



ARMSTRONG'S POINT

A P P E N D I C E S

PLANNING STUDY

- provides status of neighbourhood prior to initiating policy, programmatic, or regulatory changes
- typically includes brief history of neighbourhood and recent development proposals
- may also include statement of intent, neighbourhood values, future directions, and a description of the process(es) utilized to identify them

PROS

- provides benchmarks; provides background; proposes initial directions; captures neighbourhood status (snapshot); can serve as foundation for introducing other planning tools

CONS

- tends to burn energy, along with enthusiasm for necessary follow-up efforts; tends to be mistaken for “the plan”

SECONDARY PLAN

- provides policy direction for determining merits of future development proposals
- development proposals that are contrary to the plan’s policies are either discouraged or require plan amendment (more onerous—and much more rare—than rezoning, variance, etc)
- provides the underpinning for related initiatives which, without the plan, would either not be undertaken or would not be successfully sustained (e.g. design guidelines, zoning regulations)

PROS

- Council approved by-law expresses commitment to future neighbourhood directions; particularly useful when new neighbourhood is emerging (greenfield or brownfield) or when older neighbourhood is experiencing incompatible development pressures; applies to entire delineated neighbourhood, which is treated as a whole rather than individual properties in isolation; clear statement of intent, declaration of shared values, and identification of future directions by a community of contributors (most effective when more than one interest is represented)

CONS

- requires hard work and commitment to prepare, including cooperation and compromise among interests that may have clashed in the past; due to their rarity in Winnipeg, may be ignored in subsequent development work-ups; difficult to keep current if care is not taken to commit to review & update

DESIGN GUIDELINES

- as a supplement to zoning regulations, provide guidance to proposed exterior alterations (e.g. new infill, additions, landscape, etc)
- can involve either an administrative or consultative design review process

PROS

- encourages developments that are compatible with existing (or desired new) neighbourhood development forms and layouts

CONS

- if not carefully crafted and focused on key attributes, can stifle development and discourage maintenance; can limit creative expression if too prescriptive; can unnecessarily lengthen development approval process; requires additional department resources

SPECIAL ZONING REGULATIONS (INCLUDING OVERLAY DISTRICT)

- as a supplement to the underlying zoning regulations, better reflect existing (or desired new) neighbourhood development forms and layouts through a variety of zoning measures, including area-specific building setbacks and height, density, parking, or sign regulations
- draft zoning by-law provides several new tools, including introduction of new zoning districts and opportunity for overlay districts where planning study or secondary plan has been undertaken

PROS

- zoning regulations are effective where “no more / no less” and quantitative measures can capture planning objectives; overlay districts are effective where an existing (or desired new) neighbourhood’s development forms and layouts differ substantively from the available base (underlying) zoning districts

CONS

- because application can be made to rezone any property or vary virtually any zoning regulation (provided such a change is consistent with Plan Winnipeg), zoning provisions without a clearly articulated plan intent cannot be counted on to protect a neighbourhood from inappropriate development proposals; while not every part of Winnipeg requires more specific plans (e.g. exclusively residential suburban neighbourhoods such as Royalwood; employment clusters such as Murray Industrial Park don’t typically benefit), newly emerging neighbourhoods (e.g. Waverley West) and neighbourhoods in transition (e.g. Centennial/West Alexander) benefit from planning studies and secondary plans that form the basis for zoning regulations and other planning tools, without which decisions on proposals to change zoning on a particular property must be made without a clear policy framework

ARMSTRONG'S POINT: VICTORIAN SUBURB IN THE HEART OF WINNIPEG

If you ask Winnipeggers for directions to Armstrong's Point, chances are they will not know what you are talking about. The name does not appear on most maps of the city and is probably known to the "Pointers" themselves and few others. Armstrong's Point is a neck of land thrown out by the Assiniboine River, about a mile from the Forks. Beginning in the 1880s, it was developed out of a conscious desire for privacy and exclusivity and this isolation has been largely preserved. The river surrounds the 21.8-hectare area like a moat, making it almost an island. Gates built at the three entrances to the Point in 1911 further insulated this secure retreat from the outside world. The Point was set apart topographically from other areas of the city and its wealthy residents of mainly British background also were segregated from other economic classes and ethnic groups.

The Point has been known by a number of names since the time of European settlement at Red River. Before that, it likely had a long history as a popular Indian campsite as it offered firewood, water and protection. On maps of the Red River Settlement, this neck of land is clearly identified as "Pt. au Peltier" (see Figure 1). In 1848 the Hudson's Bay Company granted a deed of the land to Captain Joseph Hill, a staff officer of the Chelsea Pensioners who were recruited from England as part of a "home guard" for the colony. Other Pensioners lived on the Point as well and, for a time, it was known as "Pensioners' Point." Hill left the West in 1853 to fight in the Crimean War, placing his property, then known as "Hill's Point," in the care of his batman Corporal James Armstrong who kept a "shed" on the site.

In the 1870s Armstrong's Point or "Grove" was a place for day excursions or church picnics. In July 1873, for example, Captain Griggs took the S.S. Selkirk on an expedition to Armstrong's Grove. Some days later, an Orange picnic was held at the same spot. In September 1879, cavalry were camped on the Point with permission from the owner. There were some buildings on the Point in the 1870s. In 1873 it was reported that there was a row of houses facing the river. One was Colonel Osborne Smith's house, the "Crow's Nest". A gardener by the name of W.H. McKenney was resident on the Point, as was Elliott Armstrong, a farmer. Some believe the site was named after this Armstrong but recent research appears to confirm Corporal Armstrong's claim.

