CITY COUNCIL

Wednesday, March 16, 2022
1:00 PM

Henry Baker Hall, Main Floor, City Hall
This meeting is being broadcast live by Access Communications for airing on Access Channel 7. By remaining in the room, you are giving your permission to be televised.

Agenda
City Council
Wednesday, March 16, 2022

Confirmation of Agenda

Adoption of Minutes

Minutes of the meeting held March 2, 2022

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC NOTICE BYLAWS

2022-19 The Development Levy Amendment Bylaw, 2022

DELEGATIONS, COMMUNICATION, PUBLIC NOTICE AND RELATED REPORTS

DE22-29 Cathy Lawrence, Terra Developments Inc, Regina, SK: The Towns PL202100202

CR22-25 Zoning Bylaw Amendment - The Towns, Phase 2 - PL202100202

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands located at 3000 Woodland Grove Drive, Part of SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15 and Part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35, within the Towns Concept Plan, as shown in Appendix A-1 as follows:

   a. Blocks 36, 37, and a portion of Block 38 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RU – Residential Urban Zone
   b. Parcel L from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RH – Residential High-Rise Zone
   c. Parcels J4 and J5 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to ML – Mixed Low-Rise Zone
   d. Parcels W5 and W6 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to PS – Public Service Zone
2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following the required public notice.

DE22-30  Cathy Lawrence, Terra Developments Inc, Regina, SK: PL202100206 and PL202100204

CR22-26  Proposed Concept Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Part of 3000 Woodland Grove Drive - PL202100206 & PL202100204

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the application to amend the Towns Concept Plan by redesignating the land uses (low density to medium density residential and medium density to low density residential) within the area identified as the subject property and adopt the amended Concept Plan as set out in Appendix A-3.

2. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands from the Towns Phase 2, being part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35 and SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15, located within the Towns Concept Plan from UH - Urban Holding Zone to:
   a. RU – Residential Urban Zone – Parts of proposed block 38, 40, 41, 42 and 43;
   b. RL - Residential Low-Rise Zone – Proposed Block 39, 44 and Parts of proposed block 40, 4, 42 and 43; and
   c. LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone to parts of Block 40 and 43.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

DE22-31  Jeff Balon, Balon Consulting Corp, Saskatoon, SK - PL202100166 Chuka Blvd

DE22-45  Mike DiStasi and Kaitlyn Brown, Di Stasi Real Estate, Regina, SK

DE22-32  Kevin Reese, Karina Developments Ltd, Regina, SK: PL202100166 Chuka Blvd
CR22-27 Discretionary Use Application - 3810 Chuka Boulevard - PL202100166

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of an “Accessory Drive-Through” land use restaurant on the property at 3810 Chuka Boulevard (Previously 4401 E Green Falls Drive), Blk/Par P-Plan 102144305 Ext 1, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:

   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 and A-3.3, prepared by Dillon Consulting and dated February 9, 2022.

   b) Aesthetic screening shall be provided along the shared property line with Parcel P5 in accordance with *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019* requirements. This condition may be waived by the Development Officer if a non-residential development on Parcel P5 is approved.

   c) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019*.

2. Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.

DE22-33 Freya Marchuk, North Ridge Development Corp, Regina, SK:
PL202100155 2723 Narcisse Dr

CR22-28 Discretionary Use Application - 2723 Narcisse Drive - PL202100155

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of “Building, Row- Planned Group” located at 2723 Narcisse Drive, being Parcel R1, Plan 102257030 in the Hawkstone Subdivision, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:

   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 to A-3.8, inclusive, prepared by North
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b) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019.

2. Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.

DE22-34 Angela Ell and Gale Russell, Al Ritchie Community Association, Regina, SK
CR22-29 Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve an amendment to Part B of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48 by adding the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan as Part B.19, with such amendments to come into force the later of the date of Ministerial Approval or June 1, 2022, to allow time for consideration and approval of corresponding amendment to The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

CP22-4 Stu Niebergall, Regina and Region Homebuilders' Association, Regina, SK: Heritage Building Review

CR22-30 Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the amended Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A).

2. Direct Administration to initiate a call for applications, with funding and tax exemption recommendations returning to Council prior to October 2022.

3. Approve the following amendments to existing heritage bylaws and
regulations be brought forward in Q3 2022:

a) Replace the current Grade 1/Grade 2 categorization system; and

b) Adopt a categorization system based on Heritage Assessment Form and Statement of Significance Form both based on the thematic approach as outlined in the Luxton report.

CR22-31 Lead Program Enhancements - Bylaw Changes

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the amendments to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as outlined in the discussion of this report to implement the approved enhancements to the Lead Service Connection Management Program as outlined in CR21-90.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare an amendment to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as generally described in Appendix A to this report, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of the recommendations in this report by City Council.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare amendments to *The Regina Administration Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 2003-69 to allow for the lead service connection equalized payment plan program participants to continue to participate in the Tax Installment Payment Plan Services (TIPPS).

**DELEGATIONS AND RELATED MOTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DE22-35</th>
<th>Aura Lee MacPherson, Calling Lakes Ecomuseum, Katepwa, SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE22-36</td>
<td>Gail Fennell, Nature Regina, Regina, SK: MN22-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE22-37</td>
<td>Elaine Ehman, Regina Bird Friendly City, Regina, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE22-38</td>
<td>Sarah Valentine, Regina, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE22-39</td>
<td>Paul Hjertaas, Paul Hjertaas, Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides, Regina, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE22-40</td>
<td>Phil Johnson, Regina, SK: MN22-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DE22-41 Dr. Robert Wright, Regina, SK: MN22-1
DE22-42 Devon Anderson, Regina, SK: MN22-1
DE22-43 Tanya Dahms, Regina, SK: MN22-1
DE22-44 Catherine Gibson, Regina, SK: MN22-1
MN22-1 Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

COMMITTEE REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CR22-32 Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation - Appointment of Directors

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

Authorize the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability, as the City’s proxy, to exercise the City’s voting rights at the upcoming Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation (BPWTC) membership meeting to elect the following individuals to the Board of Directors for a three-year term, ending April 30, 2025:

- Judy May (re-appointment); and
- Dale Schoffer (re-appointment).

CR22-33 Advance Notice of Water Shutoff Update

**Recommendation**

That City Council remove item MN21-12, Advance Notice of Water Shutoff, from the List of Outstanding Items for City Council.

CR22-34 Cemeteries Funding Structure, Fee Schedule and Bylaw Amendments

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the recommended Cemeteries Financial Model in Appendix A which proposes funding major capital infrastructure projects – specifically upgrades to the Administration Building, maintenance shops and future expansions - from current contributions to capital.
2. Approve the Cemeteries Fee Schedule for 2022, 2023 and 2024, as set out in Appendix C, and that the 2022 rates come into effect on the first date of the month following passage of the fee schedule by City Council.

3. Approve the amendments to *The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27* as described in this report and Appendix B.

4. Direct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary amendments to *The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27* to give effect to the Fee Schedule and the additional amendments as described in this report to be brought forward to a meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations by City Council.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR22-1</th>
<th>CNC22-02 2020 and 2021 Annual Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That City Council:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive and file this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CM22-6</th>
<th>COVID-19 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That City Council receive and file this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTIONS

| MN22-2   | Whistleblower Policy                |

NOTICE OF MOTION

| MN22-3   | Ending Homelessness                 |

Adjournment
AT REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2022

AT A MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL

AT 1:00 PM

These are considered a draft rendering of the official minutes. Official minutes can be obtained through the Office of the City Clerk once approved.

Present:

- Mayor Sandra Masters, in the Chair
- Councillor Lori Bresciani (Videoconference)
- Councillor Bob Hawkins
- Councillor John Findura
- Councillor Dan LeBlanc (Videoconference)
- Councillor Landon Mohl (Videoconference)
- Councillor Jason Mancinelli
- Councillor Terina Shaw
- Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk
- Councillor Andrew Stevens
- Councillor Shanon Zachidniak

Also in Attendance:

- Interim City Clerk, Amber Ackerman
- Interim City Manager, Jim Nicol
- A/City Solicitor, Cheryl Willoughby
- A/Executive Director, Citizen Services, Kim Onrait
- A/Executive Director, City Planning & Community Dev., Deborah Bryden
- Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability, Barry Lacey
- Executive Director, People & Transformation, Louise Folk
- Director, Communications & Engagement, Jill Sveinsson (Videoconference)
- Director, Land, Real Estate & Facilities, Shauna Bzdel
- Director, Planning & Development Services, Autumn Dawson
- Director, Water, Waste & Environment, Kurtis Doney
- Manager, City Projects, Dustin McCall
- Manager, Public Policy, Jordan Reid (Videoconference)

APPROVAL OF PUBLIC AGENDA

Councillor Shanon Zachidniak moved, seconded by Councillor Terina Shaw, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the agenda for this meeting be approved, as submitted.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Councillor John Findura moved, seconded by Councillor Jason Mancinelli, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the minutes for the meetings held on February 11 and 16, 2022 be adopted, as circulated.
Councillor Bob Hawkins moved, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk, that Bylaw No. 2022-7 be read a third time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [10 to 1]
MOVER: Councillor Hawkins
SECONDER: Councillor Stadnichuk
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters
AGAINST: Councillor Shaw

The Bylaw was read a third and final time.

2022-8 The Regina Zoning Amendment Bylaw, 2022 (No.4)
2022-9 The Regina Zoning Amendment Bylaw, 2022 (No. 5)
2022-10 Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw, 2022 (No. 2)
2022-11 The Regina Zoning Amendment Bylaw, 2022 (No. 6)

First Reading

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Stevens, that Bylaws No. 2022-8, 2022-9, 2022-10 and 2022-11 be introduced and read a first time.

The Clerk called for anyone present who wished to address City Council respecting Bylaws No. 2022-8, 2022-9, 2022-10 and 2022-11 to indicate their desire.

No one indicated a desire to address Council.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]  
MOVER: Councillor Shaw  
SECONDER: Councillor Stevens  
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

The Bylaws were read a first time.

Second Reading

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Lori Bresciani, that Bylaws No. 2022-8, 2022-9, 2022-10 and 2022-11 be introduced and read a second time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]  
MOVER: Councillor Shaw  
SECONDER: Councillor Bresciani  
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

The Bylaws were read a second time.

Third Reading Consent

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor John Findura that City Council hereby consent to Bylaws No. 2022-8, 2022-9, 2022-10 and 2022-11 going to third and final reading at this meeting.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY as required by law.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]  
MOVER: Councillor Shaw  
SECONDER: Councillor Findura  
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

Third Reading

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Dan LeBlanc, that Bylaws No. 2022-8, 2022-9, 2022-10 and 2022-11 be read a third time.
The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CARRIED [Unanimous]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Councillor Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Councillor LeBlanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FAVOUR:</td>
<td>Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bylaws were read a third and final time.

**PUBLIC NOTICE REPORTS**

CR22-14 Regina Minor Football Canteen License

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve the City of Regina entering into an agreement for the license of a portion of the City-owned property located at Douglas Park and Leibel Field (3025 McDonald Street) as outlined on the attached Appendix A to Regina Minor Football 2000 Inc., consistent with the terms and conditions stated in this report.

2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability or their designate, to negotiate any other commercially relevant terms and conditions, as well as any amendments to the Agreement that do not substantially change what is described in this report and any ancillary agreements or documents required to give effect to the Agreement.

3. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the Agreement upon review and approval by the City Solicitor.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Stadnichuk
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

CR22-15 Regina Windy Flyers Lease – Kings Park

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Approve the City of Regina entering into an agreement for the lease of the portion of City-owned property located at SE 13-19-19-W2M at Kings Park (identified on the attached Appendix A) to Regina Windy Flyers, consistent with the terms and conditions stated in this report.

2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability or their designate, to negotiate any other commercially relevant terms and conditions, as well as any amendments to the agreement that do not substantially change what is described in this report and any ancillary agreements or documents required to give effect to the agreement.

3. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the agreement upon review and approval by the City Solicitor.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Bob Hawkins, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Hawkins
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

DELEGATIONS AND RELATED REPORTS

CR22-16 Drainage and Lot Grading Bylaw Amendments

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Amend The Wastewater and Storm Water Bylaw, 2016, Bylaw No.
2016-24 to allow for the enforcement practices and principles related to the recommendations of CR21-27 Drainage and Lot Grading Regulations that was approved by Council on February 24, 2021 as detailed in Appendix A to this report.

2. Repeal the specified sections of A Bylaw of The City of Regina Pursuant to the Provisions of The Uniform Building and Accessibility Standards Act and The Cities Act, Bylaw No. 2003-7 in accordance with Appendix B to this report.

3. Repeal the specified section of The Regina Community Standards Bylaw, Bylaw No. 2016-2 in accordance with Appendix C to this report.

4. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw amendments to give effect to recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above which are to be brought forward to a meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

DE22-26 Archibald Jephta-Crail, Regina, SK, addressed City Council.

Councillor John Findura moved, seconded by Councillor Terina Shaw, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that communication CP22-3: Stu Niebergall, Regina & Region Homebuilders' Association, Regina, SK, be received and filed.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor John Findura, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

| RESULT: | CARRIED  [Unanimous] |
| MOVER:  | Councillor Shaw       |
| SECONDER: | Councillor Findura |
| IN FAVOUR: | Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters |

CR22-17 Tower Crossing Financial Options for Servicing

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Approve the City providing water servicing to lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area as described in Option 1 of Appendix B.

2. Approve the transfer of $740,000 from the General Utility Reserve to fund the costs of providing Water Services to lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area.
3. Approve the City providing Sewer Services to lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area as described in Option 1(b) of Appendix B.

4. Approve an amendment to *The Development Levy Bylaw, 2011* by revising section 7.A.1 of The Development Charges Policy to allow for the collection of an Area Servicing Agreement Fee within the Tower Crossing Plan Area to enact recommendation #3.

5. Approve the City acquiring the lands needed for the identified road right-of-way network within the Tower Crossing Plan Area as described in Option 2 of Appendix B.

6. Approve the transfer of $355,000 from the Asset Revitalization Reserve to fund the costs of acquiring the lands needed for the identified road right-of-way network within the Tower Crossing Plan Area.

7. Approve an amendment to *The Development Levy Bylaw, 2011* by revising section 7.A.1 of The Development Charges Policy to exempt the subject lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area from the application of Greenfield Area Development Charges.

8. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw amendments to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to a meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

9. Instruct the Administration to bring a memo to Council to report back in 2024 the total actual costs associated with recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above and to provide a statement of revenues achieved from municipal tax revenue and servicing agreement fees.

The following addressed City Council:

- Blair Forester, representing Forster Harvard Development Corp., Regina, SK
- Bill Babey representing SCR Holdings Inc., Regina, SK

**Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Bob Hawkins, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.**

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Hawkins
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

RECESS

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 33(2.1) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw No. 9004, a 15 minute recess was called.

The Committee recessed at 2:31 p.m.

The Committee reconvened at 2:47 p.m.

(The meeting reconvened in the absence of Councillor Shanon Zachidniak.)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CR22-18 Proposed Municipal Boundary Alteration

Recommendation

That City Council:

1. Direct Administration to give Public Notice of Council’s intention to apply for an alteration to the City’s boundaries as shown on Appendix A and notify affected parties as required pursuant to section 43 of The Cities Act; and

2. Direct Administration to endeavour to negotiate a Boundary Alteration Agreement, including tax loss compensation, with the RM of Sherwood, subject to Council approval.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Bob Hawkins, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Hawkins
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, and Mayor Masters
AWAY: Councillor Zachidniak

CR22-19 Appointments for Regina Airport Authority

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

Approve the following appointments to the Regina Airport Authority for the term of office indicated below, for each vacancy and continue to hold office for the term indicated or until their successor is appointed:

- Bernadette McIntyre: May 1, 2022 to April 31, 2024
- Cory J. Furman: May 1, 2022 to April 31, 2024

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Stadnichuk
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, and Mayor Masters
AWAY: Councillor Zachidniak

(Councillor Shanon Zachidniak returned to the meeting.)

CR22-20 NE Economic Development Project Consulting Approval

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve $1,000,000 from the Land Development Reserve to fund Consulting Services for the NE Economic Development Project.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability or designate, to initiate a public procurement process to engage consulting and professional services over $750,000 to support the serviceability study, preliminary design, detailed design and
construction services related to the NE Economic Development Project.

3. Authorize the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability or designate, to negotiate, award, enter into an Agreement with the highest ranked proponent, to authorize any amendments to the Agreement that do not substantially change what is described in this report and to authorize any ancillary agreements or documents required to give effect to the Agreement.

4. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the necessary agreements after review and approval by the City Solicitor.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Jason Mancinelli, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Mancinelli
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

**CR22-21 North East Community Centre Agreement**

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Delegate authority to the City Manager or designate to negotiate and approve:
   a. Development Agreement between the City of Regina and the Regina Public School Board and/or Catholic School Board which provides for the development of a community centre as part of the new joint-use school located at the site of Imperial School and the existing Northeast Community Centre at 160 Broad Street as further described in this report; and
   b. any amendments to the Agreement that do not substantially change what is described in this report and any ancillary agreements or documents required to give effect to the Agreement.

2. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the Agreements authorized by this report after review by the City Solicitor.
Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor John Findura, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Findura
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

CR22-22 Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program - 1853 Hamilton Street

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Approve a tax exemption for the property known as the Leader Building, located on Plan: 102012163 Units #1 - #4; #6 - #15 (Parcel #164697586), addressed at 1853 Hamilton Street, in an amount equal to the lesser of:
   a) 50 per cent of eligible costs for the work described in Appendix C; or
   b) An amount equivalent to the total property taxes payable for ten years.

2. Direct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw and agreement with the following conditions:
   a) That the property possesses and retains its formal designation as a Municipal Heritage Property in accordance with The Heritage Property Act.
   b) That the property owner submits detailed written documentation of payments made for the actual costs incurred (i.e., itemized invoices and receipts) in the completion of the identified conservation work. If actual costs exceed the corresponding estimates by more than 10 per cent, the property owner shall provide full particulars as to the reason(s) for such cost overruns. The City of Regina may decline to approve any cost overrun, or portion thereof, if considered not to be reasonably or necessarily incurred for eligible work.
   c) That work completed and invoices submitted by September 30 each year would be eligible for tax exemption starting the following year of up to 50 per cent of the cost of approved work.
   d) That the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate be authorized under the tax exemption agreement to make all determinations regarding reimbursements of the cost incurred for work done to the property based on the City
of Regina’s Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program and the Conservation Plan for the property (attached as Appendix D).

3. Authorize the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate to apply to the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the property owner for any exemption of the education portion of the property taxes that is $25,000 or greater in any year during the term of the exemption.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Jason Mancinelli, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CARRIED  [Unanimous]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Councillor Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Councillor Mancinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FAVOUR:</td>
<td>Councillors: Brescia, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR22-23 Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program - 1839 - 51 Scarth Street

**Recommendation**

That City Council:

1. Approve a tax exemption for the property known as the Willoughby & Duncan Building, located on Plan: 101890739 Units #1-22 (Parcel #161609070), addressed at 1839 - 51 Scarth Street, in an amount equal to the lesser of:

   a) 50 per cent of eligible costs for the work described in Appendix C; or
   
   b) An amount equivalent to the total property taxes payable for 10 years.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw and agreement with the following conditions to be brought forward to a future Council date once the agreement has been signed by the property owners:

   a) That the property possesses and retains its formal designation as a Municipal Heritage Property in accordance with *The Heritage Property Act*.

   b) That the property owner submits detailed written documentation of payments made for the actual costs incurred (i.e. itemized invoices and receipts) in the completion of the identified conservation work.
If actual costs exceed the corresponding estimates by more than 10 per cent, the property owner shall provide full particulars as to the reason(s) for such cost overruns. The City of Regina may decline to approve any cost overrun, or portion thereof, if considered not to be reasonably or necessarily incurred for eligible work.

c) That work completed and invoices submitted by September 30 each year would be eligible for tax exemption starting the following year of up to 50 per cent of the cost of approved work.

d) That the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate be authorized under the tax exemption agreement to make all determinations regarding reimbursements of the cost incurred for work done to the property based on the City of Regina’s Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program and the Conservation Plan for the property (Appendix D to this report).

3. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the agreement on behalf of the City after the bylaw authorizing the agreements has been passed.

4. Authorize the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate to apply to the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the property owner for any exemption of the education portion of the property taxes that is $25,000 or greater in any year during the term of the exemption.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Andrew Stevens, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CARRIED  [Unanimous]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Councillor Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Councillor Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FAVOUR:</td>
<td>Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
That City Council:

1. Approve a tax exemption for the property known as the Canada Life Assurance building, located on Plan: 00RA12095 Block: 308 Lot: 41, addressed at 2201 11th Avenue, in an amount equal to the lesser of:
   a. 50 per cent of eligible costs for the work described in Appendix C; or
   b. An amount equivalent to the total property taxes payable for ten
years.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw and agreement with the following conditions to be brought forward to a future Council date once the agreement has been signed by the property owners:
   a. That the property possesses and retains its formal designation as a Provincial Heritage Property in accordance with The Heritage Property Act.
   b. That the property owner submits detailed written documentation of payments made for the actual costs incurred (i.e., itemized invoices and receipts) in the completion of the identified conservation work. If actual costs exceed the corresponding estimates by more than 10 per cent, the property owner shall provide full particulars as to the reason(s) for such cost overruns. The City of Regina may decline to approve any cost overrun, or portion thereof if considered not to be reasonably or necessarily incurred for eligible work.
   c. That work completed and invoices submitted by September 30 each year would be eligible for tax exemption starting the following year of up to 50 per cent of the cost of approved work.
   d. That the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate be authorized under the tax exemption agreement to make all determinations regarding reimbursements of the cost incurred for work done to the property based on the City of Regina’s Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program and the Conservation Plan for the property (Appendix D to this report).

3. Authorize the City Clerk to execute the agreement on behalf of the City after the bylaw authorizing the agreement has been passed.

4. Authorize the Executive Director of City Planning & Community Development or designate to apply to the Government of Saskatchewan on behalf of the property owner for any exemption of the education portion of the property taxes that is $25,000 or greater in any year during the term of the exemption.

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Bob Hawkins, that the recommendations contained in the report be concurred in.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
RESULT: CARRIED [Unanimous]
MOVER: Councillor Shaw
SECONDER: Councillor Hawkins
IN FAVOUR: Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mancinelli, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

MN22-1 Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk gave written notice that at the March 16, 2022 meeting of City Council, she intends to make the following recommendations:

That Regina City Council direct Administration to prepare a report for Executive Committee by Q4 of 2022 that includes:

1. A review of the research on how the elimination of cosmetic pesticides protects our biodiversity, especially birds and pollinators like bees and butterflies;

2. A summary of the regulation and best practices in Canada to maintain green spaces and yards without the cosmetic use of pesticides;

3. Feedback from the public through community engagement on a cosmetic pesticide ban; and

4. Recommendations and implications of implementing a cosmetic pesticide ban and the funding requirement for a public education and communications plan on such a ban including the promotion of safe alternative products and best practices for yards, gardens and parks.

MN22-2 Whistleblower Policy

Councillor Lori Bresciani gave written notice that at the March 16, 2022 meeting of City Council, she intends to make the following recommendations:

That the Administration be directed to prepare a report for Executive Committee by Q2 of 2022 that:

1. Amends the current Whistleblower Policy for City of Regina employees as follows:

   a) The City Manager’s authority to manage the policy be revoked and an internal tribunal be created to manage the policy that includes the following internal representatives:
      i. Internal Auditor
      ii. Director of People & Organizational Culture or designate
      iii. City Solicitor or designate
b) Section 4.5 of the policy requires the Tribunal to provide a non-
identifying summary of reports made under this policy and outcomes of
subsequent investigations to Executive Committee for information at
least annually.

2. Outline any associated costs and implications related to the implementation of
these amendments.

BYLAWS AND RELATED REPORTS

(Councillor Jason Mancinelli temporarily left the meeting.)

