play interaction for everyone throughout the play structure, regardless of ability. For example, connecting spaces that are not accessible with spaces that are with some sort of interactive play between the spaces is what the AAC are asking for in all play structures.
- Consideration for those with concerns that a wheelchair will bottom out and become stuck on the wood fiber.
- Mixing of surface materials such as rubberized in some locations and the less expensive engineered wood fiber in other locations. The idea of Mobi-Mats often used to make beaches/water's edge accessible.
 - Play Power replied that CSA dictates the accessible features. Sometimes there can be a danger of combining surfaces as they could impact fall-zones.
 - No one at the meeting has seen Mobi-Mats used in a playground.
 - Aboud mentioned that all Guelph play grounds are now being constructed with a concrete curb. A new option to ramp the concrete will be to have the sidewalk gradually go down to the level of what the curb ramp lower section needs to be to enter the playground surface rather than a traditional curb ramp that creates warped side of the curb ramp; the sides of the curb ramp create a steep angle for a person using a wheelchair or walker.
 - Play-Power stated that in this contract that they will focus on ground level play to be wheelchair accessible. They have a new products: therapeutic rings, solo spinners that encourage either cooperative play or individual play. Both the Junior and Senior play structures have a transfer station entrance. They also have colour contrast in their play equipment.
- For information on testing of the equipment for playability for children with Autism.
 - Play Power replied that they are looking at new designs and working with a physician in the United States who advises regarding this type of play.
 - The playground has natural water areas.
- Drinking fountains.
 - The City replied that drinking fountains are not included in small neighborhood parks.

- A ramp onto the play structure with play elements to include all kids as it is tough to see a child have to sit and watch others play. Maybe consider elements that are usable by all like the teeter totter in the South End Park (Dragonfly Park).
- The accessible seat of the games table to overlap the concrete accessible route. This idea could apply to other play elements as the designer did at the South End Park; the sand digger and a sand/water table are both adjacent to the concrete accessible route.

Final comments:

- Committee feels that there isn't play value for people with a disability in the current design.
- Aboud and Play-Power will look to see if they can improve the accessible experience of the play structures. Further, Royal City Park will be a community park with a rubberized surface.
- Play-Power spoke about talking tubes, etc. to connect the high area of the senior play structure as a good idea.
- Staff offered to bring the revised plans to the AAC however timing is of concern with the AAC not meeting again until June 18. AAC offered to review any revised plans at the Site Plan Review Sub-committee; staff agreed to take the AAC up on this offer.

Motion: AAC offered that the revised plans could be brought to the Site Plan Review sub-committee for evaluation.

Motion by: Donna

Seconded by: Lynn

Carried.

4:00 to 4:10 Item 6

Accessible Housing – **For Discussion** – Leanne Warren

In talking further with different departments it seems that the approach should be directed toward changes in the Ontario Building Code (OBC). Planning only looks at land use and by Provincial law is not able to influence beyond this. The committee was asked if it would help to have someone from the Building Department attend an AAC meeting so that we fully understand the Code and how it's interpreted with this topic.

Further, the AAC should determine if we are asking questions about all accessible housing or just accessible houses and not other multi-residential housing.

The AAC determined that we should look at both multi-residential and single dwelling housing.

AAC asked if a staff person from Building Services could attend the next meeting to help the committee understand the OBC interpretations on this subject for both single and multi-residential accessible housing. The goal of the committee is to fully understand the legislation to determine a plan to inform one or all levels of government that they are concerned that there will be a shortage of truly accessible single and multi-residential housing as the aging population adds pressure to what seems to be an already under-served population (low inventory of accessible housing).

4:10 to 4:15 Item 7

City Recreation Programs – **For Information** – Leanne Warren – Deferred in the interest of time

4:15 to 4:20 Item 8

U of G Research Project – For Information – Deborah Stienstra (AAC member) and John Beaton (U of G Project)

John and Deborah will be co-leading a project to understand how people with a disability get involved in their community (volunteering). There will be a number of focus groups including partnerships with Hope House and the People Information Network (PIN).

AAC members are not required to participate but are invited to participate.

Focus of the study is to understand why people with a disability volunteer. It has long been thought that people with a disability only volunteer to gain job skills however this study is aimed to learn if that is true or, among many possible outcomes, to learn if people with a disability volunteer to inform change in their community. It is hoped that the study will result in an understanding of how people with a disability can thrive in their community as a result of becoming involved. For example, no data exists regarding if and why women with disabilities volunteer. The results of the project could be shared with the City of Guelph. There are three pilot projects identified as an outcome of the project that will be shared with the Minister of Labor.

Deborah mentioned that “It is thought that people with a disability volunteer to get a job however that seems not to be true, for example this committee of volunteers focus on making a community better.”

AAC ask if they will be looking at the “if and why or why don’t” people with a disability volunteer. Veterinary students volunteer and were recommended to Deborah as a possible group to connect with.

Deborah will keep the AAC informed and invite members through Leanne when the project is ready to launch.

4:20 to 4:35 Item 9

Parking downtown – **For Engagement** - Lauren Short – Deferred in the interest of time

4:35 to 4:40 Item 10

AAC Site Plan Sub-Committee Report – **For Information** – Mike Greer

The number of site plan submissions has been approximately 5 to 7 every two weeks; this week there are 8.

Members were reminded that if they are interested in joining this sub-committee to let Leanne know as training before a new member’s first meeting is needed.

4:40 to 5:00 Item 11

Election of AAC Committee Chair and Vice-Chair for 2019

Julian will step down as Chair and as a committee member during the summer months this year as he is moving from the community. Mike will chair in the interim if needed.

Motion: The AAC will elect the Chair and Vice-Chair at their next meeting. Members are invited to nominate a member for a position(s) through email to Leanne by May 31, 2019 at noon.

Further, Nominees are invited to send Leanne a paragraph (approximately 3 sentences) of why they would like to be in the position that they have been nominated for by June 7 at noon.

Members are permitted to self-nominate.

Moved by Julian

Seconded: Malcolm

Carried

Members nominated at the meeting: Mike Greer for Chair – Mike has accepted.

Malcolm McLeod for vice-chair – Malcolm has accepted.

Email Leanne if you would like to nominate a member or have any questions; please watch for a confirmation email from Leanne and follow up if you don't received one within 2 business days as mentioned above.

Next Meeting:

June 18, 2019 from 3 – 5 p.m. City Hall 112

Possible Topics:

- Site Plan Sub-Committee report
- Controlling Speed on Zaduk – For Engagement - Julie Tot, Traffic Investigations
- Parking downtown – For Engagement - Lauren Short
- City Recreation Programs – For Information – Leanne Warren
- Parks and Recreation Master Plan - For Engagement – Mallory Lemon
- Building Services/Accessible Housing and OBC – For Information
- Committee Election of Chair and Vice-chair positions for 2019

Terminology Explained

1. **For Information** – Something has taken place or there is an event that the Committee members should be aware of. For example, Access Recognition Awards by the Guelph Barrier Free Committee
2. **For Recommendation** – Committee will make a motion that provides a recommendation to staff or Council
3. **For Discussion** – Committee will discuss a topic and provide the Liaison with direction. For example, topics reported in detail to the Committee of Council
4. **For Engagement** – These note the formal engagement of committee members on topics, usually directly related to the Engagement requirements in the AODA