Winnipeg experienced its first mild land boom in 1873. Corporal Armstrong, hearing nothing from Hill and supposing the officer had died, sold the land to F.E. Cornish, soon to become the first Mayor of Winnipeg. (Armstrong died a year later, and is buried in St. James Cemetery.) Captain Hill's death had been very much exaggerated, however. Two enterprising Winnipeggers went to London in 1875 to find Hill and, if possible, acquire title to the Point. When they finally traced him

through his military tailor, Hill refused to sell the land. Instead, Hill returned to Winnipeg in 1880, proved his title to the Point, and sold the property in 1881 for \$28,000, just before the collapse of a second “boom”. The new owners, John McDonald and E. Rothwell, were determined to subdivide the land into lots. Lot 86 in the Parish of St. James, or Armstrong’s Point, was surveyed into lots in 1881. (See Figure 2.) The site was renamed and promoted as “Victoria Place”. Some of the new residents used this as their address for a time but the Point was forever to be known by the name of Hill’s former batman.

Captain Hill had been fortunate to return to Winnipeg in the midst of the “Great Boom of 1881-82” which accompanied the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway yards in the city. From the early 1870s Winnipeg developed rapidly from a fur trade village to a commercial centre. As the city grew, the central core became less desirable as a residential area. Winnipeg’s elite sought escape from the dirt, smell and noise of the foundries, scrap yards and marshalling yards, from the grim immigration sheds where infectious diseases were believed to spread, and from the pickpockets, beggars, boozers and “houses of ill-fame” of the city’s core. The romantic suburb was the answer to the new wealthy class in the Victorian urban world. The suburb offered pure air, quiet extensive grounds and spacious distinctive homes unlike the drab crowded rows of identical houses found in the city. These exclusive havens were especially important for women and children, providing a safe, snug environment protected from the vice and congestion of the city. A passion for healthy outdoor sport was shared by the elite and in a suburb there was space for croquet, bowls, archery, rowing, canoeing, fishing, riding, cycling, tobogganing and skating. Lawn tennis, in particular, was all the rage in the 1880s when clubs opened up in cities across Canada.

Glancing at a map of Winnipeg today, it is odd to imagine that Armstrong’s Point was once regarded as a suburb. Yet as Randy Rostecki writes in his thesis “The Growth of Winnipeg, 1870-1886”, because of its distance from the city the Point was initially more of a summer residential area than anything else, “the country set of Winnipeg’s commercial elite.”¹³ Similarly St. John’s and Fort Rouge were suburbs of Winnipeg in the 1880s. At this time suburbs were reserved for those who had a horse and carriage to drive to town. Everyone kept horses on the Point in the early days and all had driving horses to make the trip into Winnipeg. There were stables on the grounds of each house and some of the residents hired “coachmen.” Some residents of the Point also had cows and Ross Sutherland kept a bull. People from Winnipeg regarded the Point as “way out in the woods,” as a day’s adventure, a place for picnics.

Armstrong’s Point was advertised as “not only the finest locality for artistic and stately homes, but it will become... the Faubourg St. Germain of Winnipeg, the most fashionable drive in the city.” (See Figure 3.) It did become the home of some of Winnipeg’s more affluent citizens, the realtors, merchants and financiers who dominated local politics, the founders of the prestigious Manitoba Club. It also became the site of some of Winnipeg’s finest turn-of-the-century

domestic architecture. Building began in 1882 and by 1904 there were twenty homes on the Point. The most vigorous period of construction was from 1910 to 1920. Many of these palatial homes were given names by their owners. 137 West Gate, for example, was called “Kenilworth” by the W.W. Blair family, after the magnificent ruins of the English castle where the Earl of Leicester entertained Elizabeth I. The gateways to the Point formed a clear social boundary and deepened the air of privacy and seclusion. In 1914 the original street names of Assiniboine Drive and Central Avenue were changed to the present day East Gate, Middle Gate and West Gate.

Armstrong’s Point was an enchanting place to grow up with its shady quiet streets that were insulated from through-traffic (see Figures 4-9). The children galloped their ponies around the road and, on Saturdays in winter, they could catch a ride on the Eaton’s delivery sleigh. There were hiding places along the riverbank. A fountain once stood at the central intersection of the Point and a pretty park surrounded the Cornish Library built in 1914. The Cornish Bath was beside the library (see Figure 10).

The stately homes of Armstrong’s Point document a way of life that entailed a rigid observance of class. They were staffed by cooks, maids and, in some cases, butlers and coachmen. The servants lived and worked in the rooms at the back of such homes. They had their own entrances, staircases, hallways and sleeping quarters, all of which were positioned to ensure there was little contact between the servants and the family members who lived in the larger, more opulent rooms to the front of such homes.¹⁸ Here also was an abundance of doorways, vestibules and hallways that ensured that visitors could be winnowed out according to social station.