2022-13  The Regina Traffic Amendment Bylaw, 2022

First Reading

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Shanon Zachidniak, that
Bylaw No. 2022-13 be introduced and read a first time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>CARRIED [Unanimous]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Councillor Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Councillor Zachidniak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FAVOUR:</td>
<td>Councillors: Bresciani, Findura, Hawkins, LeBlanc, Mohl, Shaw, Stadnichuk, Stevens, Zachidniak and Mayor Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWAY:</td>
<td>Councillor Mancinelli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bylaw was read a first time.

Second Reading

Councillor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Bob Hawkins, that Bylaw No. 2022-13 be introduced and read a second time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.
The Bylaw was read a second time.

Third Reading Consent

Councilor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Landon Mohl that City Council hereby consent to Bylaw No. 2022-13 going to third and final reading at this meeting.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY as required by law.

(Councillor Jason Mancinelli returned to the meeting.)

Third Reading

Councilor Terina Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk, that Bylaw No. 2022-13 be read a third time.

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

The Bylaw was read a third and final time.
CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

CM22-5 COVID-19 Update

Recommendation
That City Council receive and file this report.

Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk moved, seconded by Councillor Terina Shaw, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that this report be received and filed.

ADJOURNMENT

Councillor Bob Hawkins moved, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Stadnichuk, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that the meeting adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 3:24 p.m.

_________________  ____________
Chairperson            Secretary
BYLAW NO. 2022-19
THE DEVELOPMENT LEVY AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2022

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REGINA ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1 The purpose of this Bylaw is to amend *The Development Levy Bylaw, 2011* by exempting development of the lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area from the collection of development charges and to establish a Tower Crossing Area Rate as an alternative.

2 The authority for this Bylaw is section 169 of *The Planning and Development Act, 2007*.

3 Bylaw No. 2011-16, being *The Development Levy Bylaw, 2011* is amended in the manner set forth in this Bylaw.

4 Section 3 is amended by renumbering it as subsection (1) and by adding the following definition as clause (f.1) after clause (f):

   “(f.1) **Development Charges Policy**” means the Development Charges Policy set out in Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw;”.

   and by adding the following subsection:

   “(2) Any capitalized term used in this Bylaw that is not otherwise defined in this section shall have the meaning ascribed to such term in the Development Charges Policy.”

5 Subsection 4(2) is amended by striking out the words “set out in Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw”.

6 Schedule “A”, being the Development Charges Policy, section 4.0 is amended by adding the following definition, in alphabetical order:

   “**Tower Crossing Plan Area**: This is the area of lands located north of Victoria Avenue, on the east periphery of the City as described in Design Regina: Official Community Plan Bylaw, Part B.15 Tower Crossing Secondary Plan. These lands are excluded from the Greenfield Area and the Established Area as defined in this Policy;”
7 Schedule “A”, being the Development Charges Policy, section 7.A.1 is repealed and the following substituted:

“7.A.1 Exemptions

Servicing Agreements Fees and Development levies apply to development in all areas of the City except for the following, which are exempt:

- lands designated as Environmental Reserves;
- lands dedicated as road right of way and designated for freeways, expressways, and grade separations;
- natural lakes or rivers;
- Development on lands that were previously subject to servicing agreement fees and where no development has occurred, unless the City will incur additional capital costs as a result of the proposed development;
- lands designated as Municipal Utility;
- lands dedicated as Municipal Buffer;
- Development related to or associated with any Public Work, but only to the extent that such Public Work does not include a building or structure intended for occupancy or habitation; and
- subject to the collection of development charges in accordance with section 7.A.4, development within the Tower Crossing Plan Area.”

8 Schedule “A”, being the Development Charges Policy, is amended by adding the following section after section 7.A.3:

“7.A.4 Tower Crossing Plan Area Development Charges

For the purposes of this section:

“Tower Crossing Area Rate” means the area specific rate applicable to the Tower Crossing Plan Area that is equal to the quotient of the Tower Crossing Infrastructure Costs divided by 115.323, being the net development area of the lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area;

\[
Tower Crossing Area Rate = \frac{\text{Tower Crossing Infrastructure Costs}}{\text{Tower Crossing Plan Area (in hectares)}}
\]
“**Tower Crossing Established Area**” means all of those lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area that are outlined by red dashed lines on Figure 7.A.4-1; and

“**Tower Crossing Greenfield Area**” means all of those land within the Tower Crossing Plan Area except for lands with the Tower Crossing Established Area;

“**Tower Crossing Infrastructure Costs**” means the total capital cost of the City providing sanitary sewer services to the Tower Crossing Plan Area, estimated at approximately $59,000 per hectare, but to be determined based on actual costs incurred by the City;

**Figure 7.A.4-1**

Development approval of all lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area is subject to collection of Servicing Agreement Fees and Development Levies determined as follows:

- With respect to lands located within the Tower Crossing Established Area, development charges shall be imposed based on the following formula:
Total Development Charges (Dollars) = Net Development Area (Hectares) x Approved Tower Crossing Area Rate (Dollars per Hectare);

- With respect to lands located within the Tower Crossing Greenfield Area, development charges shall be imposed based on the following formula:

\[
\text{Total Development Charges (Dollars)} = (\text{Net Development Area (Hectares)} \times \text{Approved Tower Crossing Area Rate (Dollars per Hectare)}) + \text{Greenfield Area Development Charges calculated in accordance with section 7A.}
\]

9 Schedule “B” is repealed and the schedule labelled “Schedule “B” attached hereto is substituted.

10 This Bylaw comes into force on the day of passage.

READ A FIRST TIME THIS 16th DAY OF March 2022.
READ A SECOND TIME THIS 16th DAY OF March 2022.
READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED THIS 16th DAY OF March 2022.

Mayor
City Clerk (SEAL)

CERTIFIED A TRUE COPY

City Clerk
SCHEDULE B

1. In accordance with section 6 of this Bylaw on or after January 1, 2022, a person who applies for a development permit or a building permit for a proposed development within the Greenfield Area shall pay a development levy based on the following formula:

   a. Net Development Area (per hectare) x $297,000 = Total Development Levy for residential and commercial development; and

   b. Net Development Area (per hectare) x $99,000 = Total Development Levy for industrial development

   calculated in accordance with the Application of Servicing Agreement Fees and Development Levies as described in Schedule A, being *The Development Charges Policy*.

2. In accordance with section 6 of this Bylaw on or after January 1, 2022, a person who applies for a development permit or a building permit for a proposed development outside of the Greenfield Area shall pay a development levy calculated in accordance with the Application of Servicing Agreement Fees and Development Levies as described in Schedule A, being *The Development Charges Policy*. 
ABSTRACT

BYLAW NO. 2022-19

THE DEVELOPMENT LEVY AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2022

PURPOSE: To amend The Development Levy Bylaw, 2011 by exempting development of the lands within the Tower Crossing Plan Area from the collection of development charges and to establish a Tower Crossing Area Rate as an alternative.

ABSTRACT: The proposed amendment exempts development within the Tower Crossing Plan Area from the collection of development charges and establishes a Tower Crossing Area Rate as an alternative.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 169 of The Planning and Development Act, 2007.

MINISTER’S APPROVAL: Not required.

PUBLIC HEARING: A public hearing is required between the first and second reading of this Bylaw pursuant to section 10 of The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020.


REFERENCE: Executive Committee, February 23, 2022, EX22-13; City Council, March 2, 2022, CR22-17.


CLASSIFICATION: Regulatory

INITIATING DIVISION: Planning and Development Services
INITIATING DEPARTMENT: City Planning and Community Development
Good afternoon Mayor Masters and City of Regina Council. I am Cathy Lawrence, I am with Terra Developments and I am here today representing The Towns Subdivision.

This application before you is for a proposal for a zoning amendment for areas in Phase 2 of The Towns. This re-zone is as per the approved concept plan, the areas in question can be referred to on Appendix A-1. The subject area is within the red dotted lines.

Specifically the areas to be re-zoned are as follows:

- Blocks 36, 37 and a portion of 38 to Residential Urban Holdings (‘RU’): this will be suitable for single family homes with front garages/parking.

- Parcel L to Residential High-Rise Zone (‘RH’): this will be suitable for a future multi-family condo type of build.

- Parcels J4/J5 to Mixed Low Rise Zone (‘ML’): this a housekeeping item, as a property line adjustment was triggered from the last concept plan amendment last July. These small slivers of land require a re-zone to ML and will be incorporated to the already existing serviced J1 and J3 parcel.

- Parcels W5 & W6 to Public Service Zone (‘PS’): these areas are the walking paths to connect to the future multi-use pathway along WGD.

There was a total of 4 responses from the public circulation with one (1) in support and three (3) with identified issues. The issues brought up were surrounding density, potential building forms, traffic, parking and parks and recreation. Administrations responses to these concerns were on point and we would agree with their responses.
Respectfully,

C. Lawrence
President
Terra Developments Inc.
Zoning Bylaw Amendment - The Towns, Phase 2 - PL202100202

Date | March 16, 2022
---|---
To | Mayor Masters and City Councillors
From | Regina Planning Commission
Service Area | City Planning & Community Development
Item # | CR22-25

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands located at 3000 Woodland Grove Drive, Part of SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15 and Part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35, within the Towns Concept Plan, as shown in Appendix A-1 as follows:
   
   a. Blocks 36, 37, and a portion of Block 38 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RU – Residential Urban Zone
   b. Parcel L from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RH – Residential High-Rise Zone
   c. Parcels J4 and J5 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to ML – Mixed Low-Rise Zone
   d. Parcels W5 and W6 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to PS – Public Service Zone

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following the required public notice.

HISTORY

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-6 from the City Planning & Development Division.
Cathy Lawrence, representing Terra Developments, Regina, addressed the Commission.

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Recommendation #3 in the attached report does not need City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Gohike, Council Officer 3/10/2022

ATTACHMENTS
RPC22-6 Zoning Bylaw Amendment - The Towns, Phase 2
Appendix A-1 (Subject Property Map)
Appendix A-2 (Aerial Map)
Appendix A-3 (Towns Concept Plan)
Appendix B (Public Notice Comments)
Zoning Bylaw Amendment - The Towns, Phase 2 - PL202100202

Date | March 8, 2022
--- | ---
To | Regina Planning Commission
From | City Planning & Community Development
Service Area | Planning & Development Services
Item No. | RPC22-6

RECOMMENDATION

The Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands located at 3000 Woodland Grove Drive, Part of SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15 and Part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35, within the Towns Concept Plan, as shown in Appendix A-1 as follows:
   
a. Blocks 36, 37, and a portion of Block 38 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RU – Residential Urban Zone  
b. Parcel L from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RH – Residential High-Rise Zone  
c. Parcels J4 and J5 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to ML – Mixed Low-Rise Zone  
d. Parcels W5 and W6 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to PS – Public Service Zone

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following the required public notice.

3. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.

ISSUE

The Applicant, Terra Developments Inc., on behalf of the landowner, the City of Regina, proposes to rezone portions of land at 3000 Woodland Grove Drive, part of SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15 and part of
NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35 (forming the Towns Phase 2) from UH – Urban Holding to RU – Residential Urban Zone and RH – Residential High-Rise Zone and minor parcels to PS – Public Service Zone and ML – Mixed Low-Rise Zone. The proposal is shown in Appendix A-1. Rezoning to a suitable zone is necessary for any development to proceed.

A property owner/developer can submit an application to amend the zoning designation of their property. The process requires the Regina Planning Commission's (RPC) review and City Council's approval. These applications include a public and technical review process in advance of consideration by RPC and Council.

This application is being considered pursuant to the Planning and Development Act, 2007 (Act); Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw 2013-48 (OCP) and Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 (Zoning Bylaw). The proposal has been assessed and is deemed to be in full compliance.

**IMPACTS**

**Financial Impacts**
The Developer will be responsible for the cost of any additions or changes to existing infrastructure that may be required to directly or indirectly support the development in accordance with City standards and applicable legal requirements.

**Environmental Impacts**
City Council set a community goal for the City of Regina of achieving net-zero emissions and sourcing of net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The recommendations in this report have limited direct impacts on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

**Policy/Strategic Impacts**
The proposed development aligns with OCP – Part A policies and supports the following goals and policies:

- Section D5: Land Use and Built Environment: Goal 1 – Complete Neighbourhoods: Enable the development of complete neighbourhoods:

  7.1 Require that new neighbourhoods, new mixed-use neighbourhoods, intensification areas and built or approved neighbourhoods are planned and developed to include the following:
7.1.5 A diversity of housing types to support residents from a wide range of economic levels, backgrounds and stages of life, including those with specific needs.

- Section D6, Goal 1 – Increase the housing supply and improve housing affordability.

8.2 Leverage the City’s land assets to increase the supply and diversity of housing.

The proposed rezoning application contains various residential zones which will allow for different housing forms in the neighbourhood and accommodate the varying needs of citizens who wish to live in the neighbourhood.

The Southeast Regina Neighbourhood Plan (SENP) was reviewed, and the proposed amendments are deemed to be in compliance with this Plan.

OTHER OPTIONS

Alternative options would be:

1. Refer the application back to Administration. If City Council has specific concerns with the proposal, it may refer it back to Administration for further review and direct that the report be reconsidered by Regina Planning Commission or brought directly back to Council. Referral of the report back to Administration will delay approval of the zoning bylaw amendment until the required information has been gathered or changes to the proposal have been made.

2. Deny the application. The zoning bylaw amendment to rezone the subject lands will not proceed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The applicant and other interested parties will receive a copy of the report and notification of their right to appear as a delegation at Regina Planning Commission or the Council meeting when the application will be considered. Public notice of the public hearing that will be conducted by City Council when the proposed bylaw is considered will also be given in accordance with The Public Notice Bylaw, 2020. The applicant will receive written notification of City Council’s decision.

DISCUSSION

Proposal
The land is currently vacant and located within The Towns Concept Plan (Appendix A-3) that forms
part of the SENP. The property is currently zoned as UH – Urban Holding Zone and therefore the Applicant proposes to rezone the subject area to accommodate low, medium, and high-density residential development. Specifically, the Applicant proposes to rezone the area to the following and as shown in Appendix A-1:

- Blocks 36, 37, and a portion of Block 38 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RU – Residential Urban Zone
- Parcel L from UH – Urban Holding Zone to RH – Residential High-Rise Zone
- Parcels J4 and J5 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to ML – Mixed Low-Rise Zone
- Parcels W5 and W6 from UH – Urban Holding Zone to PS – Public Service Zone

Considerations
The Applicant proposes an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to accommodate low, medium, and high-density residential development, which includes lots intended for Building, Detached; Building, Row (duplex/semi-detached, rowhouse); and Building, Stacked (stacked townhouses/apartment) type residential.

As shown on The Towns Concept Plan, the surrounding uses are medium-density residential and Woodland Grove Drive to the west; undeveloped land to the north and northeast; and low-rise commercial, medium, and high-density residential development, and Buckingham Drive to the south and southeast.

Community Engagement
In accordance with the public notice requirements of The Public Notice Bylaw, 2020, neighbouring property owners within 75 metres of the proposed development received written notice of the application and a public notification sign was posted on the subject site. The Arcola East Community Association was included in the circulation. Following circulation, Administration attempted follow-up contact with the Community Association but did not receive a response before the deadline for submission of this report.

A summary of the public consultation with neighbouring properties is captured in Appendix B.

DECISION HISTORY

2. On July 14, 2021, City Council approved an amendment to The Towns Concept Plan by redesignating land uses within a specified 25-hectare area (CR21-104).

Respectfully Submitted,

Prepared by: Josh Estrella, City Planner I

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A-1 (Subject Property Map)
Appendix A-2 (Aerial Map)
Appendix A-3 (Towns Concept Plan)
Appendix B (Public Notice Comments)
Appendix A-2

Subject Property

Project PL202100202 Civic Address/Subdivision 3000 Woodland Grove Drive SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15 and part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35

Date of Photography: 2020
The Towns Land Use Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Use</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use or High Density Residential</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Residential</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Reserve</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention Extension</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Walkway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>129.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>320.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Notice Comments (PL202100202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Issues Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if many features were different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if one or two features were different</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Density and Related Building/Lot Design:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opposition to apartments and condominiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Desire for single detached dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Desire that development mirror the opposite side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(west) of Woodland Grove Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development should include wider frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic and Parking:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Woodland Grove Drive would see more traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns about the availability of parking in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opposition to the use of on-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There were not adequate green spaces or sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>facilities nearby for the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of issues identified through public consultation, listed in order of magnitude (starting with most numerous):

1. **Density and Related Building/Lot Design**  
   Administration’s Response:
   - The proposed zones align with the approved Towns concept plan, which reflects the goals and policies of the Official Community Plan.
   - The zoning application does not necessarily establish lot sizes, which is determined through subdivision, an administrative process. However, lot sizes would be generally consistent with the surrounding vicinity, which has similar zoning designations.

2. **Traffic and Parking**  
   Administration’s Response:
   - Associated traffic impact assessment was reviewed and approved as part of the July 2021 Concept Plan amendment and this application aligns to the Concept Plan.
   - Woodland Grove Dr. is designed as collector to handle the traffic flows generated by the adjoining the neighbourhoods.
3. **Parks and Recreation**  
*Administration’s Response:*  
- The approved concept plan provides for parks and green space which are built or in development during earlier stages within the Towns subdivision.
Good Afternoon Mayor Masters and City of Regina Council Members. I am Cathy Lawrence, I am with Terra Developments and I am here representing The Towns Subdivision.

This item before you was at Regina Planning Commission on March 8th, 2022 where it received unanimous support. This application is for a Concept Plan Amendment along with a Zoning Amendment for areas in Phase 2 of the Towns.

To provide better context of the area, I would refer to Appendix A-1 map.

Phase Two of The Towns is defined as the area between Buckingham Drive and Arenas Road, and the area in discussion is noted within the red dotted area.

The proposed changes for the “Concept Plan” are a reconfiguring of some of the blocks and changing the designations from medium to low density and vice versa.

Specifically the changes are as follows:

- Portions of Blocks 38, 40, 41 are being proposed to change FROM medium density TO low density.
  And
- Portions of Block 43 (Ferndale Cres) is being proposed to change FROM low density TO medium density.

This will allow for a greater mix within the streetscapes and allow for combinations of duplexes and triplexes on one side of the street and single family on the other side. These changes are compatible and consistent with what is currently built in Phase one of the development.

The proposed changes for the “Zoning Amendment” are to take these areas from Urban Holdings and re-zone them to RU for the low density designated blocks and then RL for the medium density designated areas. Lastly blocks 40 and portions of 43 are being proposed to have a Lance Access Overlay applied.

As noted in the Administrative report, these zones along with proposed housing forms will still allow for adequate on street parking and maximize on site parking. Understanding that these parking numbers will be a bit fluid, we are projecting there to be around 4.89 parking stalls per lot plus up to 317 on-
street parking within the subject area. There also will be appropriate areas for storing garbage and recycling bins, as the majority of these homes will have front garages.

The internal street widths will remain consistent to all areas already built, which are 18m wide and allow for both on-street parking and vehicle activity.

In summary the zones and building forms being proposed are consistent with that is already built in The Towns. With approval today these areas will be able to develop as the market requires.

Thank you for your time, I am here to answer any questions you may have.

Respectfully,

Cathy Lawrence
President
Terra Developments Inc.
Proposed Concept Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Part of 3000 Woodland Grove Drive - PL202100206 & PL202100204

Date March 16, 2022
To Mayor Masters and City Councillors
From Regina Planning Commission
Service Area City Planning & Community Development
Item # CR22-26

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the application to amend the Towns Concept Plan by redesignating the land uses (low density to medium density residential and medium density to low density residential) within the area identified as the subject property and adopt the amended Concept Plan as set out in Appendix A-3.

2. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands from the Towns Phase 2, being part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35 and SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15, located within the Towns Concept Plan from UH - Urban Holding Zone to:
   a. RU – Residential Urban Zone – Parts of proposed block 38, 40, 41, 42 and 43;
   b. RL - Residential Low-Rise Zone – Proposed Block 39, 44 and Parts of proposed block 40, 4, 42 and 43; and
   c. LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone to parts of Block 40 and 43.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.
HISTORY

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-7 from the City Planning & Development Division.

Cathy Lawrence, representing Terra Developments, Regina, addressed the Commission:

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Recommendation #4 in the attached report does not need City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Gohlke, Council Officer 3/10/2022

ATTACHMENTS
RPC22-7  Proposed Concept Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Part of 3000 Woodland Grove Drive
Appendix A-1 (Subject Property Map)
Appendix A-2 (Aerial Map)
Appendix A-3 (Towns Concept Plan-Proposed)
Appendix A-4 (Towns Concept Plan-Existing)
Proposed Concept Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment - Part of 3000 Woodland Grove Drive - PL202100206 & PL202100204

RECOMMENDATION

Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the application to amend the Towns Concept Plan by redesignating the land uses (low density to medium density residential and medium density to low density residential) within the area identified as the subject property and adopt the amended Concept Plan as set out in Appendix A-3.

2. Approve the application to rezone portions of lands from the Towns Phase 2, being part of NW 14-17-19-2 Ext 35 and SW 14-17-19-2 Ext 15, located within the Towns Concept Plan from UH - Urban Holding Zone to:
   a. RU - Residential Urban Zone – Parts of proposed block 38, 40, 41, 42 and 43;
   b. RL - Residential Low-Rise Zone – Proposed Block 39, 44 and Parts of proposed block 40, 4, 42 and 43; and
   c. LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone to parts of Block 40 and 43.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

4. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022, following the required public notice.
The Applicant, Terra Developments Inc., on behalf of the landowner, the City of Regina, proposes to amend the Towns Concept Plan by reconfiguring the land uses as shown in Appendix A-3. Subject to the approval of the concept plan, the Applicant also proposes to amend the Zoning Bylaw by rezoning the undeveloped land to various residential zones to accommodate low and medium-density residential development, as shown in Appendix A-1.

Furthermore, the Applicant is also proposing a LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone to allow front and lane vehicle access to some residential lots, as shown on Appendix A-1, where the subject property backs onto a proposed lane. The *Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019-19* (Zoning Bylaw) prohibits front parking when there is rear lane access; however, the LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone allows flexibility regarding front and lane access to residential lots, where appropriate.

A property owner/developer can submit applications to amend a Concept Plan and the Zoning Bylaw. These processes require review by the Regina Planning Commission (RPC) and approval by the City Council. These applications include a public and technical review process in advance of consideration by RPC and Council.

These applications are being considered pursuant to the *Planning and Development Act, 2007* (Act); *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw 2013-48* (OCP) and the Zoning Bylaw. The proposal has been assessed and is deemed to be in full compliance.

**IMPACTS**

**Financial Impact**
The Developer will be responsible for the cost of any additions or changes to existing infrastructure that may be required to directly or indirectly support the development in accordance with City standards and applicable legal requirements.

**Environmental Impact**
City Council set a community goal for the City of Regina of achieving net-zero emissions and sourcing of net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The recommendations result in a reduction of the projected population density of the approved Towns Concept Plan. However, it is expected that the reduction will have a limited direct impact on GHG emissions and energy use.

**Policy/Strategic Impacts**
The proposed development aligns with OCP – Part A policies and supports the following goals and policies:
• Section D5: Land Use and Built Environment: Goal 1 – Complete Neighbourhoods: Enable the development of complete neighbourhoods:

7.1 Require that new neighbourhoods, new mixed-use neighbourhoods, intensification areas and built or approved neighbourhoods are planned and developed to include the following:

7.1.5 A diversity of housing types to support residents from a wide range of economic levels, backgrounds and stages of life, including those with specific needs.

• Section D6, Goal 1 – Increase the housing supply and improve housing affordability.

8.2 Leverage the City’s land assets to increase the supply and diversity of housing.

The proposed development adds a different housing form in the neighbourhood, which will accommodate the varying needs of citizens who wish to live in the neighbourhood. The land is City-owned, and the development of this land contributes to housing supply and affordability within the market.

• Section C, Goal 4 – Ensure that new neighbourhoods and employment areas maximize infrastructure investments and quality of life through a compact and integrated built form.