On the large lots outside the homes were spacious lawns, flowerbeds and orchards. “Pleasure-walks” were laid out beside grounds for croquet, badminton and archery and along the riverbank. The most embellished portions of the grounds were those visible to observers from the street. There was also concern that fine stretches of lawn and continuously-brilliant flower beds be visible from the windows and verandas. Less attractive features, such as the kitchen garden and yards for horses and cows, were at the back. Many of the homes had elaborate, sometimes two-storey, stables and carriage houses (some examples survive today) and later, motor-car garages.

The first substantial home on Armstrong’s Point was the “Nook”, built by wholesale dry goods merchant F. W. Stobart in 1881. This home, which no longer stands, was on the site of 89 East Gate. Also in 1881, Andrew Bannatyne began construction of his magnificent home “Rothesay,” built to resemble a manor in Scotland near his birthplace (see Figures 11-14). Bannatyne was a prominent merchant, an M.L.A., M.P., first President of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and first President of the Manitoba Club. His wife was Annie McDermot daughter of the wealthy free trader Andrew McDermot. Rothesay, which had thirty rooms, originally cost \$38,000. J.H. Rowan was the architect. Imported stone was combined with local Tyndall

stone. The quoins and parapets were of Red Wing Minnesota sandstone. Bannatyne's castle, however, was not completed during his lifetime. When the boom of 1881-82 broke, Bannatyne's business as well as his health failed. He died in 1889 and his castle remained unfinished.

J. Stewart Tupper, son of Sir Charles, Father of Confederation, bought and completed the home in 1900, renaming it "Ravenscourt." It later served as an Anglican School for boys and a Catholic school for girls before it was demolished in 1950. The stone pillars that formed the gates and marked the boundaries of the estate still stand (see Figure 15). The 26.2-metre American elm that towers above 150 West Gate is one of the original plantings within the grounds around Bannatyne's castle.

In 1882 three other homeowners were resident on the Point: J.W. Dalzell, engineer, W. Osborne Smith, whose home was called "The Elms," and Arthur F. Eden, who home "The Pagoda" still stands at 147 East Gate. Eden was with the firm of Stobart and Company and a Winnipeg alderman. The front door of the home faces the river as Assiniboine Drive originally ran between the house and the river. The interior is modestly finished compared to other homes on the Point but it contains features such as a fireplace faced with blue Minton tiles depicting the story of the Knights of the Round Table and the sword Excalibur. This house originally had an enormous lot. Eden built three tennis courts on the 2.8 hectares behind the house, which was known as the "Birdcage Tennis Club." Many residents of the Point were members of the club. W.M. Fisher who bought the home in 1891, used to cut the grass courts with a mower drawn by a horse wearing leather shoes so that the turf would not be cut.

E. Powis of Lyon, Mackenzie and Powis, wholesale grocers, built 9 Middle Gate in 1883 (see Figure 16). This home still stands today. William Fisher Luxton's home, 180 West Gate, was built in the early 1880s (see Figure 17). Luxton was a founder of the Free Press. This home, which no longer stands, later was owned by Colonel H.N. Ruttan, City Engineer. The Winnipeg Waterworks, built in 1882, was located at Armstrong's Point (see Figure 18). Before this establishment, water was distributed to Winnipeg homes with ox-drawn carts.²⁵ It was delivered in pails and sold by the gallon. The new system that piped water to the consumer was a private concern until 1899 when the City assumed responsibility for water supply, purchasing the Armstrong's Point Water Works Co. distribution system for \$237,650. The waterworks were dismantled in 1911 when the City abandoned the river as a source of water.

Palatial homes were built on the Point beginning in the 1880s but there also may have been some modest dwellings, even shacks or shanties. While the outskirts of town were becoming attractive to the possessing classes, they had always been home to the economically depressed. In the 1880s, ramshackle and squalid abodes were to be found at riverbank sites like the Hudson's Bay Company flats at the Forks.²⁶ The 1890 Henderson Directory lists nine homes of labourers on Armstrong's Point. A photograph of the Point in 1899 shows several modest homes in the background (see Figure 19). Eventually all squatters and intruders were driven from the Point, even in at least one case by gunpoint. In August of 1895,

F.W. Stobart shot at “nude bathers” on the Point.²⁷ He was fined \$50 but likely succeeded in discouraging such activity near his stately home.

Among the early homes on the Point that still stand is 135 Middle Gate, built in 1891 by barrister Ross Sutherland. The John Arbuthnot home at 103-05 Middle Gate was built in 1894. Arbuthnot was Mayor of Winnipeg from 1901-03. W.J. Tupper’s large red brick mansion at 145 Middle Gate was standing by 1896 (see Figure 20). 40 West Gate, the home of Senator Lendrum McMeans, was built in 1895. James Benning Monk, manager of the Bank of Ottawa, built 134 West Gate in 1896. Daniel McIntyre, Superintendent of Schools in Winnipeg for over forty years, built 123 Middle Gate in 1894 (see Figure 21). Among those no longer standing is the C.S. Richardson home at 113 East Gate, built in 1896. This later became the home Lady Schultz, widow of Sir John Christian Schultz (see Figure 22).

69 East Gate, built in 1895, is considered to be one of the finest homes on the Point (see Figures 23 and 24). It has been retained as a single-family dwelling and its extensive grounds have been well-maintained. In 1967 a city assessor noted that it was old and not of much value and believed the large lot would be an ideal location for two modern homes. Luckily his advice was not acted upon. The home was called “Maple Grove” by its first owner, James Rawlson Waghorn, publisher of “Waghorn’s Guide and Pocket Dictionary to Manitoba and the North West” and an accountant with Osler, Hammond and Nanton.

In July of 1905 the British Ben Greet Players, famous for their open-air performances of Shakespeare, performed for three evenings on the grounds of the Waghorn home.²⁹ A grassy mound formed the pastoral stage, still visible in the front yard of the home, and the trees of the riverbank formed the backdrop. Scenes from “Twelfth Night” and “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” were presented. Sybil Thorndike, then twenty-three, played the mischievous sprite Puck. Although the women in the audience held smoking torches to ward off the mosquitoes, the performers were not as fortunate. In later years Mr. and Mrs. C.W. Chivers recalled “the mosquitoes that plagued poor little Puck.” That same evening, the first speeding ticket was issued on the Point. Most of the audience drive their horses to the performance but one exuberant motor-car driver was estimated to be doing 22 m.p.h. when the legal limit was 10.

The second owner of 69 East Gate was Donald Bain who bought the home in 1907 and remained until the 1960s. In 1908 Bain commissioned architect D.W. Bellhouse to put a major extension on the home; another large addition was made in 1914. Bain was a grocer broker and wholesaler. His warehouse “The Brokerage” at the foot of Bannatyne Avenue was restored in 1978. Bain was also a famous turn-of-the-century hockey player. He played centre for the Winnipeg Victorias who were Stanley Cup champions twice. In 1949 Bain became the eighteenth member to be inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame. In 1903 he won the Canadian trapshooting championship and in 1930, at the age of fifty-six, Bain placed second in the Canadian Figure Skating Championships in the waltz contest.

The Bain home, restored in the early 1980s, has thirteen rooms, several fireplaces, an oak-panelled den with a mullioned-paned bay window, and a dining-room which seats fifty. Elm, oak, spruce and maple trees grace the well-maintained grounds. Here may be found the graves of Bain's hunting dogs, each of which was buried with a name plate marking the grave.

A syndicate of businessmen acquired all the vacant property on Armstrong's Point in 1903 and placed several restrictions on development.³¹ The lots were not to be less than 75 feet (22.9 metres) wide. The houses were to cost a minimum of \$5,000 and they were to be set back 25 feet (7.6 metres) from the new street. Driveways were to be used instead of lanes. A new map of the residential subdivision was drawn in 1904 (see Figure 25). The new restrictions on development ensured that the Point would remain a district of wealthy homeowners.

Among the homes built after the turn-of-the-century was that of the Reverend Charles Gordon, pen name Ralph Connor, Canada's most successful novelist of the early twentieth century. He produced the best-selling western novels, *The Sky Pilot* (1899) and *The Prospector* (1904), as well as those set in the Glengarry County of his youth. The Gordons, who had seven children, built their enormous home at 54 West Gate in 1913. The cost of construction was close to \$50,000, making it one of the city's most expensive homes to that date. Gordon had no sooner moved into the home when he left to serve in France as Chaplain to the Canadian forces. During his absence, his real estate investments perished and he was heavily in debt. His home was heavily burdened with back taxes at the time of his death in 1937. Since 1945 the house has been owned by the University Women's Club of Winnipeg.

Like the Victorian suburbs of other industrial centres, Winnipeg's "Faubourg St. Germain" was eventually surrounded as the city crept nearer but, because of its peninsular shape much of its purity and solitude has been maintained. This was also in part due to the energetic residents themselves. In 1913, for example, they successfully petitioned the Mayor and Council for a by-law which prohibited the construction of apartment houses or garages "for hire or gain" on the Point. Although the residents managed to prevent the construction of apartment buildings on the Point itself, they could do little about the high-rise homes that dominate the view just across the narrow Assiniboine. However, use of the land on the Point progressively intensified and, eventually, the large lots with their immense gardens and sweeping drives were subdivided. Many of the rambling old homes were duplexed or triplexed (although some have since been restored to single-family status) and others were put to organizational use. The more modern homes on the Point were by no means as grand as their older neighbours.

It was in early suburbs like Armstrong's Point that Winnipeg's affluent citizens first displayed concerns about healthy, pleasant living conditions and safe, quiet streets for children. It is unfortunate that the possessing classes moved away and did not apply these principles to the city's centre where a greater variety of economic classes and ethnic groups would have profited. In Winnipeg's early days, however, the elite showed no such concern to create a humane environment for all of the city's citizens.

What follows are excerpts from Winnipeg Zoning By-Law #200/06 that went into force and effect on March 1, 2008. The excerpts provide the basic land use and bulk requirements for properties zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family Large District, including all properties located within the Armstrong’s Point Planning Study boundaries.

General Purposes of All Residential Districts

54. (1) The residential zoning districts contained in this section are intended to:
- (a) provide appropriately located areas for residential development that are consistent with Plan Winnipeg and with standards for public health, safety, and general welfare;
 - (b) allow for a variety of housing types and community amenities that meet the diverse physical, economic, and social needs of residents; and
 - (c) respect the scale and character of existing residential neighbourhoods and surrounding areas.