2.11 Require new neighbourhoods and new mixed-use neighbourhoods, as identified on Map 1 – Growth Plan to:

2.11.2 Achieve a minimum gross population density of 50 persons per hectare (pph)

The amendments being considered reduce the projected population of the approved Towns Concept Plan by approximately 37 people, resulting in the reduction of the population density from 54.56 to 54.29 persons per hectare, which still achieves the OCP’s minimum requirement of 50 people per hectare.

The Southeast Regina Neighbourhood Plan (SENP) was reviewed, and the proposed amendments are deemed to be in compliance with this Plan.

OTHER OPTIONS

Administration recommends in favour of the applicant's proposal. Alternative options would be:

1. Approve the application with specific amendments to the proposed Concept Plan or applied Zoning.

2. Refer the application back to Administration. If City Council has specific concerns with the proposal, it may refer the application back to Administration to address or make additional
recommendations and direct that the report be reconsidered by Regina Planning Commission or brought directly back to Council following such further review. Referral of the report back to the Administration will delay approval of the development until the requested information has been gathered or changes to the proposal have been made.

3. Deny the application. Amendments to The Towns Concept Plan and Zoning Bylaw will not proceed.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Applicant and other interested parties will receive a copy of the report and notification of their right to appear as a delegation at the Council meeting when the application will be considered. Public notice of the concept plan amendment and the public hearing required when Council considers an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw will be given in accordance with The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020. The Applicant will receive written notification of the City Council's decision.

DISCUSSION

The subject property forms part of The Towns Concept Plan. Kaufman Avenue bounds the subject property to the south, Kaufman Way to the west, Arens Road to the north and low-density residential development to the east. The Towns Concept Plan was approved in April 2016 and is approximately 70 percent subdivided and ready for development. This neighbourhood is within the plan area of the Southeast Regina Neighbourhood Plan (OCP Part B.16).

The Applicant proposes an amendment to The Towns Concept Plan and the Zoning Bylaw to accommodate low and medium-density residential development, which includes lots intended for residential single-detached and townhouses. Furthermore, the Applicant also proposes to apply the LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone over a portion of the development area to allow front and lane vehicle access to residential lots (Appendix A-1 and A-3).

The proposed amendments to the Concept Plan include reconfiguring the land uses as shown in Appendix A-1 and A-3 and are described as follows:

- Replace parts of proposed blocks 38, 40, 41 and 43, identified as Medium Density Residential with Low-Density Residential; and
- Replace parts of proposed block 43, identified as Low-Density Residential with Medium Density Residential.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw include a rezoning from the current UH - Urban Holding Zone to an appropriate residential zone. Rezoning is necessary to support the area's development (Towns Phase 2). The Applicant proposes to apply zoning as shown in Appendix A-1 and as described below:
• RU – Residential Urban Zone: Parts of proposed Blocks 38, 40, 41, 42 and 43;
• RL – Residential Low-Rise Zone: Proposed Block 39, 44 and parts of proposed Blocks 40, 41, 42 and 43; and
• LA - Lane Access Overlay Zone to parts of Block 40 and 43.

The Applicant also proposes to apply a LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone along portions of Green Stone Road (east side) between Kaufman Avenue and Arens Road and over a portion of Ferndale Crescent, as shown in Appendix A-1 (hatched area). The overlay zone would extend approximately 510 meters along the proposed streets.

The Lane Access Overlay Zone is intended to allow flexibility regarding front and lane access to residential lots on a block face. Furthermore, in accordance with Part 8M of the Zoning Bylaw, the zone is to be applied on an entire block face that is considered appropriate for having both front and lane access with due consideration to the utilization of infrastructure, surrounding land uses, and safety.

The Applicant intends to develop this area for dwellings with front and/or rear garages. Without the application of the LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone, these lots would be required to have vehicle access via the rear lane only and dwelling units with front attached garages at this location would not be permitted.

Applying the LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone does reduce the amount of on-street parking available to residents, but in some respects, this is offset by increased on-site parking, which is typically four stalls per dwelling (two in garage and two on the driveway). The additional driveway crossings reduce the available on-street parking by approximately 78 stalls.

As per the information provided by the Applicant, 69 lots will be affected by the LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone. However, approximately 117 on-street parking will remain available within the vicinity of this development. The applicant has indicated that the future homes will be a mix of townhouses with front attached garages combined with dwellings with rear lane garages. This LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone may result in an alley being partially used. This analysis was necessary to determine that applying the LA – Lane Access Overlay Zone would not result in concerns regarding safety, or conflict with planned land uses.

**Servicing Assessment**

The proposed amendments were assessed from a serviceability perspective. No concerns were identified through this review.

After reviewing the application, the Administration recommends approval of the proposal, as the applications align with the City's OCP goals and policies and have no significant impact on the City's infrastructure and the projected population of the subject neighbourhood. Furthermore, rezoning the area from the UH - Urban Holding Zone to subsequent residential zones is required to facilitate the development and implementation of The Towns Concept Plan.
Community Engagement
In accordance with the public notice requirements of *The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020*, neighbouring property owners within 75 metres of the proposed development received written notice of the application, and a sign was posted on the subject site. No comments were received during the public notification period. Arcola East Community Association was included in the circulation of the application. Following circulation, the Administration attempted follow-up contact with the Community Association but did not receive a response before the deadline for submission of this report.

DECISION HISTORY


2. On February 16, 2022, City Council approved two concurrent amendments to The Towns Concept Plan by reassigning the land uses within the Towns Concept Plan (Eastbrook).

Respectfully Submitted,

Prepared by: Binod Poudyal, City Planner II
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THE TOWNS CONCEPT PLAN
(Proposed)

The Towns Land Use Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Units /Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Use (Residential)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use or High Density Residential</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Residential</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Reserve</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention Extension</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Walkway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land Use</strong></td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>320.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Towns Land Use Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Multi Unit Dwellings</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Use (Residential)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use or High Density Residential</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Residential</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Reserve</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Detention Extension</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Walkway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>129.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>320.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good afternoon Your Worship, members of City Council and City Administration, my name is Jeff Balon of Balon Consulting. I am here today, by phone from Saskatoon, for report RPC22-8 Discretionary Use Application – 3810 Chuka Boulevard.

The Zoning Bylaw 2019 requires that “Drive Through” and “Drive-through, Accessory” for “Food and Beverage, Restaurant” land uses in the DCD-CBM Zone complete a Traffic Impact Assessment to demonstrate the traffic impacts do not conflict with on-site circulation, access and public infrastructure. I was hired by the applicant to complete the required Traffic Impact Assessment for this proposed development. The findings of the report did not indicate any adverse impacts on the existing infrastructure and traffic flow from this proposed development. Pedestrian signage recommendations are noted in the report to ensure safe transitions for pedestrians to the site. The submitted report has been reviewed by City Administration.

If there are any questions from Council I would be happy to answer them for you.

Thanks,

Jeff Balon
Good afternoon Your Worship, members of City Council and City Administration, my name is Mike Di Stasi of Di Stasi Real Estate. I am also a Tim Hortons franchisee in Regina and the applicant for the report RPC22-8 Discretionary Use Application - 3810 Chuka Boulevard. With me today is Kaitlyn Brown, our consultant on this project, and we are here to support the recommendations put forth by Administration and the Regina Planning Commission, and answer any questions you may have regarding this project.

In June of 2021 we began talking with the City Administration about this property. At the time, the adjacent property owner was in the process of applying for a zoning amendment to the DCD-CBM zoning. We were able to work alongside that applicant, and with the passing of the Zoning Amendment in November 2021, this project could now be considered by City Council. In the hopes of the zoning amendment being successful, we submitted a Discretionary Use application for a Food and Beverage, Restaurant and Drive-through Accessory this past September. We have consulted, investigated, revamped, and reviewed back and forth with our team of professionals and the City’s administration team to land where we have with a project we believe in. The goal is to have this location be a flagship Tim Hortons. It would be the first of its kind and the testing grounds for new sustainable initiatives - right here in Regina. We are excited to know that some of the things we test here could be incorporated into hundreds or thousands of Tims all across Canada.

This project is possible for us because we have the opportunity to own the land. Typically, our locations and those across Canada are owned by major developers and rarely are franchisees in a position to have the option to own the land they work from. For us, this development is a long term plan. We have been operating Tim Hortons’ in Regina for over 20 years and hope that as a 2nd generation family business our kids will make it a 3rd generation.

As part of our design process, we went through a number of site plan options. Some of those plans were able to provide more commercial area, reduce the land required for the drive thru, and likely provide us a better return on investment. However, those plans did not meet the goals and intent of the zone. They interrupted the pedestrian sidewalk, they dismantled the Chuka Boulevard Interface, and did not add to the built environment of the community. The plan we have before you meets the intent of the zone. It provides a 3m wide sidewalk through the property connecting the City sidewalk at Chuka Boulevard and Green Falls Drive with the adjacent parcel. We have also consulted with the neighbouring property owner to ensure that our sidewalk is able to align with their development plans. This plan is a result of feedback received from design professionals, administration, and our experience as operators.
As part of the review process, City Administration required a Traffic Impact Assessment to review impacts on the surrounding road network. The report found that with the addition of this development the existing infrastructure was able to continue operating within the accepted City requirements.

This new location will create 35 new jobs. Some of our current Team Members who live in the area are excited about the opportunity to transfer to this location. This will give them, and our new hires, the option to live and work in the same community which, in turn, will open jobs at our other locations for residents who might live closer to those stores.

In addition to the public consultation administered by the City, standard with all discretionary use applications, we launched a virtual open house website for residents and the community to learn more about the project, and the responses have been amazing. We had 73 people submit feedback or questions and the majority of them were positive. This was consistent with the results of the City’s consultation process where they received 47 responses, with nearly 90% supporting this proposal. We have taken the approach to listen to residents, and I have had numerous phone calls and emails with residents to help answer questions they have had. That won’t stop; I hope that with approval today from City Council I can discuss what we will do as opposed to what we hope to do. While the pictures of the project show intent, there is design work that needs to occur to make that a reality.

As a family, we take pride in being involved in the community: sending local kids to camp and raising money for local initiatives. My brother and I grew up walking distance from this site. We played pond hockey in the farmer’s field as kids, learned to drive a standard on the gravel road that passed through the development, and now we hope to put our University of Regina educations to use by operating a business here.

I would like to thank you for your time and consideration this afternoon. If there are any questions we would be happy to answer them.

Thank you.

Di Stasi Real Estate Ltd.

Mike Di Stasi
President
March 9, 2022

City of Regina
City Clerks Office
Box 1790
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3C8

Attention: City Clerk

Dear Sir/Madam:

KARINA DEVELOPMENTS LTD.

RE: RPC22-8 Discretionary Use Application – 3810 Chuka Boulevard – PL202100166

My name is Kevin Reese and I am the General Manager for The Greens on Gardiner. I respectfully request permission to address City Council in person on March 16, 2022 regarding the above mentioned item. My written submission is attached.

Communications can be mailed to:

Karina Development Ltd.
2235 6th Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4R 1B3

Sincerely,

Kevin Reese, CPA, CMA, CA
President Karina Developments Ltd.
General Manager – The Greens on Gardiner

Enclosure
Good afternoon, Mayor Masters and members of City Council. My name is Kevin Reese, President of Karina Developments Ltd. and General Manager for the Greens on Gardiner development. Thank you for allowing me to present to you today. Greens on Gardiner Development Corporation owns Parcel P, which is the parcel of land where the proposed Accessory Drive-Through will be located. We are here to support the Discretionary Use application.

I would like to thank the City of Regina Administration for preparing an excellent report. Pages 6, 7 and 8 concisely summarizes that the applicant’s proposed land use and site plan complies in every respect with all of the unique features of the DCD-CBM zone. Furthermore, the Traffic Impact Assessment demonstrates that traffic impacts do not conflict with on-site circulation, access and public infrastructure. The applicant has prepared a very good site plan and obviously worked very hard with the City Administration to develop a plan that works.

We believe it is time for the properties along the west side of Chuka Boulevard to develop. Regina has the opportunity to be the first community in Canada to have Tim Horton’s new environmentally friendly concept restaurant and let the country know that Regina is open for business. We respectfully request that City Council concurs with the Administration’s and Regina Planning Commission’s recommendation and approves this Discretionary Use application.

Thank you for your time and I would be pleased to answer any questions.
Discretionary Use Application - 3810 Chuka Boulevard - PL202100166

Date March 16, 2022
To Mayor Masters and City Councillors
From Regina Planning Commission
Service Area City Planning & Community Development
Item # CR22-27

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of an “Accessory Drive-Through” land use restaurant on the property at 3810 Chuka Boulevard (Previously 4401 E Green Falls Drive), Blk/Par P-Plan 102144305 Ext 1, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:

   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 and A-3.3, prepared by Dillon Consulting and dated February 9, 2022.

   b) Aesthetic screening shall be provided along the shared property line with Parcel P5 in accordance with The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 requirements. This condition may be waived by the Development Officer if a non-residential development on Parcel P5 is approved.

   c) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019.

2. Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.
HISTORY

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-8 from the City Planning & Development Division.

The following addressed the Commission:

− Jeff Balon, Balon Consulting Corp., Saskatoon;
− Kevin Reese, Karina Developments and the Greens on Gardner development, Regina; and
− Mike DiStasi, applicant, and Kaitlyn Brown, consultant, Regina.

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Recommendation #3 in the attached report does not need City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Gohike, Council Officer  3/10/2022

ATTACHMENTS

RPC22-8  Discretionary Use Application - 3810 Chuka Boulevard
Appendix A-1 (Subject Property Map)
Appendix A-2 (Aerial Map)
Appendix A-3.1 (Site Plan)
Appendix A-3.2 (Building Plan)
Appendix A-3.3 (Elevations)
Appendix B (Public Comments Summary)
Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of an "Accessory Drive-Through" land use restaurant on the property at 3810 Chuka Boulevard (Previously 4401 E Green Falls Drive), Blk/Par P-Plan 102144305 Ext 1, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:
   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 and A-3.3, prepared by Dillon Consulting and dated February 9, 2022.
   b) Aesthetic screening shall be provided along the shared property line with Parcel P5 in accordance with The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 requirements. This condition may be waived by the Development Officer if a non-residential development on Parcel P5 is approved.
   c) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019.

2. Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.

3. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022, following the required public notice.
ISSUE

The Applicant, Di Stasi Real Estate Ltd., proposes to develop a drive-through restaurant (i.e. “Food & Beverage, Restaurant” and “Drive-through, Accessory”) on the property at 3810 Chuka Boulevard (previously 4401 E Green Olive Drive). “Drive-through, Accessory” is discretionary in the recently amended DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone.

All properties in the City of Regina are assigned a zoning designation under *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019* (Zoning Bylaw). Within each zoning designation, land-use can be permitted, prohibited or discretionary. Discretionary use applications require a public and technical review. Due to the potential for community impact or impacts beyond its immediate boundaries, the Development Officer has determined that the subject application should be considered and recommended by the Regina Planning Commission and considered and approved by City Council to proceed.

This application is being considered pursuant to *The Planning and Development Act, 2007* (The Act); *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48* (OCP) and the Zoning Bylaw, including suitability based on the prescribed evaluation criteria for discretionary uses established in Part IE.3. The proposal has been assessed and is deemed to comply with all applicable policies, regulations and standards.

Pursuant to subsection 56(3) of The Act, City Council may establish conditions for discretionary uses based on the nature of the proposal (e.g., site, size, shape arrangement of buildings) and other aspects of site design.

IMPACTS

Financial Impacts
The developer will be responsible for the cost of any new, or changes to existing, infrastructure that may be required to directly or indirectly support any proposed development that may follow, in accordance with City of Regina (City) standards and applicable legal requirements.

Accessibility Impacts
The development requires one accessible parking stall. The proposal provides five, which exceeds the minimum requirement.

Environmental Impacts:
City Council set a community goal for the City of Regina of achieving net-zero emissions and sourcing of net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions.

The proposed application involves the construction of a drive-through restaurant. Drive-through establishments are known to contribute to the amount of vehicle idling in communities which
increases carbon emissions. Differences in wait times and traffic volume make it difficult to quantify exact fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. However, using industry estimates, Administration has calculated that vehicle idling at the drive-through will consume approximately 9,000 litres of fuel per year (82,000 kWh of energy) which would produce an additional 20 tonnes of CO2 emissions. For context, this is equivalent to the average yearly amount of emissions generated by adding 5 vehicles to the road. There is currently no policy or bylaw restricting vehicle idling in the city.

Policy/Strategic Impact
The proposed development does not conflict with any OCP policies and is consistent with the following OCP goals/policies:

- Section D5: Goal 1: Complete Neighbourhoods: Enable the development of complete neighbourhoods.
  - Policy 7.1: Require that new neighbourhoods, new mixed-use neighbourhoods, intensification areas and built or approved neighbourhoods are planned and developed to include the following:
    - Policy 7.1.4: Opportunities for daily lifestyle needs, such as services, convenience shopping, and recreation;
    - Policy 7.1.8: A distinctive character, identity and sense of place;
    - Policy 7.1.9: Buildings which are designed and located to enhance the public realm and contribute to a better neighbourhood experience;
    - Policy 7.1.10: Convenient access to areas of employment.

- Section D5: Goal 6: Build a beautiful Regina through quality design of its neighbourhoods, public spaces and buildings.
  - Support design excellence by ensuring that public and private spaces and buildings contribute to a sense of place and an enhanced public realm through high-quality design and strategic location.

The proposed development will provide additional service and employment options to the surrounding area and contribute to a complete neighbourhood. The proposed site design, which is integral to the proposed accessory drive-through, meets the intention of the zone by contributing to a high-quality built environment through strong relationship of buildings, the required public sidewalk, and the landscaped public space at the intersection of Chuka Boulevard and Green Falls Drive.

Administration recommends in favour of the application as the proposed development aligns with the OCP, associated land uses in the Green on Gardiner Concept Plan and the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone assigned to the site.
OTHER OPTIONS

Alternative options would be:

1. Approve the application with specific amendments to the plan.

2. Refer the application back to Administration. If City Council has specific concerns with the proposal, it may refer the application back to Administration to address or make additional recommendations and direct that the report be reconsidered by Regina Planning Commission or brought directly back to Council following such further review. Referral of the report back to Administration will delay approval of the development until the requested information has been gathered or changes to the proposal have been made.

3. Deny the application. The proposed development will not proceed on the subject property if City Council rejects the application. If Council defeats or does not move a recommendation to approve (with or without conditions), Council must consider an alternate motion to reject the application. The motion must include the reasons for the denial based on the evaluation criteria.

COMMUNICATIONS

The applicant and other interested parties will receive a copy of the report and notification of their right to appear as a delegation at the Council meeting when the application will be considered. Public notice of City Council’s consideration of this application will also be given in accordance with The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020. The Applicant will receive written notification of City Council’s decision.

DISCUSSION

Proposal

The Applicant proposes to develop a drive-through restaurant (i.e., “Food & Beverage, Restaurant” and “Drive-through, Accessory”) on the property at 3810 Chuka Boulevard. A “Food and Beverage, Restaurant” is a permitted land use, however, a “Drive-through, Accessory” is discretionary in the recently amended DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone. While the site plan and layout of the property, as shown in Appendix A-3, is integral to the discretionary use application review, the other commercial building to the north of the proposed restaurant as shown in Appendix A-3 is a permitted use and is therefore outside the scope of any discretionary authority.
The proposed site plan includes direct access to Chuka Boulevard, which would be right-in/out, with additional access to the site from Green Falls Drive. The drive-through is located at the rear of the restaurant and would not be visible from the Chuka Boulevard frontage. The site plan includes design elements required by the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone, including the landmark corner landscape and public space feature at Chuka Boulevard and Green Falls Drive, on-site public sidewalk, required landscaping, and limited parking between the building and Chuka Boulevard.

**Zoning and Land Use**

The Zoning Bylaw classifies the uses as “Food & Beverage, Restaurant” and “Drive-through, Accessory”. The property is zoned DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone, in which “Drive-through, Accessory” is considered discretionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Details</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/ Building Type</th>
<th>Vacant Lot</th>
<th>“Food &amp; Beverage, Restaurant” and “Drive-through, Accessory”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Analysis</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area (m²)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8400.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage (Min)</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>106.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback (m)</td>
<td>5 m</td>
<td>19 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>13.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>10.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (meter)</td>
<td>18 m</td>
<td>7.84 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Stalls</td>
<td>7 Stalls</td>
<td>66 Stalls; and One loading stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Landscape Area</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discretionary Use Analysis

In accordance with the Zoning Bylaw Regulation 1D.1.2 (2) (a) (ii) and (iii), rather than exercising delegated authority, the Development Officer determined that the subject application should be considered by City Council due to the potential for community impact or impacts beyond its immediate boundaries.

Pursuant to section 56 of The Act, a discretionary use decision to approve, reject, or approve subject to development standards or conditions must be in accordance with, and supported by the Zoning Bylaw. Section 1E.3.5 of the Zoning Bylaw specifies criteria by which all discretionary uses must be evaluated. Generally, in exercising its discretion, Council’s decision with respect to discretionary use applications must be evaluated based on:

- consistency of the proposed use with the OCP;
- consistency of the proposed use with other policy documents with emphasis on land use and intensity, and impact on public facilities and infrastructure and services;
- consistency of the proposed use with the Zoning Bylaw; and
- potential adverse impacts or nuisances affecting nearby land, development, land use, property, neighbourhood character, the environment, traffic, public right-of-way, and other matters of health and safety.

Furthermore, all discretionary use applications must consider any criteria particular to the discretionary land use (or building type) as specified in the Zoning Bylaw and be consistent with The Statements of Provincial Interest Regulations. Council may prescribe specific development standards or conditions of approval only if they are necessary to secure the objectives of the Zoning Bylaw with respect to the size, shape, and arrangement of buildings or site; accessibility and traffic patterns of people or vehicles; mitigation of noxious or offensive emissions (i.e., noise, dust, glare, odour); and treatments to landscape, parking, open spaces, lighting, signs, excluding material or architectural detail.

The application was considered for suitability based on the additional prescribed general evaluation criteria for discretionary uses as set out in the Zoning Bylaw section 1E.3, and criteria specific to this proposed a proposed drive-through in the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone, which are as follows:

1. The drive-through isles access must not conflict with the required pedestrian sidewalk.

2. The drive-through queue space is buffered or oriented to protect existing or planned residential development on the site.

3. A Traffic Impact Assessment is required to demonstrate the traffic impacts do not conflict with on-site circulation, access, and public infrastructure.

In evaluation of these criteria, the Administration provides the following analysis:
The regulations of the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone require that the corner of the property at the intersection of Chuka Boulevard and Green Falls Drive be designed as a landmark with quasi-public space, pedestrian accommodation, and landscaping to encourage a unique sense of place. The proposed site plan provides for this amenity on site and through the analysis it was determined the proposed drive-through does not compromise the function of this requirement.

The development is also required to conform to the Chuka Boulevard Interface requirements, which are illustrated below in Figure 1. The intent of the regulation is to establish and facilitate a pedestrian oriented mixed-use area along parts of Chuka Drive while balancing strong connection between buildings and the pedestrian realm, and the need for convenient parking for commercial uses. There is currently no pedestrian accommodation via city sidewalks on the west side of Chuka Boulevard. The proposed site plan conforms to the requirements and provides the essential pedestrian connection. As the drive-through access is located behind the building, the drive-through stacking isles do not conflict with or compromise the pedestrian movement along the proposed sidewalk.

A Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) was submitted by the applicant and reviewed by the Administration as a part of this application, which included site-specific impacts including access and egress locations to ensure standards are met and are optimally located. Furthermore, the impact to the existing bike path was considered and no specific concerns were identified as a result of the placement of the drive through.

![Figure 1. Chuka Boulevard Interface](streetmix.net)
The analysis provided determined the development would provide safe pedestrian access into the site. There is currently no pedestrian accommodation via city sidewalks on the west side of Chuka Boulevard and facilitating the development is an important connection to Arcola Avenue, which is identified in the Transportation Master Plan – Cycling Priority Network Map

Based on Administration’s assessment, the application is consistent with all general criteria, particularly with respect to land use and policy regulations. The following key factors were considered in the evaluation:

- The proposed land use is consistent with the Greens on Gardiner Concept Plan, which identifies the site for mixed use development.