Residential Single-Family (R1)

(4) The Residential Single-Family (R1) district is intended to accommodate primarily singlefamily residential development in lower-density neighbourhoods.

Table 4-1 Principal Use Table

“R1” Single-Family District – Principal Use Table

Dwelling, single-family detached	P	Care home
	P	(Use Specific Standard 64)
Neighbourhood rehabilitation home	C	(Use Specific Standard 66)
Community/recreation centre	C	
Library	C	
Elementary or junior school	C	(Use Specific Standard 69)
Senior high school	C	(Use Specific Standard 73)
Community gardens	P	
Park/plaza/square/playground	P	(Use Specific Standard 68)
Day care centre	C	(Use Specific Standard 70)
Place of worship	C	(Use Specific Standard 72)
Utility facility, minor	P	(Use Specific Standard 98)

Table 4-2 Accessory Use Table

“R1” Single-Family District – Accessory Use Table

Aviary	C	(Use Specific Standard 109)
Boarder or roomer	P	(Use Specific Standard 110)
Hall rental	C	
Home-based business, minor	P	(Use Specific Standard 113, 114)
Home-based business, major	C	(Use Specific Standard 113, 115)
Recycling collection centre	P	(Use Specific Standard 119)
Secondary suite	C	(Use Specific Standard 120)
Social service facility	C	
Accessory uses, not listed	P	

Table 5-2 Dimensional Standards for RR5, RR2, R1, R2, and RMH Zoning Districts

“R1-L” Single-Family Large District – Dimensional Standards

Minimum Lot Area	5500 square feet	
Minimum Lot Width	25 feet	(subject to Special Boundary Conditions 138)
Minimum Front Yard	20 feet	(subject to Front Yard Building Alignments 139)
Minimum Rear Yard	25 feet	
Minimum Side Yard	4 feet	
Minimum Reverse	10 feet	
Corner Side Yard		
Maximum Building Height	35 feet	
Maximum Lot Coverage	40%	

Special Boundary Conditions

138. (1) If an undeveloped parcel of land is located in the R1 or R2 zoning districts, or proposed for rezoning to the R1 or R2 zoning districts, and abuts an existing R1 or R2 zoning district, or is separated from an R1 or R2 zoning district by a street right-of-way, railroad right-of-way, or waterway, the undeveloped parcel must not be subdivided unless the width/square footage of the proposed lot(s) within 200 feet (measured from the edges of the proposed subdivision) of the adjacent R1 or R2 zoning district is not less than the average lot width/square footage of existing developed lots in residential use in the adjacent R1 or R2 areas along such shared boundary, but in no case may be less than 35 feet.
- (2) Other lots proposed to be created within the undeveloped parcel must comply with Table 5-2. (Illustration 10 provides an example of this requirement.)

Front Yard Building Alignments

139. Where a new single-family or two-family dwelling or addition to a dwelling is proposed within a street block or a portion of a street block where at least 80 percent of the lots have been developed with principal residential structures, and the front yard required by Table 5-2 is inconsistent with the majority of existing front yards for developed single- and two-family dwellings on the street block, the new structure must be developed with a front yard consistent with the average of the existing front yards within that block or portion of the block. In the case of a corner lot, either the average of the setback for the two nearest properties on the same block or for all the properties facing the same street on the same block may be used for calculating the allowed setback. (Illustration 11 provides an example of the application of this provision.)

“home-based business, major” means an occupation or activity that is accessory to the use of the premises as a dwelling and that does not adversely affect the residential character of the neighbourhood, but that has more impacts than minor home-based businesses.

“home-based business, minor” means an occupation or activity that is accessory to the use of the premises as a dwelling and that does not alter the exterior of the property or affect the residential character of the neighbourhood.

Prohibited Home-Based Businesses

113. The following home-based businesses are prohibited in all zoning districts:

- (1) Adult entertainment;
- (2) Dating and escort service;
- (3) Massage therapy unless the resident providing the service is licensed as such by the License Branch of the City of Winnipeg;
- (4) Body modification;
- (5) On-site painting, body repairs, or other repair of automobiles, trucks, boats, trailers, or other motorized vehicles;
- (6) Vehicle towing operations;
- (7) Dispatch centres for auto-oriented services;
- (8) Sales of firearms or ammunition;
- (9) Any business utilizing radio transmission equipment; and
- (10) Any business engaged in the sales and rental of autos, light trucks, or motorcycles.

Home-Based Business, Minor

114. In addition to all standards applicable in the zoning district where the use is located, the following conditions apply to all minor home-based businesses, as defined in Part 2. Any Home-Based Business not able to meet any one of the following conditions is considered a Major Home-Based Business and is subject to the standards under section 115, Home-Based Business, Major.