- The proposal is consistent with high-level policy requirements in the OCP.

- The innovative design of the drive-through responds to the unique standards of the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone within the Zoning Bylaw, which are intended to support a high-quality built environment creating a sense of place supportive of a pedestrian oriented and mixed-use environment.

- The development type is complementary and supportive of neighbourhood amenities, such as commercial.

- The City accepts the TIA, which demonstrates that the public infrastructure supports the proposed development.

- There are no particular factors affecting public nuisance or matters of health and safety to be addressed by this application.

**Community Engagement**

In accordance with the public notice requirements of *The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020*, neighbouring property owners within 75 metres of the proposed development received written notice of the application, and a sign was posted on the subject site. A summary of public comments is outlined in Appendix B of this report. Arcola East Community Association (AECA) was included in the circulation of the application. Following circulation, Administration attempted follow-up contact with the AECA; however, we did not receive a response prior to the deadline for submission of this report.

**DECISION HISTORY**

1. On April 25, 2016, City Council approved an amendment to The Greens on Gardiner Concept Plan to allow for the Acre 21 development. (CR16-35).
2. On Nov 10, 2021, City Council approved an amendment to the DCD-CBM – Chuka Boulevard Mixed Direct Control District Zone to allow drive through restaurants as a discretionary use and for stand-alone commercial development fronting Chuka Boulevard. (CR21-153)

Respectfully Submitted,

Prepared by: Binod Poudyal, City Planner II

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A-1 (Subject Property Map)
Appendix A-2 (Aerial Map)
Appendix A-3.1 (Site Plan)
Appendix A-3.2 (Building Plan)
Appendix A-3.3 (Elevations)
Appendix B (Public Comments Summary)
Public Consultation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Issues Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely opposed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- Will generate more traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Concern on pedestrian safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drive through should not be allowed at this busy location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Addition of a popular restaurant and drive-thru will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase the traffic at this intersection and on Green Falls Dr to a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dangerous point and will adversely impact the flow of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traffic in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- We oppose the “drive-through” as proposed because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>additional vehicle traffic it would generate would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overwhelm the existing road network and decrease the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>function of Chuka for existing residents and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>located in Acre 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The infrastructure to this area is installed, and the design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was not based on the additional traffic this proposal will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>generate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if many features were</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Increase in traffic and vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td></td>
<td>- With continued development of retail spaces, the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>has increased light pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential smell and noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Many concerns with the project being developed this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>close to my residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if one or more features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this proposal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>- A perfect fit for the space and area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- An exciting development that will hopefully bring new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ideas to Regina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A nice community gathering spot that is focused on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- As resident of this area, we should feel fortunate to have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>another major brand interested in a development in our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drive through is tucked in the back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- this will be the first clean, green, and climate friendly Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horton's in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Issue: Traffic Impact.**

   **Administration’s Response:**
   - Administration reviewed the Traffic Impact assessment submitted by the
     applicant in support of the proposed development. Planned infrastructure
     and traffic controls will accommodate the development. The Summary of the
     TIA is included in the report.
   - Pedestrians will be safely accommodated on site through the on-site sidewalk.

2. **Issue: Commercial activities impact the residential developments**

   **Administration’s Response:**
   - This development is in conformity to the Concept Plan and the Zoning Bylaw,
     as neighbourhood commercial services are an integral part of any neighbourhood.
and land use planning.

- The drive-through area will be adequately screened to mitigate aesthetic concerns and impact to abutting residential.
My name is Freya Marchuk, Operations Manager at North Ridge Development Corporation. I have no formal presentation but am available to answer any questions of Council.
Discretionary Use Application - 2723 Narcisse Drive - PL202100155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Mayor Masters and City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Regina Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>City Planning &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>CR22-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of “Building, Row-Planned Group” located at 2723 Narcisse Drive, being Parcel R1, Plan 102257030 in the Hawkstone Subdivision, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:
   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 to A-3.8, inclusive, prepared by North Ridge Development, dated December 3, 2021.
   b) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019.

2. Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.

HISTORY

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-9 from the City Planning & Development Division.
Freya Marchuk, representing North Ridge Development, Regina, addressed the Commission.

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Recommendation #3 in the attached report does not need City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Gohike, Council Officer 3/10/2022
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Discretionary Use Application - 2723 Narcisse Drive - PL202100155

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 8, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Regina Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>City Planning &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>RPC22-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

1. **Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed development of “Building, Row-Planned Group” located at 2723 Narcisse Drive, being Parcel R1, Plan 102257030 in the Hawkstone Subdivision, subject to compliance with the following development standards and conditions:**

   a) The development shall be generally consistent with the plans attached to this report as Appendix A-3.1 to A-3.8, inclusive, prepared by North Ridge Development, dated December 3, 2021.

   b) Except as otherwise specified in this approval, the development shall comply with all applicable standards and regulations in *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019*.

2. **Authorize the Development Officer to issue a development permit with respect to the application, upon the applicant making payment of any applicable fees or charges and entering into a development agreement if one is required.**

3. **Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.**
ISSUE

The Applicant, North Ridge Development, proposes to develop a 22-unit residential “Building, Row” (townhouses). The subject property is located within the Hawkstone Neighbourhood, at 2723 Narcisse Drive. The subject property is zoned RH – Residential High-Rise Zone, in which multiple residential buildings on one lot (Planned Group) is a Discretionary Use. The proposed development is comprised of four buildings.

All properties in the City of Regina are assigned a zoning designation under The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 (Zoning Bylaw). Within each zoning designation, land use can be permitted, prohibited or discretionary. Discretionary use applications require a public and technical review; consideration and recommendation by the Regina Planning Commission and consideration and approval by City Council to proceed. As a note, this application was submitted before September 1, 2021 when Bylaw No. 2021-44, delegating authority of discretionary use decisions to the Development Officer, took effect.

This application is being considered pursuant to The Planning and Development Act, 2007 (The Act); Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48 (OCP) and the Zoning Bylaw, including suitability based on the prescribed evaluation criteria for discretionary uses established in Part IE.3. The proposal has been assessed and is deemed to comply with all applicable policies, regulations and standards.

Pursuant to subsection 56(3) of The Act, City Council may establish conditions for discretionary uses based on the nature of the proposal (e.g., site, size, shape arrangement of buildings) and other aspects of site design.

IMPACTS

Financial Impacts
The Applicant will be responsible for the cost of any new, or changes to existing, infrastructure that may be required to directly or indirectly support any proposed development that may follow, in accordance with City of Regina (City) standards and applicable legal requirements.

Accessibility Impacts
The development requires zero accessible parking stalls. The proposal provides one accessible stall, which exceeds the minimum requirement.

Environmental Impact
City Council set a community goal for the City of Regina of achieving net-zero emissions and sourcing of net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that
Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The recommendations in this report have limited direct impacts on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

**Policy/Strategic Impact**

The proposed development does not conflict with any OCP policies and is consistent with the following OCP goals/policies:

- Section D6-Housing, Goal 3 – Diversity of Housing Forms: Increase the diversity and innovation of housing forms and types to support the creation of complete neighbourhoods across Regina.
  
  o 8.11 Encourage developers to provide a greater mix of housing to accommodate households of different incomes, types, stages of life, and abilities in all neighbourhoods.

- Section D5 Land Use and Built Environment, Goal 1 – Complete Neighbourhoods: Enable the development of complete neighbourhoods.
  
  o Policy 7.1.5 A diversity of housing types to support residents from a wide range of economic levels, backgrounds and stages of life, including those with specific needs;

The proposed development adds to the diversity of housing choices in the Hawkstone neighbourhood, which has an established character of a mixture of low, medium, and high-density residential built forms.

**OTHER OPTIONS**

Alternative options would be:

1. Approve the application with specific amendments to the plan.

2. Refer the application back to Administration. If City Council has specific concerns with the proposal, it may refer the application back to Administration to address or make additional recommendations and direct that the report be reconsidered by Regina Planning Commission or brought directly back to Council following such further review. Referral of the report back to the Administration will delay approval of the development until the requested information has been gathered or changes to the proposal have been made.

3. Deny the application. The development will not proceed on the subject property if City Council rejects the application. If Council defeats or does not move a recommendation to approve (with or without conditions), Council must consider an alternate motion to reject the application. The motion must include the reasons for the denial based on the evaluation criteria.
COMMUNICATIONS

The applicant and other interested parties will receive a copy of the report and notification of their right to appear as a delegation at the Council meeting when the application will be considered. Public notice of City Council’s consideration of this application will also be given in accordance with The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020. The Applicant will receive written notification of City Council’s decision.

DISCUSSION

Proposal
The applicant proposes a planned group of townhouses (“Building, Row – Planned Group”) on the subject property, which is within the Hawkstone Neighbourhood. The property is zoned RH - Residential High-Rise Zone, in which a Planned Group is a discretionary use. The proposed development contains a total of 22 dwelling units within four buildings. Each building is designed to be two residential floors above a ground-level garage. The buildings are 10.1 metres tall.

Discretionary Use Analysis
Pursuant to section 56 of The Act, a discretionary use decision to approve, reject, or approve subject to development standards or conditions must be in accordance with, and supported by, the Zoning Bylaw. Section 1E.3.5 of the Zoning Bylaw specifies criteria by which all discretionary uses must be evaluated. Generally, in exercising its discretion, Council’s decision with respect to discretionary use applications must be evaluated based on:

- consistency of the proposed use with the OCP;
- consistency of the proposed use with other policy documents with emphasis on land use and intensity, and impact on public facilities and infrastructure and services;
- consistency of the proposed use with the Zoning Bylaw; and
- potential adverse impacts or nuisances affecting nearby land, development, land use, property, neighbourhood character, the environment, traffic, public right-of-way, and other matters of health and safety.

Furthermore, all discretionary use applications must consider any criteria particular to the discretionary land use (or building type) as specified in the Zoning Bylaw and be consistent with The Statements of Provincial Interest Regulations. Council may prescribe specific development standards or conditions of approval only if they are necessary to secure the objectives of the Zoning Bylaw concerning the size, shape, and arrangement of buildings or site; accessibility and traffic patterns of people or vehicles; mitigation of noxious or offensive emissions (i.e., noise, dust, glare, odour); and treatments to landscape, parking, open spaces, lighting, signs, excluding material or architectural detail.

The application was considered for suitability based on the additional prescribed evaluation criteria.
for discretionary uses as set out in the Zoning Bylaw section 1E.3. The application is consistent with all criteria, particularly with respect to land use and policy regulations. With respect to the criteria, Administration notes key factors in the evaluation:

- The proposed land use is consistent with the Hawkstone concept plan, which identifies the site for high-density residential (Appendix A-4).

- The neighbourhood has an established character of a diversity of residential densities, including high density.

- The design of the site and orientation of buildings is compatible with surrounding planned land uses. The buildings are only three stories tall and a comparable scale to surrounding properties. There is planned medium density to the north, and townhouses to the south.

- Parking is provided in excess of the requirement of one parking stall per unit. An additional 22 parking stalls are provided, which will ease parking congestion.

- There are no particular factors affecting public nuisance or matters of health and safety to be addressed by this application.

The land-use and zoning details of this proposal are summarized in the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Details</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RH – Residential High-Rise Zone</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>Planned Group “Building, Row”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling</td>
<td>Vacant Lot</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Analysis</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area (m²)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage (min)</td>
<td>14.6m</td>
<td>40.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback (min)</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
<td>6.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (min)</td>
<td>5.0m</td>
<td>5.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage (max)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FAR (max)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (max)</td>
<td>20.0m</td>
<td>10.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Stalls</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Landscape Area</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other aspects of the proposed development, including parking and landscaping, conforms with the Zoning Bylaw. The surrounding land uses are low-density residential to the west, medium density residential to the north and south, and the Albert Street and Highway 11 Right-of-Way to the east.
Community Engagement

In accordance with the public notice requirements of *The Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020*, neighbouring property owners within 75 metres of the proposed development received written notice of the application and a sign was posted on the subject site. The Argyle Park Community Association was contacted but did not respond. There was a significant number of responses from this public notice. Comments from neighbouring properties are included in Appendix B.

A previous proposal was circulated to neighbouring residents in August 2021 for a 39-unit, 4-storey “Building, Stacked” apartment development. There was substantial negative feedback around that project’s height, density and parking. In response to the concerns, the applicant submitted a different proposal, which is the subject application. Only comments are included from the current proposal within this report.

DECISION HISTORY

1. On October 9, 2012, City Council approved the rezoning of the subject land from UH – Urban Holding Zone to R5 – Residential Medium Density Zone (CR12-147).

2. On November 6, 2013, City Council approved a Planned Group Discretionary Use on the subject property (CR13-159). (The development permit has since lapsed)

3. On June 25, 2018, City Council approved the rezoning of the subject land from R5 – Residential Medium Density Zone to R6 – Residential Multiple Housing Zone. There was an associated Concept Plan Amendment to reclassify this parcel from medium-density residential to high-density residential (CR18-58).

Respectfully Submitted,

Prepared by: Michael Sliva, City Planner II

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A-1
Appendix A-2
Appendix A-3.1
Appendix A-3.2
3 Bedroom Plan

Third: 620 sq. ft.

Total: 1340 sq. ft.

Primary Bedroom 11'-6" x 10'-8"

Bedroom 2 8'-4" x 9'-4"

Bedroom 3 8'-4" x 9'-4"

Building A - Third Floor Plan
Main Floor: 180 sq. ft.

Garage: 18'-0" x 20'-0"

UP 15R

8' Ceiling

Main Floor: Suite B
167 sq. ft.

Main Floor: Suite A
112 sq. ft.

Main Floor: 180 sq. ft.

Main Floor: 180 sq. ft.

Main Floor: 180 sq. ft.

Building C - Main Floor Plan

8' Ceiling

Garage: 11'-6" x 20'-0"

Garage: 11'-6" x 24'-0"
Building C - Second Floor Plan

Second Floor: Suite B
670 sq. ft.
Total Suite B: 837 sq. ft.

Second Floor: Suite A
112 sq. ft.

Second Floor: 540 sq. ft.

Second Floor: 540 sq. ft.

Second Floor: 540 sq. ft.

Bedroom
11'-4" x 12'-0"

Living
12'-0" x 11'-0"

Living
12'-0" x 11'-0"

Living
12'-0" x 11'-0"

Dining
11'-0" x 8'-0"

Dining
11'-0" x 8'-0"

Dining
11'-0" x 8'-0"

Kitchen
11'-0" x 10'-0"

Kitchen
11'-0" x 10'-0"

Kitchen
11'-0" x 10'-0"

Pantry
10'-6" x 9'-0"

Pantry
10'-6" x 9'-0"

Pantry
10'-6" x 9'-0"

Balcony
15'-0" x 6'-0"

Balcony
15'-0" x 6'-0"

Balcony
15'-0" x 6'-0"

9' Ceiling

Nook
10'-4" x 9'-0"

Nook
10'-4" x 9'-0"

Nook
10'-4" x 9'-0"

9' Ceiling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Issues Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely opposed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- Would prefer a park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wants additional road access into Hawkstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceived drop in property value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not like renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wants single-family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if many features were different</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Would prefer a park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept if one or two features were different</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- Additional road access to neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this proposal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- Wants single-family homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of issues identified through public consultation, listed in order of magnitude (starting with most numerous):

1. **Park Space or Single-Family Dwellings.**

   *Administration’s Response:*

   - The property is zoned for high-density residential development, which is consistent with the Hawkstone Concept Plan. Any changes in land use would require a zoning amendment and concept plan amendment, typically initiated by the developer, reviewed by Administration including public consultation and approved by City Council.
   - If this location was to become a park space, it would require the City purchasing the land from the developer.
   - Single-family dwellings are not a permitted use at this location because of the current zoning and land use designation on the Concept Plan.
   - Developers of the Hawkstone neighbourhood has already provided the park and open space (Municipal Reserve/MR) required under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*.

2. **Property Value**

   *Administration’s Response:*

   - Administration is not aware of any supporting document that suggests that there may be a perceived loss of property value due to the addition of high or medium density residential development.
3. **Renters**

   *Administration’s Response:*

   - The City of Regina cannot legally prevent an owner from renting out their property.

4. **Additional Road Access into Hawkstone**

   *Administration's Response:*

   - The Hawkstone Concept Plan identifies two additional road accesses into the Hawkstone neighbourhood. One at the intersection of Big Bear Boulevard and Argyle Street. Another further north at Argyle Street and a non-yet-named street.
   - Due to the proximity to the Highway 6 interchange, it is not permitted for Rochdale Boulevard to extend and connect to Albert Street as this has been explored with previous applications in this area.
Al Ritchie Community Neighbourhood Plan Land Use Plan

Request: That the 10% variance provision of the zoning bylaw be eliminated for all builds in the Al Ritchie neighbourhood.

Date of meeting we wish to appear at: March 16, 2022

Subject to be discussed: Concerns about negative impacts of the variance provision of the zoning bylaw in the Al Ritchie neighbourhood, particularly in the Arnhem and Assiniboia subdivisions.

Name of Spokespersons
Angela Ell
Gale Russell

There are seven key points that we wish to make regarding the negative impacts and our concerns of the 10% variance provision of the zoning bylaw on the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood:

1. Impact on environmental sustainability
2. Impact on food solidarity and green spaces
3. Impact on infrastructure
4. Impact on population density
5. Failure of the administration of the current zoning bylaw and variance provision.
6. Other impacts on neighbours
7. Creation of patchwork housing

Background
The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is the first City of Regina neighbourhood to have a Neighbourhood Plan developed. The process used in developing this plan is to be used to inform what happens in other Regina neighbourhoods’ plan developments.

During the development of the plan, the Al Ritchie Community Association (ARCA) Board carried out a detailed survey of the community residents. We used the results of that survey to direct our work with the City Neighbourhood Plan developer. The biggest concern to emerge from that survey was keeping the height of the new builds, particularly in the Arnhem and Assiniboia subdivisions, which historically have bungalows and short two-storey homes on very small lots.
ARCA was pleased when the city planner informed us that he was able to put a maximum height of 7.5m in those areas, and since we had been told that despite the undertaking being framed as a neighbourhood plan it actually could not address, or even mention, anything about infrastructure, we gladly wrote a letter of support for the plan.

It was after the submission of that letter of support that the 10% variance provision to the zoning bylaw was brought to our attention. This provision to the bylaw means that, in fact, the maximum height for Arnhem and Assiniboia is 8.3 m, not 7.5 m, and that difference will have a lot of negative impacts for both the residents of the two sub-divisions and for the City as a whole. Those impacts, and our general concerns, are next briefly explained.

**Impact on Environmental Sustainability**

Recently, there has been much talk, and even some restructuring action, in the City of Regina around a goal to work towards environmental sustainability and is actively engaged in the preparation of an Energy and Sustainability Framework (ESF). Another City goal is net zero emissions and sourcing net zero renewable energy by 2050.

A big part of achieving environmental sustainability (ESF and the net zero goal) is contingent upon the decrease and ultimately complete disuse of fossil fuels. In homes in the Al Ritchie area, the best and most affordable alternative to fossil fuel heating is solar power. Other options include geo-thermal and wind power; however, the clay-based soil in the area is not stable enough to make geo-thermal power sustainable, and wind power requires substantial land use - land which the city does not have.

To have solar power, however, you need to have places to put solar panels that can catch the sun. Even builds of 7.5 m will block out the sun (with the exception of the very start of daylight and the end of daylight in a day) on the typical shorter homes in the area. Because the lots are small in this area, builds with a height of 7.5m or higher will not only block out the sun from the roof of the adjoining property home, but also the south side of the roof of the next home over.

Consider the picture (showing homes on the south end of the 2600 block of the west side Atkinson Street) which shows two high builds and then the two smaller homes to the north of them. This picture was taken on March 9, 2022 at 5:30 PM so at that time some sunlight will hit the north side of the first home’s roof and the south side of the second home’s roof, but the duration of that sunlight availability will average to less than an hour a day. From the front, you will see that there are large City elm trees which in the summer would block the early morning sunlight as they are filled in with leaves. Once the sun moves past those trees, it will be completely blocked from the two smaller adjacent homes for the majority of the day. This will render the use of solar paneling on the homes as an alternative energy source ineffective. If the two larger builds had been built to a height that was compatible with the homes to the north of them, solar paneling would have been a viable and valuable option.
The 10% variance provision for the zoning bylaw only takes into consideration the adjoining lots to the lot in question, but as you can see below, the increased height would actually negatively impact a non-adjoining lot as well in terms of sunshine.
Despite being taken at 4:00, when the sun is in the west, you can see here how the first two houses are completely in shadow.

**Impact on Food Solidarity and Green Spaces**

Food solidarity and sustainability has become a very real concern for many people, and with the impacts of the pandemic on the supply chain, and the inevitable cost of living increases, more and more people are turning to growing their own vegetables and fruits. Extra height allowances on the buildings, just as it did in terms of alternative power sources, also negatively impacts home owners and renters ability to grow most foods because of the same impact on the sunlight hours, and also heat, as described for the alternative energy sources discussion. Considering then the 10% variance on the maximum height, 75 cm (more than 2 feet), will eliminate even a small viable garden space.

With the photo below, you can see how the afternoon shadow of another build, illegally done against the back alley, completely shades out the entire backyard. In a discussion with the owner of the smaller home she reported that she can no longer grow her own vegetables in her back yard.
In addition, when larger builds are made on our smaller lots, it requires clear cutting of the lots to make space for the machinery and the eventual builds. These trees, bushes, and shrubs are never replaced, including the City trees. Despite the bylaw on the removal of City trees, the developers of these larger builds are never fined for the removal of the City trees.

In addition, it should be noted that the OCP states that urban forests need to be protected and preserved. Consider the images below that document the clear cutting of all of the forestry on the lot of 2776 Atkinson Street to accommodate the building of two towers. Neither of these two new builds have replaced any of the trees, bushes, or shrubs. Trees do not naturally grow in Regina. It takes a lot of time, care, and attention to grow a large tree. We should be very concerned about housing practices that remove such trees ... even the City trees.
Impact on Population Density
First, it should be noted that population size of Al Ritchie is already larger than that of Melville, yet the land area that it occupies is 1/7 of that of Melville. Despite this, the City is set on intensification even in Arnhem and Assiniboia.

Unfortunately, the strategies used so far for intensification have increased the heights of new builds, but the number of people living in those new builds is consistently less than (or
occasionally equal to) the number of people who lived on the same lots in shorter homes. Increasing heights does not equate to greater population density. The addition of the 10% variance to the 7.5 m does not equate to more people living in the area, so this argument for keeping the 10% variance provision in place is not valid.

The two homes shown side by side below, which replaced a single bungalow, currently house at least one person less than previously lived on the lot, and as noted previously, the trees are gone and up to two existing homes can no longer make use of solar energy to heat their homes.

After infill:

Before infill:
Net result: one less person in the community, green space destroyed, and sunshine on two existing homes is diminished, at best.

**Impact on Infrastructure**

Although infrastructure maintenance and upkeep are not part of the neighbourhood plan (which is why it is now being proposed that “neighbourhood plan” be changed to “land use plan”), it is illogical to seek intensification in isolation from consideration of infrastructure.

Al Ritchie has some of the oldest infrastructure in the city. Water main breaks plague the neighbourhood, rank, toxic sewer smells emanate throughout the neighbourhood all year round, and the roads and sidewalks are in terrible neglect of repairs. All of these conditions point to an infrastructure that is not able to accommodate the existing population density, let alone an intensification of it. The 10% variance provision only serves to increase the burden on the infrastructure through increased water and sewer usage. The result will be an increase in the costs to the City and tax payers for more band-aid solutions.

**Failure of the Administration of the Current Zoning Bylaw and Variance Provision**

ARCA was told by the Development and Planning, that out of 600 building permits, only two have requested the 10% variance allowed by the bylaw. However, most (if not all) of the builds in Al Ritchie over the past five years have exceeded the current zoning bylaw. This, unfortunately, must mean that the administration of the current zoning bylaw has not been done appropriately, or that its processes are inappropriate. It is bad enough that our community has had to put up with these “mistakes” that have already happened, but then with the variance provision being made available for enactment in our community through our new Neighbourhood Land Use Plan, this is just opening the door for even more “mistakes” to happen.
Consider the following “mistake” (2514 Atkinson Street) that somehow slipped through the administration of the city zoning bylaws: a large house built against the back alley in a yard that has another house in the front of the yard.
The neighbourhood was notified of the request to do this build and the neighbourhood rejected it. A couple of years later, it got built anyway with no notification to the neighbourhood. What was done to deal with this infraction of the zoning bylaw? Nothing.

Along with the pair of new builds previously shown, there are many other missed infractions of the zoning bylaw. Here are a few more examples:
2700 Block MacDonald
2700 MacDonald Street
2300 MacDonald Street
2400 Block Reynolds
2505 Atkinson Street
2600 Wallace Street
2700 Wallace

(Note: the home (a group home) to the right of the tower was a new build, and they had no idea that the tower was going to be built beside them.)
Other Impacts on Neighbours
People who live in homes that are on lots adjoining to the ones with the taller builds (that exceed 7.5 m) also now have to deal with privacy issues. In speaking with a number of these home owners, as well as renters, the closeness of the homes (due to small lots) has resulted in the new build’s kitchen, dining rooms, or living rooms having windows that look directly into the bathroom or bedroom of the neighbouring home. This was not an issue with the previous smaller build homes that once occupied those lots.

The owner of the smaller home pictured below, who, you may recall, can no longer grow vegetables in her backyard, also lamented the loss of her back yard privacy, as is evidenced by the picture that follows.
Creation of Patchwork Housing

Reviewing the photos provided previously clearly indicates that patchwork housing is becoming a reality in Al Ritchie and its progress needs to be stopped. Allowing the 10% variance provision to the bylaw will increase the progress and severity of the patchwork.

Conclusion

It is for all of the above summarized reasons that we come to you today to request that you not allow the appliance of the 10% variance provision to the zoning bylaw in the Al Ritchie neighbourhood, particularly in the Arnhem and Assiniboia sub-divisions.

If we had known that this provision existed, ARCA would have argued for a 6.8 m maximum height so that new builds would remain below our true maximum target of 7.5 m.

We cannot stress enough how there is no benefit to the higher builds. Instead, the 10% variance provisions negatively impacts any efforts towards environmental sustainability (and beyond the single adjacent lots that the zoning bylaw provision only considers), food solidarity, green spaces, infrastructure, and neighbour privacy.
As well, allowing higher builds has not shown to increase population density in our area (in fact, the reverse is true) and Al Ritchie is already doing more than its fair share in relation to the City of Regina’s population density.

Finally, with no assurance that the administration of the zoning bylaw will be improved, we see no need for the 10% variance provision in the Al Ritchie neighbourhood and removing that provision would help mitigate the creation of patchwork housing in our area.

**Our Neighbourhood Plan Vision**
To assure the City that we are not opposed to OCP’s call for compatible infill and preservation of the existing housing stock, we leave you with some fabulous examples of what Al Ritchie’s Neighbourhood Land Use Plan should be promoting and supporting.
**RECOMMENDATION**

That City Council:

1. Approve an amendment to Part B of *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48* by adding the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan as Part B.19, with such amendments to come into force the later of the date of Ministerial Approval or June 1, 2022, to allow time for consideration and approval of corresponding amendment to *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019*.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

**HISTORY**

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-10 from the City Planning & Development Division.

Jeremy Fenton, Senior City Planner, City Planning Department, made a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

Angela Ell, representing the Al Ritchie Community Association, addressed the Commission.

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.
Recommendation #3 in the attached report does not need City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Gohike, Council Officer  3/10/2022

ATTACHMENTS
RPC22-10  Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan
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Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan

Date | March 8, 2022
---|---
To | Regina Planning Commission
From | City Planning & Community Development
Service Area | Planning & Development Services
Item No. | RPC22-10

RECOMMENDATION

Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

1. Approve an amendment to Part B of *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48* by adding the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan as Part B.19, with such amendments to come into force the later of the date of Ministerial Approval or June 1, 2022, to allow time for consideration and approval of corresponding amendment to *The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019*.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary bylaw(s) to give effect to the recommendations to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations and the required public notice.

3. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.

ISSUE

A Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan (NLP) has been prepared for the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood and, through this report, is submitted to City Council for approval consideration (Appendix B). NLPs form part of *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw 2013-48* (OCP); therefore, City Council approval of a bylaw to amend the OCP is required.

Preparation of the Al Ritchie NLP is part of a program to develop new NLPs for neighbourhoods within the city’s Intensification Area identified in the OCP. NLPs serve as a policy framework for guiding the type, location and design of new development in a particular neighbourhood with the
intent to support objectives of the OCP, and aspirations of neighbourhood residents, relating to growth and development. The Al Ritchie NLP is the first NLP to be developed as part of this new program.

Preparation of the Al Ritchie NLP involved a rigorous process, including comprehensive public engagement and consultation with the Al Ritchie Community Association. In addition to process due diligence, the Al Ritchie NLP is deemed to comply with relevant provincial legislation (Planning and Development Act, 2007 and the Statements of Provincial Interests Regulations) and with Part A of the OCP (Design Regina).

To implement the Al Ritchie NLP, amendments to the Regina Zoning Bylaw 2019-19 (Zoning Bylaw) will also be required, which will be brought forward for consideration at a future date. Accordingly, to ensure consistency between the two bylaws, this report also recommends that the adoption of the Al Ritchie NLP not come into force until such time as the related Zoning Bylaw amendments are also adopted. This approach will allow Council to confirm or amend the Al Ritchie NLP before a detailed Zoning Bylaw review is undertaken.

IMPACTS

Financial Impact
This Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan (NLP) serves as a policy framework for guiding the type, location and design of new development in the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood. The cost of any additional, or changes to existing, infrastructure that may be required to support new development, directly or indirectly, will be the responsibility of individual developers, in accordance with City standards and applicable legal requirements.

Environmental Impact
City Council set a community goal for Regina to achieve net-zero emissions and sourcing net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas (GHG) implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions.

The Al Ritchie NLP identifies opportunities for additional residential and commercial development; therefore, supports a more compact and “complete” neighbourhood that offers “live-work-play” opportunities within walking distance. Accommodating opportunities for daily life needs in existing neighbourhoods, while encouraging more people where appropriate, will likely contribute to increased population density and reduce GHG emissions as result.

Intensification in established areas of cities is generally known to contribute to the reduction of energy consumption and associated GHG emissions in various ways, including:

- Reducing travel distances
- Encouraging active transportation and use of transit, while promoting active and healthy lifestyles
Making more efficient use of land and infrastructure already developed and in place

The City is currently preparing an Energy & Sustainability Framework (ESF) to direct Council’s objective noted above. Following approval of this framework, neighborhood land-use plans will be reviewed to ensure alignment with the ESF.

Policy/Strategic Impact

Official Community Plan

- Section C, Goal 1, Policy 2.3: Direct at least 30% of new population to existing urban areas as the City’s intensification target

- Section C, Goal 2, Policy 2.4: Make use of residual capacity of infrastructure in existing urban areas.

- Section C, Goal 2, Policy 2.5: Develop compact and contiguous neighbourhoods.

The Al Ritchie NLP identifies opportunities for intensification to support the intensification target, for compact and “complete” neighbourhoods and the efficient use of existing infrastructure and services.

- Section C, Goal 3, Policy 2.8: Require intensification in BUILT OR APPROVED NEIGHBOURHOODS to be compatible with the existing built form and servicing capacity.

The Al Ritchie NLP includes policy and guidelines for supporting compatible infill development, including targeted height and land-use control measures.

The Al Ritchie NLP authorizes the City to require that applicants associated with major development proposals (e.g. multi-unit buildings) demonstrate servicability.

- Section D5, Goal 1 – “Enable the development of complete neighbourhoods.”

Through the Al Ritchie NLP, opportunities for additional commercial and alternate housing types (e.g., town/row house and multi-unit buildings) have been identified, which will help diversify the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood while maintaining its identity through implementation of height, massing and setback requirements.

- Section D5, Goal 3, Policy 7.12: Cluster high density built form within URBAN CORRIDORS adjacent to TRANSIT NODES, POTENTIAL TRANSIT NODES, or prominent intersections.

The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is framed by the Victoria Avenue Urban Corridor, which includes an express transit route. The Al Ritchie NLP supports intensification along this corridor; however, does not provide a detailed strategy for achieving this. A future Corridor Plan could include a strategy for
enhancing the roadway and streetscape and incentivizing specific development.

- Section D5, Goal 4, Policy 7.16: Encourage local commercial within residential areas.

Through the Al Ritchie NLP, opportunities for additional neighbourhood-oriented (local) commercial have been identified.

- Section D6, Goal 1, Policy 8.8: Support residential intensification in existing and NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS to create complete neighbourhoods.

The Al Ritchie NLP identifies opportunities for intensification and additional medium and high-density housing types, as discussed in this report.

- Section E, Goal 2, Policy 14.9: Ensure that community engagement is a component of the community building process and is a fundamental tool in achieving this Plan.

The process to develop the Al Ritchie NLP included comprehensive community consultation, including three public engagement events.

Comprehensive Housing Strategy
- Goal # 3 – 29: Strengthen Official Community Plan policies related to encouraging a mix of land uses, walkable neighbourhoods, and access to public transportation.

Through the Al Ritchie NLP, opportunities for additional neighbourhood-oriented commercial and alternate housing types (e.g. town/row house and multi-unit buildings) have been identified, which will help diversify the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood.

Regina Cultural Plan
- Identify and understand the heritage value and character of not only buildings but also areas, streetscapes, and cultural landscapes through the process of creating neighbourhood plan and related local area studies.

Heritage was part of the community consultation discussion as it relates to community character. There is significant support for the older, original homes, which, in the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood, tend to be of smaller scale compared to modern; therefore, Al Ritchie NLP includes policies for controlling height and massing to ensure new development is compatible with existing neighbourhood character.

Underutilized Land Improvement Strategy
Underutilized lands were examined through the review process. Although there are few vacant parcels (and these relate to small lots), the Victoria Avenue corridor has potential for significant intensification. The Al Ritchie NLP supports intensification along this corridor; however, does not provide a detailed strategy for achieving this.
OTHER OPTIONS

Alternative options would be:

1. Deny the amendment to Part B of the OCP, to include the proposed Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan. Growth policies in Part A of the OCP will continue to apply but neighbourhood specific growth policies would be absent in the Al Ritchie neighbourhood.

2. Refer the Al Ritchie NLP back to Administration. If City Council has specific concerns with the proposal, it may refer the applications back to Administration to address or make additional recommendations and direct that the report be reconsidered by RPC or brought directly back to Council following such further review.

COMMUNICATIONS

Interested parties will receive a copy of the report and notification of their right to appear as a delegation at the Council meeting when the application will be considered. Notification and a link to the report will also be posted on the City’s Be Heard public engagement project page: Regina.ca/alritchie

Public notice of Council’s intention to consider the OCP amendment (Al Ritchie NLP) as well as of the public hearing that is required to be conducted upon consideration of the proposed bylaw will be given in accordance with the Public Notice Policy Bylaw, 2020.

DISCUSSION

Background
In 2016, City Council passed motion MN16-9 - Neighbourhood Plans directing that the City of Regina prioritize the completion of new “neighbourhood plans”. Historically, the City has used neighbourhood plans to guide growth, development, servicing, and other matters within specified neighbourhood areas. Neighbourhood plans form part of the OCP (Part B) and include specific growth policy for individual neighbourhoods.

In 2019, Administration presented, to a Committee of Council (PPC19-2), a strategy for completing these new neighbourhood plans which included direction for:

- The area of the city that would be subject to new neighbourhood plans (Intensification Area).
- Prioritizing when a particular neighbourhood receives a new neighbourhood plan (sequencing plan).
- Establishing neighbourhood plans boundaries (that follow Community Association boundaries).
- Defining the scope and intent of the neighbourhood plans (land-use, urban design and
The neighbourhood plan strategy transitioned into an active program and the process and objectives were further defined. A key feature of the current process is the focus on “land use” and “built form”. Respectively, this means: the type and location of new development; the shape, design and configuration of buildings. The term “neighbourhood land-use plan” (NLP) has since been implemented to better reference this more refined focus. The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is the first neighbourhood to receive a new NLP.

This focus (land use and built form) recognizes the significant work to develop new “master plans” over the last five years to address various City services including: Water Master Plan; Wastewater Master Plan; Transportation Master Plan; Recreation Master Plan; Regina Cultural Plan, etc. Notwithstanding this focus, the need for neighbourhood-specific servicing analysis may be considered on a case-by-case basis for each project (e.g., when a proposed NLP supports intensive development).

In most cases, the Zoning Bylaw will be the primary method for implementing the policies of an NLP; however, these plans also have the potential to direct other related regulations, such as heritage. In turn, NLPs serve to implement the related objectives of OCP Part A (Design Regina) and provide a bridge between the high-level policy and detailed, neighbourhood-specific, regulations.

**Neighbourhood Overview**
The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood (Neighbourhood) is a primarily residential neighbourhood located in close proximity to the east boundary of the Downtown. It is bound by the Victoria Avenue Urban Corridor to the north, Wascana Centre park to the south, Winnipeg Street to the west and the Ring Road to the east.

The Neighbourhood was developed between 1911 and 1970, through three annexations. Subdivisions west of Park Street (Broders Annex; Assiniboia Place) were some of the earliest in the city, while others developed after WWII (Arnhem Place) and during the 1960s and 1970s (Glen Elm Park). The Neighbourhood is fully developed and includes a mix of residential, commercial, civic and open space land uses.

**Composition**
Population:
The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is growing and diversifying. Between 2006 and 2011, the Neighbourhood grew by 245 people and between 2011 and 2016, the Neighbourhood grew by another 485 people, resulting in a 2016 population of 8235 people. This represents a growth rate of 9.5% over this ten-year period. The 2021 population and recent change will be made available in 2022, as part of the Stats Canada census release.

Note: The demographic composition is explained in detail through the Neighbourhood Profile inventories maintained by the City – www.regina.ca.
Residential:
The predominant residential building types in the Neighbourhood fall in the low-density category, which includes single-detached dwellings (70%) and 2-unit dwellings (6%). Medium and high-density residential building types are mostly clustered in two locations and represent 11.5% and 14% of residential dwelling units, respectively.

Although it may be concluded that medium and high-density residential types are limited, especially 3-unit buildings (e.g. triplexes) and town/row homes, the typical narrow lot design (7.5 metre lot width) allows for a relatively dense arrangement of single-detached dwellings.

Commercial:
The primary location for commercial development is along Victoria Avenue, which is a designated Urban Corridor (per OCP). Additionally, there are three neighbourhood-oriented commercial nodes within the Neighbourhood and two on the periphery. The predominant commercial type in all of these locations is small-scale retail and service-oriented businesses (e.g. restaurants; personal care; etc.).

There is no industrial development in the Neighbourhood or any land-use or facilities considered as having a health or safety risk (e.g. rail corridors or pipelines).

Planning considerations (associated with Neighbourhood’s composition):
- Limited opportunities for medium and high-density housing.
- Strategic locations for flexible land-use solutions (residential, commercial or mixed-use).
- The absence of a grocery store within walking distance of the Neighbourhood.
- Expansion of existing neighbourhood-oriented commercial nodes.
- Intensification of Victoria Avenue corridor.

Character
The Neighbourhood was developed over an extended period; therefore, it represents diverse features. West of Park Street was developed first and is based on a grid street network; evenly spaced local and collector streets; rear lanes; and narrow lots (7.5 metres is typical). East of Park Street was developed during the 1960s and 1970s and is based on a modified grid street pattern, rear lanes, and wider lots (15 metres is typical). These areas are separated by Arcola Avenue, which is an arterial roadway with limited crossing points.

Due to the extended build-out period (1911 – 1970s), there is a diversity of residential buildings styles in the Neighbourhood, including: Craftsman bungalow, Prairie Style, Four Square, “Wartime/Veteran” housing (especially in the Arnhem subdivision), and modern 2-storey designs. Replacing original homes with modern is an ongoing trend, especially west of Park Street. Where a new development is situated amongst original homes, the difference regarding design style and massing (i.e. height and length) is often conspicuous. The issue of infill compatibility is a key concern expressed by Neighbourhood residents.
Planning considerations (associated with Neighbourhood’s character) include:

- Height and massing difference between original and modern homes.
- Concentration of “Wartime/ Veteran” housing in the Arnhem Place subdivision.
- Limiting the encroachment of non-residential uses into residential areas.

Public Engagement
Preparation of the Al Ritchie NLP was subject to significant public engagement, including the following:

- Three public consultation opportunities (summarized in Appendix A)
- External stakeholder consultation, which included: school boards; Saskatchewan Health Authority; Regina and Region Home Builders’ Association; and Regina Realtors Association
  - The City only received comments from the school boards. Both noted that there is no intent to eliminate existing schools and there is no current need for additional schools to accommodate the Neighbourhood.
- Regular check-in meetings with the Al Ritchie Community Association (ARCA) and consideration of a door-to-door survey they had undertaken, during the course of preparing this NLP, regarding a broad range of neighbourhood issues. The ARCA has indicated general support for the Al Ritchie NLP; however, they do not fully support proposed Policy 4.2.1, which confirms available variance provisions of the Zoning Bylaw apply to the maximum height limits set forth in the Al Ritchie NLP (it is the preference of the ARCA that the maximum height limits be final without the variance provision).

The ARCA also indicated concern with the following matters that are beyond the scope of this NLP project:
  - The condition of sidewalk and roadway infrastructure.
  - Sanitary sewer – odour.
  - Park upgrades and maintenance.
  - Property maintenance; crime; bylaw enforcement.
  - Property maintenance and rehabilitation – incentives.

The City responded to these concerns by outlining, as part of the September 28, 2021 public consultation event, the following initiatives:
  - Implementation of “Eastern Pressure Zone” is planned for 2026, which will improve water pressure.
  - Approximately 50 per cent of the sanitary sewers in the Neighbourhood have been recently relined and the City continues to inspect the remaining areas.
  - Upcoming drainage upgrade projects in the area will improve on the stormwater service levels.
  - Comprehensive Housing Strategy will be reviewed in 2022. Initiatives regarding affordable housing; regeneration and repair, etc. will be reviewed.
  - Parks Master Plan underway - public engagement is ongoing.
Plan Strategy

Land Use
The focus of the Al Ritchie NLP is maintaining the existing character and land-use composition of the Neighbourhood while allowing a transition to higher-density residential or commercial or mixed-use development at key locations. Key components of the land-use strategy include:

- Support the continuation of the Residential Urban Zone as the predominant zone for the low-density areas, which allows for single-detached dwellings to continue or a transition to 2-unit residential buildings (e.g. duplexes).
- Maintain existing medium and high-density clusters and allow additional opportunities for medium-density residential adjacent to Victoria Avenue.
- Support Victoria Avenue as the primary commercial area and location for potential transition to high-density mixed-use development.
- Recognize Victoria Avenue, west of Arcola Avenue, as a downtown gateway by restricting “auto-oriented” land uses, thus helping to support a more “urban-oriented” streetscape and appropriate transition to Downtown.
- Provide opportunity for the existing neighbourhood-oriented commercial nodes to expand.
- Provide opportunity for “flexible” (residential, commercial or mixed-use) land-use solutions at key locations.

Built Form
The general focus of the built-form strategy is height control – respecting the character of the low-density, low-height areas while supporting taller buildings along major corridors and existing clusters. The Al Ritchie NLP also includes policy for supporting the original character of the Assiniboia and Arnhem Place subdivisions. Key facets of the built-form strategy:

- A gradation of height, from taller to smaller, moving southward through the Neighbourhood from Victoria Avenue to Wascana Park.
- Support tallest buildings at Victoria Avenue – Park Street intersection, recognizing this key intersection and proximity of express transit service.
- Support building height and massing within the Assiniboia and Arnhem Place subdivisions associated with original housing styles.
- Further limit building height within Arnhem Place subdivision to recognize the prevalence of smaller residential buildings, including “Wartime/ Veteran” housing.

Plan Implications

Intensification
Population and building permit data indicate that the Neighbourhood has experienced intensification over the last ten years. This trend is partly accounted for through the replacement of single-detached dwellings with 2-unit residential buildings (e.g. duplexes) in the low-density areas and the construction of a multi-unit building in the Glen Elm Subdivision. New duplex dwellings are generally in the form of “stacked” buildings, where one unit is located above the other, as opposed to side-by-side design due to the typical narrow lots found in the Neighbourhood, including within the low-density area.
The areas with greatest intensification potential is low-density area and the Victoria Avenue corridor and adjacent blocks. Most of the low-density area is zoned Residential Urban Zone, which allows for single-detached dwellings or duplex dwellings. Although most buildings are single-detached dwellings (one unit), allowances are provided for 2-unit dwellings. It should be noted, however, where a single-detached dwelling with a basement apartment is replaced by a duplex dwelling, the net increase in units is zero (as two units is maximum).

The segment of Victoria Avenue abutting the Neighbourhood has the potential, per existing zoning, to transition from its current low-density and massing to a continuous street wall of buildings up to 6-storeys in height; however, this scenario is not appear viable in todays market. To encourage development, a future corridor plan can support the transitioning to a mixed-use, attractive, pedestrian-friendly environment.

In addition to the aforementioned areas where existing zoning already allows for intensification, the Al Ritchie NLP allows the blocks between the Victoria Avenue rear-lane and 14th Avenue to transition from low-density to medium density. Factoring in the proposed height regulations, a maximum scenario would be replacement of single-detached dwellings with 3-storey apartment buildings behind Victoria Avenue and replacement of single-detached dwellings with row/townhouse buildings in the balance of the area (currently, this area is all single-detached dwellings). However, considering historic growth trends and the logistics of assembling multiple lots for larger development, it is expected that the transition of this area to a higher density scenario will be gradual over time.

Zoning Bylaw
To implement the policies of the Al Ritchie NLP, an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw is required. Currently, the Residential Infill Development Overlay Zone (RID Zone) is used to help support more compatible and complementary infill development; however, these regulations are generic in nature and apply to all one and 2-unit residential buildings in the city corresponding to the Intensification Area (OCP Map 1c). As the Al Ritchie NLP includes regulations specific to the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood, the Zoning Bylaw will need to be amended to include neighbourhood specific regulations.

An amendment to the Zoning Bylaw, as discussed above, will be presented to City Council in Q2, 2022. A recommendation of this report includes a provision ensuring that the Al Ritchie NLP and the Zoning Bylaw amendments come into force concurrently. These amendments will not result in “up-zoning” (re zoning to accommodate intensification), as it is expected that landowners will pursue this, voluntarily over time, through site-specific applications.
DECISION HISTORY

On August 29, 2016, City Council passed a Motion from Councillor Shawn Fraser: Neighbourhood Plans (MN16-9).