- (1) All home-based businesses must be operated in accordance with all plans and documents approved as part of the application.
- (2) The operators of the home-based business must be residents of the dwelling unit.
- (3) A minor home-based business must not have non-resident employees.
- (4) More than one home-based business per dwelling may be permitted, provided that all applicable regulations are satisfied.
- (5) An accessory structure may be used for conducting a home-based business, provided that the structure complies with all other requirements of this By-law.
- (6) The cumulative size of all home-based businesses within a dwelling unit or accessory building must not exceed 25 percent of the total gross floor area of the dwelling unit and accessory building or 800 square feet, whichever is less.
- (7) Work or activity must be conducted entirely within the residential unit or accessory building.
- (8) No home-based businesses may have any outdoor storage of any items related to the business, including without limitation, materials, inventory, or equipment, unless such items are stored in an enclosed accessory building meeting the requirements of this Bylaw.
- (9) There must be no exterior indication of the existence of the home-based business, and no indoor display of the business visible from the outside, except that a home-based business may have one non-illuminated identification sign not exceeding 2 square feet in area, provided the sign is attached to and parallel with a wall of the principal or accessory building.
- (10) repealed 121/2008
- (11) Clients, customers, and suppliers are not permitted to visit the home-based business with the exception of day cares.
- (12) If the home-based business is a day care, the use must comply with the following additional requirements:
 - (a) the hours of operation must be limited to between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm;
 - (b) no other home-based businesses may be conducted within the premises;
 - (c) limited to no more than 8 persons;
amended 121/2008
 - (d) limited to a single family dwelling; and
 - (e) must provide a pick-up/drop-off area, which may be a driveway, sufficient to ensure the safety of people when entering and leaving the premises.

Home-Based Business, Major

115. In addition to all standards applicable to the zoning district where the use is located, the following conditions apply to all major home-based businesses, as defined in Part 2.

- (1) All home-based businesses must be operated in accordance with all plans and documents approved as part of the application.
- (2) A major home-based business may have a maximum of two non-resident employees or business partners working on the premises.
- (3) A major home-based business may provide instructional classes for not more than 4 pupils at a time.
- (4) If the home-based business is a bed and breakfast, the use must comply with the following additional requirements:
 - (a) the operator of the business must reside on the premises and must use it as their principal residential dwelling;
 - (b) the maximum number of guest rooms is the number of bedrooms existing in the structure, minus one for occupancy by the owners/operator of the facility;
 - (c) no cooking facilities are permitted in guest rooms;
 - (d) guests may reside at the Bed and Breakfast for a maximum of 2 weeks;
 - (e) bed and breakfast facilities are not subject to the restriction that home-based businesses occupy no more than 25 percent of the gross floor area of the principal building; and
 - (f) a minimum of 2 parking spaces must be provided per 3 guest rooms.
- (5) If the major home based business is a day care the use must comply with the following additional requirements:
 - (a) the hours of operation must be limited to between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm;
 - (b) no other home-based businesses may be conducted within the premises;
 - (c) Limited to no more than 12 persons;
amended 121/2008
 - (d) Limited to a single family dwelling; and
 - (e) Must provide a pick-up/drop-off area, which may be a driveway, sufficient to ensure the safety of people when entering and leaving the premises.
- (6) There must be no exterior indication of the existence of the home-based business, and no indoor display of the business visible from the outside, except that a home-based business may have one non-illuminated identification sign not exceeding 2 square feet in area, provided the sign is attached to and parallel with a wall of the principal or accessory building.
- (7) Notwithstanding subsections 113(5) and (10), all existing Conditional Use Orders for auto dealers and auto repair operations, are not affected by the By-law. Conditional Use Orders with expiration dates shall be allowed to continue to operate in compliance with the conditions contained in their respective Orders until January 1, 2025, at the discretion of the Director of Planning, Property and Development.

STREET CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM – DRAFT SUMMARY

Classification	Function	Typical Traffic Volumes	Average Running Speeds
Expressway	Expressways accommodate large traffic volumes at higher operating speeds and under unimpeded flow conditions. They are intended to serve longer trips including intra-urban travel and trips destined to major centres of activity. All types of vehicles are accommodated and expressways are full time truck routes.	> 20,000 vehicles per day	60 to 90 km/h
Major Arterials	Major arterials carry large traffic volumes and connect large development areas including major residential areas, the central business district, regional shopping centres, large industrial and commercial areas and other major activity areas. Generally, major arterials are full time truck routes.	> 20,000 vehicles per day	50 to 80 km/h
Minor Arterials	Minor arterials carry slightly lower traffic volumes than major arterials and augment the major arterial system by connecting residential, employment, shopping and recreational areas. Minor arterials typically serve trips of a shorter length than major arterials and have slightly lower operating speeds. Minor arterials may be designated as full time or part time truck routes.	Up to 20,000 vehicles per day	40 to 70 km/h
Industrial/Commercial Collectors	The primary function of industrial/commercial collector streets is to collect and distribute traffic between industrial/commercial local streets and arterial streets. The secondary function of these streets is to provide land access in industrial and commercial areas. Passenger vehicles, large trucks and buses are accommodated.	Up to 20,000 vehicles per day	30 to 60 km/h

Classification	Function	Typical Traffic Volumes	Average Running Speeds
Residential Collectors	The primary function of residential collector streets is to collect and distribute traffic between residential local streets and arterial streets. The secondary function of these streets is to provide land access in residential areas. Passenger vehicles, delivery trucks and buses are accommodated. All bus routes in new residential areas should be developed to residential collector standards at a minimum.	Up to 5,000 or 20,000 vehicles per day (depending on the cross section)	30 to 60 km/h
Industrial/Commercial Locals	Industrial/commercial locals provide direct access to properties in industrial and commercial areas. Most traffic on an industrial/commercial local street has an origin or destination along the length of the street. This type of street is not intended to carry traffic between two streets of a higher classification. Generally, passenger vehicles and trucks are accommodated.	Up to 4,000 vehicles per day	20 to 50 km/h
Residential Locals	Residential locals provide direct access to properties in residential areas. This type of facility is not intended to carry high volumes of traffic or to carry traffic between neighbourhoods or between two streets of a higher classification. Generally, vehicles traveling on a residential local have an origin or destination along the length of the street. Passenger vehicles and delivery trucks are accommodated.	Up to 1,000 vehicles per day	20 to 50 km/h