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Prepared by: Jeremy Fenton, Senior City Planner
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## APPENDIX A

### Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan
### Public Consultation Summary

#### Community Event #1

**Date:** November 21, 2019  
**Type:** Walk-in Open House – Core Ritchie Neighbourhood Centre  
(Supplemented by Online Option)  
**Goal:** Project kick-off; share ideas; learn about residents’ aspirations and concerns  
**Participants:** 86 walk-in attendees; four online respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Feedback</th>
<th>City Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What people like: Access to amenities (e.g. Neighbourhood Centre, Wascana Park, Downtown); low-density character; walkable; local shops; original homes; trees/ parks</td>
<td>The Al Ritchie NLP is focused on maintaining key elements associated with the existing character while allowing some higher density/intensification along major corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally accept some higher density/intensification along major corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views regarding the predominance of single-detached dwellings was mixed – while many expressed favor for this composition, others expressed a desire for alternate housing types, such as seniors housing, condominiums, affordable, small (&lt;1000sqft), secondary suites</td>
<td>The Al Ritchie NLP identifies areas that may transition from low-density to medium-density housing, which could include town/row house; triplexes and 3-storey multi-unit buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A majority indicated interest in more shops, amenities and services including a grocery store</td>
<td>The Al Ritchie NLP identifies sites suitable for commercial and mixed-use development, which could accommodate a grocery store; although, large lots with redevelopment potential are few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to preserve and rehabilitate original homes was raised by some, but was not a broadly emphasized sentiment</td>
<td>The Al Ritchie NLP does not contemplate heritage or architectural control areas; however, these measures could be considered through a future amendment to the Al Ritchie NLP, should there be an initiative by residents to explore this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matters of concern (within scope of NLP): Infill development and lot splitting/densification (size; design; traffic)</td>
<td>The Al Ritchie NLP includes policy for controlling the height and massing of infill development with the intent of supporting traditional character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matters of concern (beyond scope of NLP): Property maintenance; crime/safety; rental properties; condition of streets and sidewalks; sewer capacity (odour)</td>
<td>The City explained matters that are beyond the scope of the NLP. Further, updates regarding related City initiatives were provided as part of Community Event 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan Public Consultation Summary

**Community Event #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Feedback</th>
<th>City Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> January 25 – February 5, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Online survey (Be Heard Regina)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Share draft planning concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants:</strong> 58 survey submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong support for targeting intensification along major corridors and preserving the low-density character over the majority of the neighbourhood; however, many felt there was too much proposed intensification along College Avenue and blocks backing Victoria Avenue</th>
<th>City scaled back amount of land identified for intensification, while still retaining key locations, thus accommodating resident concerns while still supporting some growth and diversification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support for a decreasing height gradation from Victoria Avenue going southward</td>
<td>City scaled back amount of land identified for 8.5 metre height area, while still retaining key locations for this scale of building, as well as areas for medium and high-density, thus accommodating resident concerns while still supporting some growth and diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong support for a decrease in maximum height, for residential buildings within the low-density areas, from 8.5 metres to 7.5 metres; however, there was general support that blocks closer to Victoria Avenue could be reserved for taller buildings (8.5 – 11 metres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for modest expansion of neighbourhood-oriented commercial nodes; however, many had concern with the amount of proposed “Flex-Area” along College Avenue and Winnipeg Street, which could allow for residential or commercial or mixed-use development</td>
<td>City eliminated the Flex-Area 1 designation and scaled back the area designated as Flex-Area 2, while still retaining key locations, thus accommodating resident concerns while still supporting some growth and diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for additional development controls in Assiniboia Place and Arnhem Place subdivisions to better ensure that infill is compatible with the scale and massing of original housing</td>
<td>This was retained due to positive support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Event #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Feedback</th>
<th>City Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments respecting the NLP were minor and limited</td>
<td>No additional changes required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reiterated comments relating to matters beyond the scope of the NLP</td>
<td>The City explained matters that are beyond the scope of the NLP. Further, the following updates regarding related City initiatives was provided:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of “Eastern Pressure Zone” will occur in 2026, which will improve water pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approximately 50% of the sanitary sewers in the neighbourhood have been recently relined and City continues to inspect the remaining areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Upcoming drainage upgrade projects in the area will improve on the stormwater service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive Housing Strategy will be reviewed in 2022. Initiatives regarding affordable housing; regeneration and repair, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parks Master Plan underway - public engagement is pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This Plan forms part of:

Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48

Enactment of this Plan is authorized through Section 29 of:

The Planning and Development Act, 2007
1.1 Summary

The intent of the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan (“Al Ritchie NLP” or “Plan”) is to serve as a policy framework for guiding the type, location and design of new development in the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood.

As the City continues to grow and evolve, it is important to guide new development in a way that supports the aspirations of residents, as well as broader objectives that aim to foster a vibrant and sustainable city. This Plan supports this objective by establishing a policy framework for guiding new development in the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood (Neighbourhood). The intent is to enhance the Neighbourhood by encouraging complementary and compatible new development.

This Plan focusses on land-use and built-form. Respectively, this means: the type and location of new development; the shape, design and configuration of buildings. This Plan has a specialized role by directing how the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw, which provides detailed direction for land-use and built-form, are applied appropriately to the Neighbourhood. Other important matters, such as the provision of various community services, are addressed in City master plans.

Thank you to the residents of the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood for providing valuable input into the preparation of this Plan. The objectives and policies grew through community dialog and evolved through the process as we checked back with residents at various stages. Although generally long-term in nature, this Plan may be subject to reviews, so that it remains in alignment with evolving resident aspirations, market conditions and development concepts.

This Plan forms part of the City’s Official Community Plan (Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48) and is in accordance with Provincial legislation and regulations: The Planning and Development Act, 2007 and the Statements of Provincial Interests Regulations.
1.2 Legal

The City uses a hierarchy of policy and regulatory instruments to guide land-use and development across the city, from the high-level, city-wide policy of the Official Community Plan to the detailed regulations of the Zoning Bylaw. Neighbourhood Land-Use Plans fit in the middle, providing policy direction for the growth and development of specific neighbourhoods.

At the top of the policy hierarchy is the Official Community Plan (Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48). The Official Community Plan (OCP – Part A) is used to guide growth, development, the provision of services, and other important matters, across the city. The OCP is comprehensive and long-term in focus. Neighborhood Land-Use Plans and the Zoning Bylaw must be in conformity with the OCP.

The Al Ritchie NLP forms part of the OCP (OCP - Part B), and acts as a bridge between the high-level goals of the OCP and the detailed regulations of the Zoning Bylaw. Neighbourhood Land-Use Plans specify how the applicable policies of the OCP, and the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw, are applied to a particular neighbourhood. The Zoning Bylaw, and “zoning bylaw related decisions”, must be consistent with this Plan.

This Plan includes maps, policy and various terminology for guiding land-use and development and associated administrative processes. Key terms should be interpreted as follows:

- “Shall” equates to mandatory compliance.
- “Should” infers that compliance is generally expected, except where execution of the policy is not practical or where an exceptional situation applies, etc.
- “May” infers that execution of the policy is optional; however, where “may” is used in conjunction with a City directive, the City has final authority to require or waive requirement.

When specific land-uses are mentioned, please refer to the Zoning Bylaw for further clarification.

Where a proposed development conflicts with this Plan, an amendment is possible where it is in accordance with the decision authority of the City Council and Section 4.3 of this Plan.
2.1 Context

Located in close proximity to the east edge of the Downtown, the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is framed by major placemaking features, including the Victoria Avenue urban corridor (north); Wascana Centre park (south) and Ring Road (east). It is further defined by transecting collector and local streets, including the historic College Avenue roadway. This location and design allows for convenient access to all major downtown, and other nearby, services and amenities.

Figure 2 - Context
2.2 History

Regina is located on Treaty 4 land and within the traditional territory of the Metis.

Regina was incorporated, as a City, in 1903. The city was centered on a CP Rail station and the original town plan was based on a classic CP Rail settlement design: grid pattern; evenly spaced roadways; central town hub and train station. Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is based on an extension of this original gridiron framework.

The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood was developed between 1911 and 1970, through three annexations. Subdivisions west of Park Street were some of the earliest: Broders Annex; Assiniboia Place, while other developed after WWII (Arnhem Place) and during the 1960s and 1970s (Glen Elm Park). Today, housing design represents an eclectic array of many different styles.

The neighbourhood is named after Alvin (Al) Ritchie, who was inducted into the Saskatchewan Sports Hall of Fame in 1966 and who holds the distinction of being the only coach to have won national championships in the ranks of hockey and football. In between his amazing sports career, he took time to serve overseas in WWI.

The Al Ritchie Community Association (ARCA) is a registered charity that has been advocating on behalf of the community and helping to serve its community needs since 1987. The Core Ritchie Neighbourhood Centre is the civic heart of the neighbourhood and serves a number of community functions, including a public library.
2.3 Composition (2020)

The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood consists mostly of low-density residential development; however, there are clusters of medium-density and high-density in different locations as well. Non-residential development includes: commercial along all of Victoria Avenue and at key intersections along College Avenue; four schools; five parks and a neighbourhood centre.

The land-use pattern has existed since the neighbourhood was originally developed and overall change has been minimal. Although medium and high-density residential is limited, the characteristic narrow lots (7.6 metres) allows for a dense pattern of single-detached homes.

Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building, Detached</th>
<th>Building, Row</th>
<th>Building, Row</th>
<th>Building, Stacked</th>
<th>Building, Stacked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2515 - 70%</td>
<td>225 - 6%</td>
<td>165 – 4.5%</td>
<td>245 - 7%</td>
<td>500 – 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building, Detached (single-detached) homes are the most common residential building type. The neighbourhood was developed through multiple annexations, and over several generations, so includes a diversity of design styles. Historic styles include: Craftsman bungalow, Prairie Style, Four Square and the “Wartime Housing” provided to veterans and families. A trend within the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is the replacement of older homes with modern, including taller buildings with two or more units. This trend partly accounts for the continuing population increase.

Population

For more demographic data, go to City website and search: “Neighbourhood Profiles”

Stats Canada data shows that the population is growing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7505</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7750</td>
<td>+ 3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2011</td>
<td>+ 3 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>+ 6 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Public Realm

The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood public realm consists of streets, lanes, parks and civic facilities. At the heart, is the Core-Ritchie Neighbourhood Centre, which includes a gym, library, community garden and other facilities. The neighbourhood is also well serviced by transit, including two express transit routes and local service. The street and block pattern is based on a grid, which generally allows for a high level of mobility in multiple directions; however, the neighbourhood is bifurcated by Arcola Avenue, which is a major arterial roadway with limited crossing options.

Figure 3 – Features

![Map of Al Ritchie Neighbourhood showing public realm features and mobility routes.](image-url)
2.5 Built Realm

The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood consists, primarily, of residential blocks that were developed over an extended period (1910-1970). Other major defining features include Victoria Avenue, which is a major commercial and traffic corridor, and College Avenue, which defines the heart of the Neighbourhood through its central location, design and local shopping opportunities. The Al Ritchie Neighbourhood is diverse and includes several “sub-areas” that have unique characteristics. These sub-areas are defined through the pages that follow.

Figure 4 – Features
Overview:

Victoria Avenue was first developed during the City's formative years and was extended over time. As the primary gateway into the city and downtown, the corridor is named in honor of Queen Victoria.

Victoria Avenue has long been recognized for its commercial potential – commercial zoning, from the downtown to Park Street, dates back to the City's first zoning bylaw (1927).

Victoria Avenue's historic and mixed-use legacy is visible today – along its length, are original pre and post-WWII homes converted into commercial. Alongside, are purpose-built commercial buildings representing a broad age swath, from original to present day.

Considerations:

- Interface between Victoria Avenue commercial and adjacent residential.
- Capitalizing on transit potential through mixed-use and intensification, while considering arterial roadway and traffic.
- Aging buildings, underutilized lots and urban design objectives.
- Gateway into the city – land-use transition.
Broder’s Annex, Assiniboia and Arnhem Place were annexed into the City during 1911; substantially developed from 1910 to 1960 and subject to the City’s first Zoning Bylaw (1927).

These areas were designed based on a classic grid, replete with rear lanes throughout. There is a wide variety of housing types; however, many are pre-1950. Also included: parks, schools and College Avenue, which is a key corridor that includes local commercial nodes and transit.

Arnhem Place is notable for its WWII theme, including collection of 1945-1955 “wartime housing”. The name and Holland Park is a tribute to Canada’s role liberating Holland in WWII.

Considerations:

- Grid pattern and rear-lanes, which supports walkability; development flexibility.
- Narrow lots (7.6m is common).
- Accommodating modern building design while respecting historic character.
- The prevalence of original single-detached dwellings and a diversification trend.
- The unique qualities of College Avenue, including local commercial areas; transit.

City of Regina OCP
Al Ritchie NLP – Part B.19
Glen Elm Park – North

Overview:

Greer’s Court and adjacent multi-unit lots were annexed into the City during 1951; were substantially developed from 1960s to 1980s.

This area is unique by its collection of multi-unit buildings, including 3-4 story “walk-up” apartments. It also shares, with Glen Elm Park South, a neighbourhood core that includes park space, schools and a local commercial area.

Greer’s Court was built in 1967 as Regina’s second public housing project. The uniform design consists of two-story row houses with brick facades. This development is managed by the Saskatchewan Housing Authority.

Considerations:

- Neighbourhood core, consisting of park, schools and local commercial area.
- Prevalence of multi-unit buildings and affordable housing opportunities.
- The unique character of Greer’s Court.
- Interface with Victoria Avenue and Victoria Avenue - Ring Road interchange.
Overview:

Glen Elm Park South was annexed into the City during 1951; 1956; was substantially developed from 1955 to 1980 and was subject to the City’s first Official Community Plan (Faludi Plan).

This area is unique, in the Al Ritchie Neighbourhood, by the prevalence of large lots (15m wide) and common building design – square, single-story bungalows. Glen Elm Park South was developed during the transition between pre-WWII grid and more modern form, which is why you still see lanes, but the lots are not as wide as more modern neighbourhoods. It is bordered by major roads on all sides.

In addition to housing, Glen Elm Park South shares, with Greer’s Court and adjacent areas, a neighbourhood core that includes park space, schools and a local commercial area.

Considerations:

- Neighbourhood core, consisting of park, schools and local commercial area.
- Prevalence of square, single-story bungalows on large lots (15m); or equally sized duplexes on 7.5 m wide lots (per unit).
- Interconnectivity, considering all sides are bordered by major roadways.
- Limited commercial amenities.
The following objectives of this Plan are focused on supporting the existing land-use pattern and character, while allowing for appropriate growth and development in key locations. These objectives reflect the goals and vision of Neighbourhood residents and serve to direct the policy of this Plan; how the policy is to be interpreted and future amendments to this Plan.

**Al Ritchie Neighbourhood Land-Use Plan Objectives**

1. Preserve the main residential character by directing non-residential land-use (stores, amenities, etc.) to specified areas and corridors.

2. Direct more intense commercial development to the Victoria Avenue Corridor.

3. Support the two local commercial areas along College Avenue and allow for modest expansion to provide additional amenities and services to the community.

4. Direct medium-density residential development to major corridors with transit service and to existing medium-density clusters and the community centre.

5. Support the development of a community-oriented grocery store by identifying potential adequately sized location(s).

6. Direct higher-density residential development to existing high-density areas as infill.

7. Focus taller buildings along, and adjacent to, Victoria Avenue and within high-density residential areas.

8. Support smaller building dimensions in the south part of the community, complementing the rich stock of more traditional homes and the border of Wascana Park.

9. Seek ways to support maintenance of the existing neighbourhood character while encouraging the development of a variety of housing types to meet current and future residents’ needs.

10. Maintain public open space as a community amenity.

These objectives are illustrated through the following graphics.
Figure 5 – Neighbourhood

This map illustrates a potential future land-use scenario - transition areas that will allow the Neighbourhood to grow and evolve over time, in accordance with the Plan objectives.

The areas in white will continue to support the existing pattern of land-use, blending together with the transition area to form a cohesive and synergistic Neighbourhood design pattern.
College Avenue is centrally located and is a destination for local shopping and civic activities.

This Plan supports the existing character of this important corridor while encouraging opportunities for additional neighbourhood commercial at key locations.

Flex-Areas 1 and 2 allow for residential or commercial or both in the same building (mixed-use). Flex Area 2 allows for more diversity and taller buildings.

Building height will be limited to 7.5 metres (m), except that taller buildings may be considered at the key locations shown.
4.0 POLICY

4.1 Land-Use

1. Land-use shall be in accordance with Figure 7 and Table 1.

2. Notwithstanding Policy 4.1.1:
   a. The following land-uses shall be prohibited from locating along Victoria Avenue, west of Arcola Avenue: gas/service stations; car washes; drive-through restaurants and cafes; parking lots (as principal use); outdoor sale yards (Retail Trade, Outdoor Lot).
   b. The following additional land-uses may be approved for the area designated as Flex Area 2, located at the intersection of Park Street and Arcola Avenue, as shown on Figure 7: office; institutional; recreation; open space.
   c. Greer’s Court, as shown on Figure 7, shall be reserved for medium-density housing types (i.e. Building, Row [3+ units]; Building, Stacked [3+ units]).

3. Notwithstanding Policies 4.1.1; 4.1.2, the existing gas/ service station located at Winnipeg Street and Victoria Avenue may continue as an acceptable land-use at this location.

4. Public open space shall remain as public open space, except where the City approves a portion of the public open space for a facility associated with a public utility or service.

5. Notwithstanding Policies 4.1.1; 4.1.4, should a school no longer be required, the site may transition to public open space, or another land-use, as per the School Re-Use policies of Part A of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48.

6. Low-Density B area, as shown on Figure 7, shall be reserved for lot size and development corresponding to the RN – Residential Neighbourhood Zone of the Zoning Bylaw.

7. Expansion of commercial zoning/ development relating to the neighbourhood commercial nodes along College Avenue (at Broder Street and MacKay Street intersections) shall be contiguous with existing commercial development.

8. Within the Urban Corridor Interface Area, as shown on Figure 7, the City may require, where a new commercial development is being proposed, that screening (e.g. fence/ wall, landscaping) be implemented to help reduce off-site impacts affecting residential lots.
Figure 7 – Land-Use

LAND USE
- Low-Density A
- Low-Density B
- Medium-Density
- High-Density
- Mixed-use 1
- Mixed-use 2
- Mixed-use 3
- Flex-Area 1
- Flex-Area 2
- Urban Corridor Interface

CIVIC USES
- Open Space
- Community Centre
- School

MOBILITY
- Arterial Road
- Collector Road
### Table 1 - Land-Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-Density Residential (A)</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Low-Density Residential (A) area is to accommodate single-detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, as well as complementary land-uses. Corresponding Zoning Designations that support this category include: Residential Neighbourhood Zone; Residential Urban Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-Density Residential (B)</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Low-Density Residential (B) area is to accommodate single-detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, as well as complementary land-uses, on wider lots. Corresponding Zoning Designations that support this category include: Residential Neighbourhood Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Med-Density Residential</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Medium-Density Residential area is to accommodate a range of housing types, from single-detached dwellings to townhouses and low-rise apartments, as well as complementary land-uses. Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Residential Urban Zone; Residential Low-Rise Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-Density Residential</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the High-Density Residential area is to accommodate apartment-style (multi-unit) housing opportunities, as well as complementary land-uses. Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Residential Low-Rise Zone; Residential High-Rise Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed-Use Area 1</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Mixed-Use 1 area is to accommodate small-scale commercial opportunities that cater to neighbourhood residents, which may also include mixed-use buildings (commercial on bottom and residential on top). Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Mixed Low-Rise Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed-Use Area 2</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Mixed-Use 2 area is to accommodate medium-scale commercial opportunities that cater to the neighbourhood and broader public, which may include mixed-use buildings (commercial on bottom and residential on top). Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Mixed High-Rise Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed-Use Area 3</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Mixed-Use 3 area is to accommodate larger-scale commercial opportunities that cater to the community and broader public, which may include mixed-use buildings (commercial on bottom and residential on top). Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Mixed Large Market Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flex-Area 1</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Flex-Area 1 area is to accommodate either low or medium-density housing types or small-scale, neighbourhood-oriented commercial development, or a combination of all. Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Residential Urban Zone; Residential Low-Rise Zone; Mixed Low-Rise Zone; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flex-Area 2</strong></td>
<td>The intent of the Flex-Area 2 area is to accommodate either medium or high-density housing types or medium-scale commercial development, or a combination of all. Corresponding zoning designations that support this category include: Residential Low-Rise Zone; Residential High-Rise Zone; Mixed Low-Rise Zone; Mixed High-Rise Zone; Institutional Zone; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Built-Form

1. The maximum height of buildings shall be in accordance with Figure 8.
   (excepting approved variances authorized through the Zoning Bylaw)

2. Notwithstanding Policy 4.2.1, for a proposed building within the Low-Density Area, as
   shown on Figure 7, the maximum building height shall be the greater of: the requirements
   of Figure 8, or the average of the actual building height of all existing principal buildings
   on the same block face as the proposed development.

3. Notwithstanding Policies 4.2.1 and 4.2.2:
   a. For the areas shown on Figure 8 that have a height limit of 8.5 metres and are
      located along Winnipeg Street and north of 14th Avenue, the maximum height limit
      shall be 7.5 metres for corner lots.
   b. Within the 6.5 metre height area (Arnhem Place subdivision), as shown on Figure 8,
      existing buildings that are greater than 6.5 metres in height may be rebuilt/ replaced
      to a maximum of 7.5 metres in height.
   c. The height limits shown on Figure 8 shall not apply to the following land-uses:
      Assembly, Religion; Institution, Education.

4. Within the area identified as Arnhem Place and Assiniboia Place, as shown on Figure 7:
   a. The maximum finished floor height of the first/ ground floor shall be 1.2 metres above
      established grade.
   b. The depth (length) of buildings shall not exceed 15 metres.
   c. Residential design reflecting traditional architectural design, is encouraged:
      i. Roof examples: gable or hip (simple or varied), gambrel
      ii. Material examples: stucco, wood, masonry (or engineered replication)
      iii. Color examples: earth tone, pastel, off-white
      iv. Enhanced front façade (e.g. veranda, pent roof, hooded door, bay windows)
      v. Fenestration articulation: (e.g. sills and headers [min. 25 mm projection])
      vi. Avoidance of utility/ mechanical equipment visibility on walls facing street
4.3 Implementation

Zoning Bylaw

1. The Zoning Bylaw shall be amended, as needed, to implement the policies of this Plan.

2. Within the Medium-Density area north of 15th Avenue, as shown on Figure 7, allowable medium-density building types may be accommodated via parcel specific rezoning, where the existing zoning does not permit the development.

Servicing

3. The City may require, at its discretion, that applications for major developments (e.g. high-density residential buildings; large-scale commercial and mixed-use development, etc.) be accompanied by analysis, prepared by qualified professionals, demonstrating serviceability (e.g. provision of transportation and utility services).

Plan Review

4. Applications to amend this Plan, to accommodate a proposed development, shall be contingent on demonstration, to the City’s satisfaction, that the proposed development is:

   a. In general accordance with the Plan objectives, and
   b. Is considered complementary and compatible with adjacent development.

5. At the City’s discretion, this Plan may be subject to periodic reviews to ensure that the information and policies remain current and continue to reflect resident aspirations.

6. The process associated with applications to amend this Plan, or to amend the Zoning Bylaw, in relation to development proposals within the area of this Plan, shall include consultation with the affected Community Association.
February 24, 2022

City Council
City of Regina

Subject: Heritage Building Rehabilitation Review

Dear City Council,

The Regina and Region Home Builders’ Association (RRHBA) appreciates we had the opportunity to engage and participate in the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review.

Our Association sees value in conserving heritage properties, but recognizes the heritage file can be complex, create strong emotion and at time create adversarial outcomes.

After reading the final report, we have concluded that all the recommendations made by Donald Luxton and Associates Inc work very well as a whole and are greater than the sum of its parts. It is important that public policy decision makers appreciate that only choosing some of the recommendations and not others made in the report would only erode the holistic approach to effective heritage preservation.

We encourage City Council to support the recommendations in the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review. Our Association would gladly be a partner in supporting communications of future heritage policies to the industry and the public.

Thank You,

Stu Niebergall
President & CEO
Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review

Date | March 16, 2022  
To | Mayor Masters and City Councillors  
From | Executive Committee  
Service Area | Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services  
Item # | CR22-30

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the amended Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A).

2. Direct Administration to initiate a call for applications, with funding and tax exemption recommendations returning to Council prior to October 2022.

3. Approve the following amendments to existing heritage bylaws and regulations be brought forward in Q3 2022:

   a) Replace the current Grade 1/Grade 2 categorization system; and

   b) Adopt a categorization system based on Heritage Assessment Form and Statement of Significance Form both based on the thematic approach as outlined in the Luxton report.

HISTORY

At the March 9, 2022 meeting of Executive Committee, the Committee considered the attached EX22-29 report from the City Planning & Community Development Division.
Donald Luxton, representing Luxton & Associates, Vancouver, BC, made a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

The following addressed the Committee:

− Steve Pinel, representing Nicor Group of Companies, Regina, SK; and
− Jackie Schmidt, representing Heritage Regina, Regina, SK.