ARMSTRONG'S POINT FACILITATION EXERCISE (June 11/07)

Attendance:

Sandy Butterfield	Christine Common-Singh	April Kassum
Marilyn Thiessen	Pat Thomson	Sandra Thusberg
Giovanni Geremia	Larry Greer	Tom Prins
Leigh Taylor	Arthur Thiessen	Giles Bugailiskis
Martin Sandhurst		

Tabulation:

- 1 What do you value about your neighbourhood right now? (20 minutes)
- trees [1]
 - residential "R1" [7]
 - central location [4]
 - association (protection) [1]
 - architecture [6]
 - heritage/historical properties survive (published history) [4]
 - quiet [0]
 - passionate neighbourhood spirit [4]
 - place to raise children [1]
 - house size [0]
 - upper-scale neighbourhood [0]
 - park-like ambience (unique) [6]
 - retaining current character [2]
 - feeling of rejuvenation [0]
 - small town-like [0]
 - comeback (past 10 years) [0]
 - recent young families [1]
 - colourful/interesting history [2]
 - urban oasis [4]
 - intact neighbourhood [3]

- 2 What would you like your neighbourhood to be like in 20 years? (20 minutes)
- retain “R1” status [8]
 - retain values identified [1]
 - school to remain current size [2]
 - less traffic (on West Gate and Middle Gate) [1]
 - more resident control [1]
 - greater protection/more cooperation regarding “R1” status [3]
 - speed limit reduced [4]
 - formal neighbourhood recognition (unique area) [6]
 - preserve and enhance family neighbourhood [0]
 - less vigilance required by residents regarding development applications (including demolitions) [6]
 - retain ambience – original (particularly older homes) [5]
 - retain integrity of the homes and ongoing upkeep [1]
 - political accountability from elected representatives [4]
 - character not lost through incremental decisions [4]
 - safe neighbourhood [1]
 - treed neighbourhood [2]
 - public infrastructure maintained [1]
- 3 What would you like to change about your neighbourhood? (20 minutes)
- stop threats of expansion and inappropriate uses [7]
 - reduced traffic/parking/servicing nuisance to/from businesses and institutions [1]
 - training school for grader operators [1/2]
 - APA board enjoying neighbourhood, not fighting development applications [0]
 - historic overlay protection (on top of “R1” zoning) and neighbourhood historic designation (teeth?) [15]
 - better street maintenance [1]
 - improved street lighting (aesthetic) [1]
 - school moves on (out of Armstrong’s Point) or reduced in scale [9]
 - house maintenance and improvement incentives (reduce potential for run-downs) [3]
 - advertising signs removed [0]
 - return school land to residential use [7]
 - no more pests [1/2]
 - speed limit reduced [5]

- 4 What's in your neighbourhood now that you would like to work towards eliminating within 20 years?
(20 minutes)
- unlicensed businesses and illegal activities [12]
 - school moved on (out of Armstrong's Point) [16]
 - non-conforming uses (including car brokers) [3]
 - non-resident parking that currently overwhelms during events [4]
 - derelict aspects of houses (not the houses themselves) [5]
 - traffic volume [5]
 - business opportunity (beyond current home occupation parameters) [4]
 - eliminate current zoning definition of family (stretch) [0]

Preliminary Analysis:

- the exercise was conducted in order that Planning & Land Use Division staff could hear directly from a select group of neighbourhood residents
 - facilitation assists in gaining insights into shared values and aspirations
 - preliminary results help with project scoping—the intent of a planning investigation (i.e. planning study) and its extent (i.e. resourcing, time frame, etc)
 - the exercise was not expected to result in a definitive shared values statement—that would be premature—but it should contribute to a direction for planning investigation in Armstrong's Point
 - again, this preliminary analysis is not an exact science—but it is illuminating and will influence the planning study workplan
- 1 What do you value about your neighbourhood right now?
- residential "R1", architecture, park-like ambience are clearly shared values
 - to a somewhat lesser extent, participants collectively value central location, heritage/historical properties survive (published history), passionate neighbourhood spirit, urban oasis, intact neighbourhood
- 2 What would you like your neighbourhood to be like in 20 years?
- looking into the future, participants clearly aspire to retain "R1" status, formal neighbourhood recognition (unique area), less vigilance required by residents regarding development applications (including demolitions), retain ambience – original (particularly older homes)
 - to a somewhat lesser extent, participants collectively foresee greater protection/ more cooperation regarding "R1" status, speed limit reduced, political accountability from elected representatives, character not lost through incremental decisions

- 3 What would you like to change about your neighbourhood?
 - stop threats of expansion and inappropriate uses, historic overlay protection (on top of “R1” zoning) and neighbourhood historic designation (teeth?), school moves on (out of Armstrong’s Point) or reduced in scale, return school land to residential use, speed limit reduced are clearly shared concerns
 - to a somewhat lesser extent, house maintenance and improvement incentives (reduce potential for run-downs) is a shared concern