The Committee adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report after making the following amendment:

That City Council approve the following amendments to existing heritage bylaws and regulations to be brought forward in Q3 2022:

a) Replace the current Grade 1/Grade 2 categorization system; and

b) Adopt a categorization system based on Heritage Assessment Form and Statement of Significance Form both based on the thematic approach as outlined in the Luxton report.

Recommendation #3 in the attached report does not require City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk 3/11/2022

ATTACHMENTS
EX22-29 - HBRP Review
Appendix A - Amended Heritage Incentives Policy 2022
Appendix B - City of Regina Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review
Appendix C - Heritage Survey Responses
RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Committee recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the amended Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A).

2. Direct Administration to initiate a call for applications, with funding and tax exemption recommendations returning to Council prior to October 2022.

3. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.

ISSUE

The City of Regina (City) continues to evolve its heritage conservation policies and programs to align with best practice and reflect the priorities of residents. A review of the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program by Donald Luxton & Associates found opportunities to encourage increased conservation efforts, support neighbourhood character and promote greater public appreciation of heritage properties through expanded financial incentives and other program and policy changes.

This report focuses on several recommendations that are strongly aligned with public input to date and which Administration is prepared to implement immediately. There are other recommendations in the Review that require additional stakeholder engagement and implementation planning. Administration will report to Council on these additional recommendations in Q3, 2022.
IMPACTS

Financial Impacts
Additional ongoing resources for heritage conservation were approved in the 2022 Budget, and an additional request will be submitted in 2023 to bring funding for incentives in alignment with the consultant’s recommendations. The funding allocation is described in Table 1.

Table 1 – Financial impact of recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Planner II</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>This position has been in place on a term basis since 2019 and required permanent funding. No change to service level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analyst (CMM 5)</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>To allow time for recruitment full funding was not requested through the 2022 budget process but will be required in 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new FTE beginning Q2 2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investments</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Support for programs focused on celebration, activation and education of heritage matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services and Engagement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Required for third party reviews and heritage impact assessments, as well as stakeholder and community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and maintenance grants to property owners.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Based on recommended benchmark of $1 per resident per year. Program uptake is expected to be slow in 2022, but to reach recommended budget levels in 2023.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If approved, the revised Heritage Incentive Policy will continue to allow for tax exemptions for heritage properties. The financial impact varies from year to year.
Table 2 – Tax Exemptions under the Heritage Incentive Policy 2017 - 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Municipal Levy</th>
<th>Total Levies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>205,706</td>
<td>336,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>177,996</td>
<td>297,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>130,567</td>
<td>223,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>128,699</td>
<td>224,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>123,956</td>
<td>219,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>766,923</td>
<td>1,302,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Impacts
City Council set a community goal for the City of Regina of achieving net zero emissions and sourcing of net zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions.

Rehabilitating heritage properties prevents greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that result from demolition of an existing structure and the embodied emissions that are created through construction of a new building. Additionally, heritage rehabilitation is an opportunity to improve energy efficiency in buildings such as older homes that are often the most energy inefficient. Renovating and rehabilitating create an opportunity to incorporate energy efficiency retrofits that can reduce energy consumption and improve energy efficiency in older homes. The Administration will ensure the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program aligns with Regina's goal to become renewable by 2050.

Policy/Strategic Impacts
The recommendations in this report and the full Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review in Appendix B are strongly aligned with the policies outlined in Part A of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2013-48 (OCP):

Section D8: Culture

Goal 1 – Support Cultural Development and Cultural Heritage: Enhance quality of life and strengthen community identity and cohesion through supporting cultural development and cultural heritage.

10.1 Build partnerships and work collaboratively with community groups, other levels of government, and the private and voluntary sectors to encourage cultural development opportunities and conserve historic places.
10.4 Protect, conserve and maintain historic places in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* and any other guidelines adopted by City Council.

10.5 Encourage owners to protect historic places through good stewardship and voluntarily designating their property for listing on the Heritage Property Register.

10.6 Leverage and expand funding, financial incentive programs and other means of support to advance cultural development, cultural resources and conservation of historic places.

The recommendations in this report are also consistent with the vision and objectives of *Regina’s Cultural Plan*:

**Goal 7.3 – Commemorate and Celebrate the City’s Cultural Heritage**

Objectives:
- Demonstrate Leadership through the Management of the Heritage Conservation Program.
- Conserve Cultural Heritage Resources.
- Ensure New Development contributes to Sense of Place

**Other Impacts**

None with respect to this report.

**Accessibility Impacts**

Accessibility upgrades are an eligible conservation expense under the revised Heritage Incentives Policy.

**OTHER OPTIONS**

1. Approve the recommendations with specific amendments.
2. Refer the Program Review and Heritage Incentives Policy back to Administration.
   - If City Council has specific concerns with the recommendations, it may refer the report back to Administration to address or make additional recommendations. It should be noted a referral back to Administration will delay implementation of the new Heritage Incentives Policy.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

A communications strategy will be developed to support awareness of changes to the Heritage Incentives Policy and expanded financial opportunities for conserving heritage properties. Administration will engage key stakeholders, including heritage property owners, in subsequent public consultation and implementation planning for the remaining recommendations outlined by
DISCUSSION

City of Regina Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program Review (Program Review)
The Program Review attached as Appendix B provides a thorough assessment of the City’s current approach to encouraging heritage conservation, including areas where the program has been successful and where there are opportunities for improvement. Highlights of the City’s existing approach include a strong record of designation - Regina has 103 protected heritage properties that have been formally designated at the municipal or provincial level – and uptake of existing incentives. The number of designated properties continues to grow as typically one to three designation applications are received annually.

The Program Review identifies numerous ways that the City’s approach to heritage conservation can be improved, starting with expanded incentives recommended in this report. Program Review recommendations, once implemented, will encourage property owners and the City to work collaboratively to meet conservation priorities, supported by expanded financial incentives and improved communication, education and capacity building.

Implementation Plan
Administration proposes to divide consideration, approval and implementation of the Program Review recommendations into three Phases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Program Review Recommendation</th>
<th>Status &amp; Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td><strong>Recommendations to Council March 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Expanded Incentives</td>
<td>If the revised Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A) is approved, Call for Applications for Heritage Incentives will be issued in March 2022 with a deadline of June. Recommendations will come back to Council as soon as possible, likely Q3. The Heritage Sector Reference Group is anticipated to begin meetings in March 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Information Accessibility and Transparency</td>
<td>New web content, forms and other resources are in development that respond to stakeholder requests for clarity and ease of access to critical information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Public Awareness and Education</td>
<td>Additional funding of $30,000 in 2022 is directed towards this outcome in the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Program Review Recommendation</td>
<td>Status &amp; Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Phase 2   | **Recommendations to Council Q3**  
(if possible, align timing with Community Character (Lakeview/Cathedral) Project) | Administration has prepared draft standards that will be workshopped with the Heritage Sector Reference Group and other City departments to ensure standards will support heritage conservation objectives and can be enforced consistently. |
|           | C. Improved Heritage Building Maintenance                                                    | This recommendation has implications for the City’s Neighbourhood Planning Program as well as alignment with the current Community Character project that is underway in the Lakeview and Cathedral neighbourhoods. Preliminary recommendations from that project will be presented to Administration in March. |
|           | E. Ongoing Neighbourhood Heritage Planning                                                     | Internal discussions have begun on alignment of the City’s Building Code review processes and heritage conservation objectives. |
|           | F. Building Code Updates                                                                       | The process for pre-application meetings will be formalized. Building permit fees are an eligible cost under the revised Heritage Incentives Policy. Administration will provide an opportunity for input on a proposed zoning bylaw amendment to reflect permitted increase in unit numbers on designated properties. |
|           | G. Permit Application Processing                                                                | Administration will review implications of the recommendations with the Heritage Sector Reference Group. |
|           | Heritage Evaluation and Nomination Recommendations (page 23)                                    | Phase 3 Recommendations are for future consideration. Administration will review the Heritage Incentives Policy bi-annually. Opportunities for expansion could be triggered by evidence that existing programs are not meeting conservation objectives. |
| Phase 3   | H. Further Expansion of Targeted Incentives                                                     |                                                                                     |
|           | I. Heritage Commission                                                                         |                                                                                     |
|           | J. Heritage Foundation                                                                         |                                                                                     |
| (Future)  | K. HBRP Evaluation and Future Expansion                                                         |                                                                                     |
Summary of revised Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A)
The City’s heritage incentives have seen steady uptake for many years. The existing program provides up to 10 years of tax exemption or 50 per cent of eligible conservation costs, whichever is less. A cash grant of up to $50,000 is currently available but only to tax exempt properties such as churches. The Program Review identified the opportunity to significantly expand both budget and eligibility for incentives beyond what exists currently, to support a variety of property types in conservation and maintenance activities.

In alignment with the Program Review, the recommended revisions to the Heritage Incentives Policy (Appendix A) include:

- Formalizing a single intake for applications each year to allow for prioritization, and establishment of an external committee (Incentive Review Panel) to review applications and make recommendations to Administration
- Significant expansion of use of cash grants to incentivize conservation:
  - New eligibility criteria include all properties, not just those that are tax exempt
  - Budget is increased from $30,000 annually to $150,000 approved in the 2022 Budget, and $250,000 beginning in 2023, subject to budget approval
- Expansion of eligibility criteria for all incentives to include Heritage Inventory properties, at a lower level of funding or percentage of total eligible costs
- Addition of maintenance grants that support routine work that will prevent deterioration

Administration will monitor the new program to ensure that it meets the intended objectives. Performance indicators include application numbers, private investment in heritage conservation, and the number of designated properties that are identified as having potential maintenance concerns. The Program Review speaks to the importance of developing stronger relationships between the City and property owners. Expanded incentives provide a foundation for better communication and engagement with property owners, focusing dialogue on knowledge sharing and negotiation to achieve conservation outcomes that benefit both the property owner and the public.

While the Program Review recommends delegation of incentive approval to the Administration, in alignment with other grant and incentive programs, the Heritage Property Act appears not to provide Council the ability to delegate decision-making on heritage incentives. As a result, incentive recommendations will be brought annually to Council for approval. Administration will continue to explore options for delegation of authority with the Province.

Heritage Stakeholder Engagement
The Program Review recommends establishment of a Heritage Sector Reference Group to improve dialogue and communication between the City and community heritage experts. Sector Reference Groups established in Culture and Accessibility areas since 2020 have strengthened relationships and ensured that policies and programs are impactful and focused on community priorities.
Sector Reference Group process allows for ongoing stakeholder engagement on key issues and an efficient means to incorporate sector expertise within Administration’s analysis and recommendations to Council.

The new Heritage Incentives Policy requires that an Incentives Review Panel be established to review applications and provide recommendations to Administration. The Sector Reference Group itself or a subcommittee will function as an Incentives Review Panel to review and prioritize incentive applications for Administration.

**Addressing the Financial Viability of Heritage Conservation Projects**

In preparing the Program Review, Luxton & Associates was asked to provide guidance on how to consider the condition and financial viability of rehabilitation of a property in situations where the owner is reluctant to invest. The Program Review suggests that the City undertake further study of the trade-offs between the value of conservation and the financial impact to the City/taxpayers and property owners, including local case studies where commercial, single and multi-family residential projects have benefitted from heritage conservation efforts.

In the interim, the Program Review recommends that incentives be accessed when Council is considering designating a property without the owner’s express consent. To this end, the revised Heritage Incentives Policy outlines a process whereby the Incentive Review Panel may prepare a recommendation on incentives that would support viable conservation, when Council is considering designation of a property without the owner’s consent, or issuance of a repair order for a property that is already designated.

**Heritage Conservation Survey**

The City ran a public survey from December 1 to 12, 2021 to learn more about the broad public interest in heritage matters. 698 responses were received. Just under one third of respondents see heritage as being “very important” while 17 per cent say it’s not important. Respondents want to see the City focus on clear, well-resourced processes for designation and conservation, encouragement for rehabilitation and maintenance, and regulations that will ensure new construction reinforces existing neighbourhood character. Finances are seen as a barrier to conservation; respondents cited return on investment and the additional cost of restoration and maintenance as perceived barriers to conservation, as well as a lack of information on what heritage is. Incentives, regulatory tools, and public education are public priorities for the renewed program.

The survey findings reinforce feedback from stakeholder engagement in the Spring of 2021 that was outlined in the Program Review. The full results are attached as Appendix C.
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### Heritage Incentives Policy

#### Title:
Heritage Incentives Policy

(Formerly known as the Municipal Heritage Incentives for the Preservation of Heritage Properties)

#### Applies to:
City of Regina
Social and Cultural Development Branch

#### Reference #:
#### Approved by:
City Council

#### Dates:
- Effective: 02-Mar-2022
- Last Review: 02-Mar-2022
- Next Review: 02-Mar-2024

### 1.0 Policy Statement

Through flexible and responsive incentives, the City of Regina supports heritage property owners to conserve their properties, revitalize neighbourhoods and ensure that Regina’s history is preserved and shared for current and future residents.

### 2.0 Purpose

The objectives of the incentives provided under this policy are:

- To encourage investment in the maintenance and upgrading of heritage properties to support their long-term conservation, extend their effective life and/or to ensure their structural integrity.
- To reduce barriers associated with premium costs of rehabilitating heritage buildings.
- To ensure diverse heritage properties continue to contribute to neighbourhood character and vitality and tell the full story of Regina.

### 3.0 Definitions

**Character-Defining Elements:** The materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of an historic place, which must be retained to conserve its heritage value.

**Conservation:** All actions or processes that are aimed at safeguarding the character-defining elements of a historic place to retain its heritage value and extend its physical life. This may involve “Rehabilitation,” “Preservation,” “Restoration” or a combination of these actions or processes in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

**Conservation Plan:** A plan describing the proposed methods used to conserve the heritage values and character-defining elements of a historic place. A Conservation Plan should also indicate the overall condition of the historic place and longer-term plan to maintain it in a sound and attractive state.

**Designated Heritage Property:** Any Municipal Heritage Property, any pre-1965 property within the Victoria Park Heritage Conservation District or any Provincial Heritage Property.
Eligible Conservation Work Costs: The expenses incurred to conserve a building, structure or landscape as further described in 5.8 Eligible Conservation Work below.

Executive Director: Executive Director, City Planning and Community Development, or their designate.

Heritage Alteration Permit: A permit authorizing the alteration of a designated property.

Heritage Fund: The annual budget for heritage grants, including any carry forward of unspent amounts from previous years.

Heritage Inventory: An inventory of non-designated properties located within the corporate boundaries of the City of Regina that have been identified as having Heritage Value in accordance with the Thematic Framework.

Heritage Value: The aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance or significance for past, present, and future generations. The heritage value of a historic place is embodied in its character-defining elements.

Incentive Review Panel: A panel comprised of heritage experts and community stakeholders tasked with the review of heritage incentives application and making recommendations to Administration.

Maintenance: Routine, cyclical, non-destructive actions necessary to slow the deterioration of a designated or Inventory property. It entails non-destructive cleaning, minor repair and refinishing operations.

Statement of Significance: A statement that identifies the description, heritage value and character-defining elements of a Property.

Thematic Framework: A structure for the Heritage Inventory that uses themes to help conceptualize past events and to place sites, places, and events within their historical contexts.

4.0 Transition Provisions

Tax exemption and grant agreements established under the former policy remain valid and are covered under the terms and conditions of the former policy. Any applications for incentives received on or after March 16, 2022, are subject to this policy.

5.0 Incentive Policy

5.1 General Eligibility Requirements

5.1.1 Subject to the restrictions below relating to the Victoria Park Heritage Conservation District, the application of this policy is limited to buildings, structures or landscapes that have been formally recognized by City Council as designated property pursuant to *The Heritage Property Act* those properties on the Heritage Inventory, or provincially designated property pursuant to *The Heritage Property Act*. With respect to the Victoria Park Heritage Conservation District, only those designated properties that were built before 1965 are eligible. In determining the date when properties were built, the City uses the dates provided in the Assessment and Taxation records.
5.1.2 Owners that have property taxes or other charges past due to the City of Regina are not eligible.

5.1.3 Eligible work carried out up to a year prior to the application deadline may be considered for Incentives.

5.1.4 Where a development is also eligible for tax exemption under the Housing Incentives Policy, the full benefit under both policies may be provided. The Heritage Incentives Policy will be provided first unless otherwise approved by the Executive Director.

5.1.5 Incentives provided under this policy may be stacked with incentives offered by the Municipal, Provincial and Federal Governments.

5.2 Types of Incentives

Eligible properties may access the following incentives under this Policy, subject to the approval of Council:

5.2.1 Designated Heritage Properties are eligible for Tax Exemptions, Maintenance Grants and Major Grants as further described in 5.3 and 5.4.

5.2.2 Heritage Inventory Properties are eligible for Maintenance Grants and Major Grants as further described in 5.4.

5.3 Calculation of Tax Exemption

5.3.1 A property tax exemption may be provided to taxable Designated Heritage Properties equivalent to 50 per cent of eligible conservation work costs to a maximum of 10 years of exemption.

5.3.2 The amount of the property tax exemption, including calculation of any percentage or portion and the determination of any use or cost, shall be conclusively determined by the City Assessor. The amount shall only apply to the portion of the property containing the building, structure, or landscape with heritage value pursuant to The Heritage Property Act.

5.3.3 Notwithstanding subsection 5.3.1, The Education Property Tax Act, contains provisions which require Provincial approval to exempt the education portion of the property taxes where the value of the educational tax is equal or greater than $25,000 in a single year. If this approval is not granted, the exemption will cover the municipal and library portions of the taxes only.

5.3.4 The tax exemption does not apply to local improvement fees, business improvement fees, and the non-exempt portion of taxes (i.e. laneway improvements) and other charges to tax accounts; these must be paid during the term of the agreement in the year in which they are due. No abatement of outstanding or current taxes will be negotiated.

5.4 Calculation of Grants

5.4.1 Designated Heritage Properties can access:
- Maintenance Grants equivalent to 50 per cent of eligible maintenance costs, to a maximum grant amount of $5,000
• Major Grants equivalent to 50 per cent of eligible conservation work costs to a maximum of $50,000. Amounts larger than $50,000 may be recommended by the Incentive Review Panel, subject to the availability of funds, when financial need and the importance of the investment to Regina’s heritage portfolio can be demonstrated.

5.2.2 Heritage Inventory Properties can access
• Maintenance Grants equivalent to 50% per cent of eligible maintenance costs, to a maximum grant amount of $2,500.
• Major Grants equivalent to 25% of eligible conservation work costs to a maximum grant amount of $50,000.

5.5 Combination of Incentives.

5.5.1 Owners of eligible properties may apply for both tax exemptions and Major Grant if the combined value of the incentives does not exceed 50% of eligible conservation work costs. Approval is subject to the review and recommendations of the Incentive Review Panel, availability of funds and approval of City Council.

5.6 Consideration of Incentives Outside the Application Process

5.6.1 When Council is considering designation of a property without the owner’s consent, or issuance of a repair order for a property that is already designated, the Incentive Review Panel may prepare a recommendation for Administration to bring forward to Council on incentives that would support viable conservation.

The Panel’s assessment will consider:
• the premium costs of heritage conservation and retention that cannot be recouped through sale, lease, or rental revenue
• history of investment in repair and maintenance of the property
• the importance of the investment to Regina’s heritage portfolio
• the public benefit of conservation, including the level of public visibility or access to the heritage property
• The impact on the Heritage Fund and future funding cycles.

5.6.2 In the absence of an application, the Panel will have access to any relevant information submitted to the City by the owner as well as any additional reviews undertaken by the City including third-party condition assessment and opinion of costs.

5.6.3 Incentives require Council approval and are subject to agreement with the property owner.

5.7 Exemption and Grant Agreement

The property tax exemption or cash grant will be subject to an agreement between the City of Regina and the property owner(s). The term of the agreement will be dictated by the number of years it will take to complete the work in addition to the term of the exemption.

5.7.1 The expiry date for the agreement may be extended by one year at the sole discretion of the Executive Director to accommodate unanticipated construction delays.
5.7.2 The applicant is required to notify the Social and Cultural Development Branch of the City of Regina when the project work is complete. A representative of the Branch will inspect the project to verify its completion.

5.7.3 The agreement may be assigned to a new owner at the sole discretion of the Executive Director. An assignment agreement will be required.

5.7.4 Owners of designated heritage properties are required to ensure ongoing maintenance and conservation of the property.

5.7.5 Incentives will only be provided after confirmation of eligible conservation or maintenance work is done and the required documents are submitted.

5.8 Eligible Conservation Work

5.8.1 Eligible conservation work must be specifically aimed at extending the life and increasing the heritage value of designated property. The conservation work must also be in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. The following work is eligible:

- Conservation Plans and other research and documentation.
- Accessibility upgrades
- Building Permit Fees
- Qualified architectural or professional engineering and consulting services
- Conservation of exterior character-defining elements or significant landscape elements.
- Conservation of significant or rare character-defining interiors or interior elements as noted in the designating bylaw.
- Structural stabilization.
- Improvements required to meet National Building Code (NBC) or City of Regina bylaw requirements, including the repair or upgrading of mechanical and electrical systems.
- Improvements to energy efficiency (e.g. insulation, windows, furnace).

5.8.2 The conservation of exterior character-defining elements may include the cleaning of surfaces, removal of unsympathetic materials and painting associated with the replacement of these elements.

5.8.3 Cosmetic improvements, tenant improvements and new additions are NOT eligible.

5.9 Eligible Maintenance Work

5.9.1 Eligible maintenance work must be aimed at slowing the deterioration of a designated or inventory property. The following work is eligible:

- Non-destructive cleaning
- Minor repair
- Refinishing operations
5.10 Application Requirements

5.10.1 Application packages must include the following general information:

a. Completed Application Form
b. Statement of Significance
c. Description of the proposed use of the building(s) and property (if different from current use)
d. Detailed description of the proposed work
e. Rationale for proposed work and current photos
f. Explanation of financial need including identification of any premium costs associated with conservation of the property.
g. Assessment of how the proposed work aligns with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada and rationale for any areas where proposed work may not align with the Standards & Guidelines.
h. Any additional archival photographs and historical documentation
i. Construction schedule with estimated start and completion dates

5.10.2 In cases where the value of the requested incentive is greater than $200,000 applicants must provide the following further information in addition to the general information required above:

5.10.2.1 A development pro forma that provides detailed costs, budget, cash flow and future anticipated revenue if applicable. The pro forma should include financing details, two estimates for materials and labour, leasing specifications, project soft costs and hard costs, operating statement and an explanation of how the exemption will affect the financial viability of the project

5.10.3 In cases where the value of the incentive is less than $200,000 applicants must provide the following further information in addition to the general information required above:

5.10.3.1 The application must include two estimates for all work to be done or project costs based on the assessment of a qualified architect or professional engineer or qualified quantity surveyor.

5.10.4 In addition to these requirements, the City may require additional historic research, engineering, or other studies in support of the application.

5.11 Application Review and Approval Process

5.11.1 Complete, eligible applications will be reviewed by an Incentive Review Panel comprised of heritage experts and other community stakeholders. The panel will make recommendations for grant and tax exemption incentives to Administration. These recommendations require Council approval.

5.11.2 The Panel will assess incentive applications based on:

- Importance of the investment to the heritage value of the property which may include investments that improve financial viability of conservation over the long term.
- Urgency of the investment; e.g. where the integrity of the heritage property may be at risk if the work does not proceed
• Public benefit of the investment, including the level of public visibility or access to the heritage property.

5.11.3 To the extent possible the Panel’s recommendations will represent a variety of projects and property types. When applications for grants exceed the funding available, those projects that demonstrate financial need and that cannot benefit from tax exemptions or for which tax exemptions would provide minimal value will be prioritized for grant funding.

5.11.4 The Panel may choose not to recommend investment of the full Heritage Fund budget in a given year provided clear rationale is provided for that recommendation.