- 4 What’s in your neighbourhood now that you would like to work towards eliminating within 20 years?
 - looking into the future, participants collectively express a desire to eventually eliminate unlicensed businesses and illegal activities, school moved on (out of Armstrong’s Point), derelict aspects of houses (not the houses themselves), traffic volume
 - to a somewhat lesser extent, non-conforming uses (including car brokers), non-resident parking that currently overwhelms during events, business opportunity (beyond current home occupation parameters) are collective concerns that should eventually be eliminated

with Westgate Mennonite Collegiate, University Women's Club / Friends of Ralph Connor House, Library Services

Westgate Collegiate (Oct/07)

- met with two representatives and their planning consultant on Oct 30/07 to outline the planning study underway, what led to it being initiated, and how the school's inputs will help with its completion, recommendations, and utility
- also, provided opportunity for the school to detail the process they've engaged with APA prior to initiating any future expansion or redevelopment at 86 West Gate
- basics: established at 86 West Gate in 1964; grades 7 – 12; in addition to an academic curriculum, also have music/performing arts/visual arts/sports/shops program
- current enrolment is 302 students—with a cap on enrolment tied to their (school and surveyed parents) desire to provide two classes per grade, with maximum of 28 students per class (336 students maximum)
- faculty is 24 teachers, with additional 12 office and support staff
- referenced a recent (with 5 – 10 years) survey and study—which could be shared with APA and others if it will provide some context for their facility (including desire to remain at current location, size of facility, program focus, etc)
- previewed potential planning study outcomes, particularly utility to provide decision-makers (property owners, developers, Council, Board of Adjustment) with a solid understanding of this neighbourhood—its history, layout and built form, values, and aspirations, expected development submission information (e.g. demonstrate that a new or expanded non-residential use will not have a negative impact on this low-density residential neighbourhood—traffic study, program statement, etc), and potential planning interventions (e.g. additional dwelling unit opportunities where valued built form is protected via HBC listing)...see Part 7 Analysis and Part 8 Recommendations

University Women's Club / Friends of Ralph Connor House (Feb/08)

- met with three representatives on February 20/07 to outline planning study underway, what led to it being initiated, and how the club's inputs will help with its completion, recommendations, and utility
- basics: club established at Fort Garry Hotel in 1909, began operating at 54 West Gate in 1939; purchased property from the City of Winnipeg and began restorations in 1945
- granted heritage status by the City of Winnipeg (HBC List in 1983) and the Government of Manitoba, with application for national heritage status pending

- in order to enable charitable receipts, the FRCH was established in 2003 and now owns the property—UWC continues as tenant, manager, and programmer of the property
- UWC meets at the club house and rents meeting rooms to affiliated groups and individuals—approximately 350-400 individuals (approximately 45 groups) use the club on a monthly basis, with the exception of July and August
- in 2007, FRCH initiated a fundraising campaign to enhance building systems, comfort, and accessibility
- no expansion of the existing building footprint is foreseen—nor is more intensive programming

Cornish Library

- met with two representatives of Library Services Division on March 27/08 to outline planning study underway, what led to it being initiated, and how the division’s inputs will help with its completion, recommendations, and utility
- basics: library opened in 1914 at the location of a former waterworks plant
- despite several threats to and investigations into possible closure since the early-1980s, the library continues to provide services to local neighbourhoods and broader community
- annual circulation exceeds 100 000; collection approximately 30 000 items
- in addition to book borrowing, continues to function as a community meeting place—“the living room of the community”
- client base very daytime-oriented, compared to most other branches
- no physical expansion of the building foreseen; some grounds (in conjunction with Maryland Bridge rehabilitation) and building envelope improvements
- although community programming of basement meeting rooms is anticipated to decline in the immediate future, no sea change is foreseen
- cite survey of modes of transportation to branch (approximately 15 years ago; details to be provided by CM)

Public Works – Transportation Engineering Division

Sherbrook / Cornish intersection modifications

- When were modifications made?
- Who initiated modifications? (councillor? community committee? residents? department?)
- What were they intended to achieve?
- Were they successful?
- Were any previous modifications attempted?

Traffic counts

- Are recent traffic counts available for Cornish Avenue, East Gate, Middle Gate, West Gate, or Blanchard Avenue?
- Are previous traffic counts available?
- Have these counts been mapped?

Onstreet parking restrictions

- What restrictions are now in place? [Monday – Sunday, 8:00am – 10:00pm]
- When were restrictions put in place?
- Who initiated restrictions?
- What were they intended to achieve?
- Were they successful?
- Were any previous restrictions attempted?

Non-conforming private approaches

- t what addresses have non-conforming approaches been approved?

Other traffic / parking initiatives or requests

- Have any other traffic or parking initiatives been undertaken or requested?
- Any DAO, DAC, or DAOC applications? (Blanchard street ends?)



Planning, Property & Development Department

Planning and Land Use Division

Urban and Neighbourhood Planning Branch

15 - 30 Fort Street

Winnipeg, Manitoba

R3C 4X5

Office: (204) 986-3213

Fax: (204) 986-7524

www.winnipeg.ca/ppd