5.11.5 If the property is not designated, an application for designation and an application for an incentive may be submitted at the same time. Consideration of the designation application may occur concurrently with the incentive application. Both designation and Incentives application require Council approval.

5.11.6 If approved by City Council, the incentive will be provided in accordance with a formal agreement between the City and the subject property owner(s). Agreements will be authorized by City Council’s passage of an enabling bylaw.

6.0 Roles & Responsibilities

The Executive Director, or their delegate, in their sole discretion conclusively determines compliance with the eligibility criteria for tax exemptions and grants under this policy. Council approval of all tax exemptions and grants under this Policy is required through the passing of a bylaw. The Executive Director is authorized to finalize and approve the terms of any agreements entered into pursuant to this policy, and the City Clerk is authorized to execute the agreements after review and approval by the City Solicitor.

7.0 Related Forms

Application for incentives under this policy should be made using the Heritage Incentives Application Form.

8.0 Revision History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
<th>(Re)-Approval Required (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug-2014</td>
<td>Increase in length of property tax exemption to 10 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase cash grants for tax exempt properties to $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

This report will assist the City of Regina in the utilization of realistic and effective heritage incentives, regulations and procedures that will promote the conservation of historic resources throughout the community. A broad range of incentive and regulation-based heritage tools will form an important step in the proactive management of the City’s significant resources, as administered through the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program (HBRP).

Heritage can be defined as anything of a physical, cultural or social nature that is unique to, and valued by, a community, and can be passed from generation to generation. Heritage is important for a number of reasons. Each municipality’s heritage is distinctive, and therefore can help instill a sense of community identity and resident pride. It promotes a sense of continuity for residents and an understanding of where we have been and where we are today. As such, key resources should be conserved for future generations to enjoy and benefit from. Heritage conservation is also important economically; it can increase property value and provide opportunities for business, property owners and tourism.

The value of conserving heritage properties is not always immediately recognized, especially if there are perceived financial benefits from demolition and/or redevelopment. Municipal heritage programs should balance regulations and incentives, based on owner cooperation; in virtually all cases, heritage protection is achieved on a voluntary basis. Where there are external pressures threatening heritage assets, it has been recognized that more effective conservation will be achieved through incentives rather than by stringent regulation.

Compensation may be required for loss of economic value when continuing protection is enacted; in lieu of compensation, an incentives package that is acceptable to the property owner can be offered. This is the primary means by which continuing protection is secured for heritage sites. Incentives also help ensure long-term conservation, by ensuring that each project is, and remains, financially viable.

It is in the best interest of both the public and the municipality to avoid the stigma of “unfriendly designation” and the negative impacts (financial and otherwise) that accompany the use of rigid controls to conserve heritage sites. An extreme example of an unfriendly designation occurred in Victoria when the City designated the interior of the Rogers’ Chocolates building against the wishes of the owner; an arbitration ruling found the City liable for substantial compensation and legal costs. This illustrates the reluctance of municipalities to enact any form of protection against an owner’s wishes.

Instead, incentives-based, voluntary and cooperative Heritage Programs are best practice. If possible, regulations should not be forcibly imposed on owners; rather, heritage projects should be approached in a way that will ensure there are benefits for the applicant. This approach is supported by offering incentives that result in renewed investment in heritage properties, plus satisfaction and benefits on all sides.

In order to conserve significant heritage sites for future generations, the City will need to work cooperatively with owners to achieve the public goal of heritage conservation. As outlined in this report, there are a number of procedures, techniques and tools available to achieve this overall goal.
2. BENEFITS OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Heritage conservation has many potential cultural, social and economic benefits. Conserving and celebrating a community’s heritage allows it to retain and convey a sense of its history and provides aesthetic enrichment as well as educational opportunities. Heritage resources help us understand where we have come from so that we can appreciate the continuity in our community from past to present to future. Historic sites become physical landmarks and touchstones, and many other intangible heritage features - such as traditions, events and personal histories - add to the City’s vibrancy and character. This broad range of heritage resources represents a legacy that weaves a rich and unique community tapestry.

Cultural and heritage-based tourism, including visits to historic sites, is among the fastest growing segments of the overall tourism industry. Other benefits of strong heritage policies include maintaining distinctive neighbourhoods, conserving cultural heritage, strengthening community identity and promoting civic pride. Heritage conservation is also inherently sustainable and supports initiatives such as landfill reduction and conservation of embodied energy. It reinvests in existing infrastructure and promotes avoided impacts through reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These are all important considerations in the long-term management of our built environment.

The benefits of a well-managed heritage conservation program include:

- retention of unique community heritage
- celebrations of historical events and traditions
- partnership opportunities with senior levels of government
- engagement of the broader community including the private and volunteer sectors
- conservation of a broad range of historical sites that supports other public objectives, such as tourism development and education
- flexible heritage planning that assists private owners in retaining historic resources
- investment in heritage sites through community partnerships
- generation of employment opportunities and other economic benefits
- linkages with goals for greener community development and sustainability initiatives

Heritage initiatives provide many tangible and intangible benefits and have a strong positive impact on the development of a complete community and the emergence of a vibrant culture of creativity and innovation. There is, however, a widely-held perception that protecting heritage property reduces property values or inhibits development. Studies have shown that this is not so; Professor Robert Shipley of the University of Waterloo looked at almost 3,000 properties in 24 communities across Ontario between 1998 and 2000. His study concluded that heritage designation could not be shown to have a negative impact on property values.

In fact, there appears to be a distinct and generally robust market in protected heritage properties. Generally, these properties perform well, with the majority of them maintaining their value at average or better than average market value. The rate of sale among designated properties is also as good, or better than, average market trends. Moreover, the values of heritage properties tend to be resistant to downturns in the general market.

The Vancouver Heritage Foundation undertook a research project to determine whether there were positive or negative impacts to heritage designation, through a comparison of the assessed values of heritage and non-heritage properties in four Vancouver neighbourhoods (Strathcona, Kitsilano, Mount Pleasant and Hastings Sunrise). The study found that between 1999 and 2005, Heritage Register and designated heritage houses increased in value by 42%, while non-heritage houses increased in value at a slightly lower rate of 39%.
The Victoria Heritage Foundation tracked the market values and assessments of 142 heritage houses designated prior to 1988. Between 1988 and 1999 the tax assessments for these individual designated (and well-maintained) heritage houses increased at a rate 26% higher than the average tax assessments for residences throughout the City. This resulted in an increased tax return to the City as a result of the heritage incentives that were provided.

The experience of these two heritage foundations indicates that when incentives are available, the property values of heritage houses rise at a higher rate than normal building stock, therefore providing higher assessments and ultimately increased property taxes. This is a desirable outcome for the municipality, which reaps the downstream benefits of this investment in heritage conservation. The same is true for tax incentives, which can be used to stimulate investment in under-utilized properties that will ultimately pay higher property taxes. Heritage conservation initiatives provide stability in the marketplace and helps protect property values. This is especially true when conservation incentives are offered, creating a category of prestigious properties that are highly valued in the marketplace.

In general, heritage incentives leverage many times their original value in owner investment, construction and job creation. In addition to being a sound community investment, they are a sound financial investment for the City.
3. BEST PRACTICES

3.1 Global Heritage Conservation
Examples of the best practices for heritage conservation can be found across the world in various principles and charters and throughout the initiatives of many different levels of authority. Similar to other cultural sector activities, heritage conservation follows a tiered organizational system, beginning at the global scale; UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) and ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) provide the fundamental standards of heritage conservation, which are intended for adoption by individual countries. Canada is a signatory state to these protocols. According to UNESCO, there are a number of measures that governing bodies can undertake in order to ensure that the conservation of heritage sites, which contribute to authentic local identity, is incorporated into legislation:

- All official plans must provide for heritage conservation.
- Every government should empower an entity to advise it on endangered heritage property.
- Heritage protection should be binding on government agencies.
- Public agencies should orient their construction policies to renovating space in old buildings.
- Cultural Landscapes should be subject to protection.
- The areas around historic places should be subject to rules ensuring harmonization.
- Groups of modest buildings that are collectively of cultural value should be protected even if no individual one is noteworthy.
- There may be a quid pro quo for designation.
- Any policy for protection must be accompanied by a policy for revitalization.
- Owners of historic places should be encouraged by means of tax incentives.
- Governments should establish either special subsidies or a national conservation fund outside the normal budgetary process.
- Governments should make grants, subsidies, or loans available to municipalities, institutions, and owners to bring the use of historic places up to contemporary standards.
- A system should be established with public and private sector participation to provide rehabilitation loans with low interest and/or long repayment schedules.
- Rehabilitation projects should observe modern safety standards, but when building and fire codes interfere with conservation, alternate compliance should be considered.

3.2 The Canadian Context
Canada has had a rich history of heritage conservation, despite its relatively young age. The heritage movement in Canada began prior to the advent of World War One, out of the concern for the condition, and future, of some of the country’s earliest buildings. In 1919, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada was established. The development of the *Historic Sites and Monuments Act* followed in 1953. The Act was the first federal legislation created to allow the national designation of Canadian buildings, however, the Act, although supporting research and recognition of historic resources in Canada, does not provide any legal protection to heritage sites.

Modern Canadian heritage planning is based on two primary tools: the Canadian Register of Historic Places and the Parks Canada *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*, both of which were originally developed under the Canadian Historic Places Initiative (HPI). Started in 2001, the HPI was formed through intergovernmental collaboration (between municipal, provincial, territorial, and federal levels of government) in order to establish a pan-Canadian culture of conservation. The Statement of Significance (SOS) tool, implemented as part of the HPI, remains the primary method of conveying the heritage value of Canadian historic sites across the country. Though the third tier of the HPI, the certification program for incentives, was never fully enacted, the *Standards and Guidelines* and Statement of Significance documentation remain Canadian best practice.
3.3 The Provincial Context

When the Cities Act came into force in January 2003, all cities in Saskatchewan were granted the option to operate either under the Cities Act or under the Urban Municipalities Act; all cities opted to operate under the former rather than the latter. This Act, Chapter C-11.1 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, provides the broad framework of governance for the City of Regina, but does not specifically mention the management of heritage sites.

Authority for the management of heritage sites is enabled under The Heritage Property Act. This Act grants municipalities the authority to provide tax relief or other incentives to heritage properties. The Act also enables, but does not compel, the City to appoint a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC). The Act states that Council should consult with the MHAC, if one has been established, prior to designating a property or demolishing a designated property.

The Saskatchewan Heritage Conservation Branch is the steward of many diverse historic resources throughout the province. The Built Heritage Management Unit focuses on provincial heritage property designation and alteration review and approvals, municipal heritage property advisory and registry services, community engagement to build local heritage conservation and management capacity and managing the Saskatchewan Register of Heritage Property. The Archaeological Resource Management Unit focuses on land and resource development review, impact assessment and mitigation, investigation permitting, managing the Saskatchewan Archaeological Site Inventory, and geographic place naming. In addition, the Heritage Conservation Branch is responsible for providing administrative and technical support to the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation and its various standing committees, including the Saskatchewan Heritage Advisory Committee, the Saskatchewan Heritage Property Review Committee, and the Saskatchewan Geographic Names Committee.

3.4 Municipal Heritage Programs

Though no one municipal program is perfectly comparable to the Regina context, there are components of a variety of programs, which have been studied by both the consultant team and City Staff, that can be used to inform and improve Regina’s Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program.

The City of Saskatoon’s municipal heritage program offers a somewhat direct comparison to Regina.

- **Register of Historic Places**: created in 2014, but with roots in the 2004 Built Heritage Database, the register is a collection of historic resources that are recognized and protected at the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal level, and additionally contains recognized, but non-designated sites; the three-part Statements of Significance for each site are available online on the City’s website; nearly 200 sites are included on the register

- **Planning and Regulatory Tools**: include the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, which works on behalf of City Council in reviewing any changes to criteria to the evaluation of resources, and additionally reports to Council matters of heritage via the Planning and Operations Committee; Bylaw No. 6770, passed in 1987, and more commonly known as the Holding Bylaw, prevents demolition of listed properties in the bylaw for 60-days following the initial application of the demolition permit; the City’s Heritage Coordinator promotes the implementation of heritage strategies based on the Heritage Policy and Program Review; the Civic Heritage Policy of 2014 helped broaden the role of the municipality in the conservation of the historic resources in the city by instituting definitions of heritage and policy direction; it was further augmented by the Saskatoon Heritage Plan, providing a long-range plan and support mechanisms for conservation

- **Incentives**: are available both financially and non-financially; in cases where conservation interventions are expected to result in an increase in property taxes, property tax abatements are covered up to 50% of the costs of the project (up to a maximum of $150,000); when property taxes are not expected to increase, or for tax-exempt properties, grants covering up to 50% of conservation work (up to maximum of $150,000, or $75,000 for tax-exempt
properties) are available; additionally, the City provides maintenance grants and permit refunds (up to 50% of fees related to eligible project costs for designated properties), and will also support owners of historic resources through the offering of alternative building code compliance mechanisms, as well as the potential rezoning for adaptive reuse; for commercial properties located within Business Improvement Zones, Façade Conservation & Enhancement Grants are also available.

The City of Calgary has a comprehensive heritage program with a focus on the identification, evaluation, and awareness of heritage sites, demonstrated by the breadth of sites on the Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources, the public availability of information pertaining to evaluated resources, and the biannual municipal heritage awards. Recently, the City has embarked on a number of conservation projects on publicly owned resources, setting a precedent for future conservation endeavours in the city.

- **Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources**: is a list of sites that have been evaluated by municipal heritage planners, community members, and/or consultants; the Inventory contains more than 800 resources, though sites that have been demolished are kept as active entries on the list; the City has instituted a values-based, non-numerical custom-evaluation form, which includes a Statement of Significance and a Statement of Integrity
- **Planning and Regulatory Tools**: the City is guided by the 2008 long-range planning report, the Calgary Heritage Strategy; the Strategy provides recommendations on incentives and processes for the municipal heritage planners and administration
- **Incentives**: for Municipal Historic Resources, the City provides grants for conservation projects up to 50% of the costs (up to a maximum of 15% of the assessed property value); these grants are only available for an individual property every 15 years; municipally designated sites are eligible for a cost share grant through the provincial Heritage Preservation Partnership Program

The City of Edmonton has a robust heritage program with an emphasis on predictability and marketability, offering sustainable and attractive incentives to its citizenry to encourage conservation, including:

- **Heritage Register**: provides valuable information on each building, including date of construction, architect, owner, etc.; more than 700 properties are listed, including more than 100 that have been designated
- **Planning Tools**: the City of Edmonton incorporates heritage conservation into its overall planning framework; it has also developed several plans and policies to manage heritage sites and development growth directly, including; Historical Resources Management Plan; City Policy C-450B: A Policy to Encourage the Designation and Rehabilitation of Historic Resources in Edmonton; The Art of Living: a plan for securing the future of arts and heritage in the City of Edmonton; and The Way We Grow, a development plan
- **Incentives**: include a fund to provide financial compensation for the designation of Municipal Historic Resources and the continued, long-term maintenance of designated resources; direct grants; property tax rebates; and non-monetary incentives

The City of Vancouver Heritage Conservation Program boasts a diverse program that offers a wide range of management tools and conservation incentives, including:

- **Heritage Register**: more than 2,200 sites are listed, including buildings, structures, streetscapes, landscape resources and archaeological sites
- **Neighbourhood Planning**: incorporates heritage zoning districts, zoning guidelines, and community planning projects
- **Protection Measures**: include legal designation; changes to designated heritage sites administered only through Heritage Alteration Permits
Incentives: include a new program with an expanded budget, as well as individual application streams, such as the Transfer of Density program; the Heritage Building Revitalization Program; and Heritage Revitalization Agreements

The Vancouver Heritage Foundation (VHF): manages a recently expanded granting program geared towards residential properties and provides a wide variety of programming focused on heritage awareness and education

The City of Victoria offers a marketable and predictable program, which encourages active participation and buy-in from Victoria residents. The salient program components include:

- Planning and Regulatory Tools: including the Heritage Register (listing approximately 1,100 historic sites); Heritage Inventory; use of Heritage Alteration Permits; Heritage Strategic Plan For The City of Victoria; the creation of 13 heritage conservation areas (HCA); and the Official Community Plan, which has adopted the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
- Incentives: including the House Grants Program; the Building Incentive Program; the Tax Incentive Program for Downtown Heritage Buildings; and the Illuminate Downtown Grant, offered by the Downtown Victoria Business Association
- Education: heritage conservation is promoted through various organizations across the city including the Victoria Heritage Foundation, the Victoria Civic Heritage Trust, the Hallmark Society, the Victoria Historical Society, and the Old Cemeteries Society; as well as the publication of This Old House: Victoria’s Heritage Neighbourhoods

The City of Toronto offers a predictable, diverse, and marketable heritage program with a focus on neighbourhood character and the creation of sustainable heritage conservation districts. Tools include:

- Heritage Conservation Districts: HCDs allow City Council to administer guidelines designed to protect and enhance the special character of groups of properties in an area; the character is established by the overall heritage quality of buildings, streets and open spaces as seen together; Toronto has sixteen Heritage Conservation Districts
- Heritage listing: there are approximately 9,000 properties identified, including 4,500 that have been designated
- Heritage Easement Agreements: identifies elements of a building which are to be retained in perpetuity and may also set out permitted alterations and development.
- Financial Incentives: including the Toronto Heritage Grant Program and the Heritage Property Tax Rebate Program

The City of Montreal offers a very diverse program, due to its broad definition of ‘heritage’ and its focus on intangible heritage, in particular. The most significant components of the Montreal program include:

- Planning and Regulatory Tools: surround Tangible Cultural Heritage (including public art, archaeological heritage, archival heritage, and built heritage); Moveable Heritage (including artistic, archaeological, documentary, ethno-historical and scientific collections – as well as landscaped heritage); Intangible Cultural Heritage (including traditions, arts, knowledge, and memory – also referred to as ‘living heritage’)
- Incentives: include restoration education, grants, home ownership assistance, and minimum maintenance standards (which are provincially mandated, defining the failure to adequately maintain a designated heritage property as an ‘offence’)
- Education Tools: Urban Heritage Interactive Publications, which provide tools, tips, and strategies to help owners take care of Montreal’s Urban Heritage

After reviewing these municipal heritage programs across Canada, certain heritage planning practices were analyzed for their potential applicability to the City of Regina. Although they respond to many different factors including different legal frameworks, these municipal programs provide lessons and
aspirational examples of potential policy directions for Regina. In general, the most successful municipal heritage programs include several key elements related to incentives:

- **Predictability**: successful programs have proven to be reliable, sustainable, and predictable over time. In order for the program to be effective, applicants need to trust that the incentives and tools on offer will remain available and constant through the duration of their project, and beyond.

- **Diversity**: a combination of incentives (both financial and non-financial), planning and regulatory tools, and public education should be available in order to engage the greatest number of users and protect the most historic places.

- **Versatility**: due to the ever-changing and evolving nature of heritage conservation, as well as the broadening definition of what constitutes an 'historic place', a successful program must be adaptable. Programs are considered versatile when they offer applicable and desirable incentives and recognition tools for a wide range of sites, as well as remaining flexible regarding emerging technologies, conservation techniques, program information management, and education and awareness initiatives.

- **Marketability**: the components of a heritage conservation program must be relevant and desirable to the local community; for example, over-size and out-of-scale infill or additions may not be appropriate in sensitive heritage areas. A heritage conservation program should be tailored to the local context, recognizing development and market trends and responding to the changing needs of communities.
4. PROGRAM VISION AND GOALS

4.1 A Renewed Vision for the HBRP
Building upon the many years of heritage planning initiatives in Regina, a renewed vision for the HBRP seeks to encourage better heritage conservation outcomes throughout the community.

_The City of Regina Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program will provide dependable and accessible incentives for a variety of heritage property types across the city. These incentives will foster a higher level of heritage conservation in the community, revitalize neighbourhood development, and raise awareness of the cultural importance of preserving our shared history._

4.2 HBRP Goals

**GOAL #1: INCREASE HERITAGE CONSERVATION EFFORTS**
Offer additional incentives that are predictable and consistent and that are most effective within the evolving market, for a variety of property types and owners. Update heritage policy to encourage meaningful conservation and the ongoing maintenance of heritage properties.

**Strategic Directions:**
- Remove policies and processes that may discourage heritage conservation.
- Stimulate the community’s interest in undertaking heritage conservation projects.
- Streamline the processing of heritage property applications (both incentives and permits).
- Encourage property owners to maintain their heritage properties.

**GOAL #2: SUPPORT NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER**
Target incentives toward historic places that support local identity. Ensure more sustainable neighbourhood development, while retaining historic places and valuable character-defining elements.

**Strategic Directions:**
- Integrate heritage conservation considerations into neighbourhood planning programs.
- Link HBRP to environmental, social, and economic sustainability initiatives.
- Enhance the viability of conserving heritage properties over time, despite ownership changes.

**GOAL #3: PROMOTE GREATER PUBLIC APPRECIATION OF HERITAGE PROPERTIES**
Promote enthusiasm and support for the celebration and protection of the city’s historic places. Demonstrate heritage leadership by linking program information to civic and partner campaigns designed to educate the public on the benefits of heritage conservation. Consider additional sites as heritage, including those with environmental or intangible cultural value.

**Strategic Directions:**
- Seek opportunities for heritage awareness and education campaigns and partner with organizations offering these programs.
- Improve access to information on heritage sites.
- Celebrate and highlight heritage designated sites.
5. PROGRAM REVIEW

Overview
The HBRP exists within the overall heritage planning framework in the City of Regina. As such, the program cannot be fully evaluated without understanding its relation to other heritage policies, procedures, and initiatives.

There are two primary categories of heritage properties in the City of Regina.

- **Heritage Inventory listed** properties have been identified as possessing heritage value and which have the potential to become designated.
- **Designated** heritage properties are legally protected against demolition or significant change under *The Heritage Property Act* of Saskatchewan. These properties are confirmed to have historical, cultural, or architectural significance. Approximately 100 properties have been designated in this manner.

Currently, the primary determinant of eligibility for HBRP incentives is the legal *designation* status of heritage property. In order to be considered for this status through an application process, a building must first be recognized as having heritage significance and this is an ongoing effort at the City. The City of Regina has been very effectively and methodically analyzing and documenting properties on its Heritage Inventory. This initiative will prove critical to increase the number of properties that may be eligible for heritage incentives, thereby increasing interest in a renewed HBRP. There is a potential to expand certain incentive eligibility to properties that are Heritage Inventory listed and not fully designated. Again, the City’s efforts to evaluate listed properties will prove valuable in this case.

The City has also recently completed its *Historic Context Statement* and *Thematic Framework*, two very important, best practice documents that help thread its individual historic sites together as part of a larger system of heritage properties across Regina. These documents will also assist the City in the future identification of potential heritage properties as neighbourhoods grow and mature. Other heritage planning program components have been studied and through discussions with various parties, the desired position and scope of the HBRP has been communicated.

5.1 Engagement Activities
A robust internal and external engagement process has taken place to ensure civic and community groups have been consulted on the program and its desired upgrades. The following collaborative engagement activities occurred as part of the HBRP review. The groups were selected to ensure the most appropriate cross-section of citizens were consulted regarding their experiences with heritage properties across the city.

- Workshop with City Staff: March 15, 2021
- Workshop with City Council: April 19, 2021
- Workshop with Heritage Regina: May 17, 2021
- Workshop with Heritage Property (both listed and designated) Owners: May 28, 2021
- Workshop with Real Estate Developers and Realtors: June 1, 2021

The workshops consisted of the following components:

*Part 1: Project Introduction and Heritage Conservation Best Practices*

The first part of the workshops introduced the overall project parameters and goals and provided an overview of global best practices regarding heritage conservation.
Part 2: SWOT Analysis
A review of the program’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats took place in Part 2 of the workshops. Participants were asked to consider past and current local heritage conservation efforts as direct input was provided during each session. Responses to each facet were documented and helped to steer the direction of the HBRP analysis and recommendations.

Part 3: Heritage Incentives Review
The next part of the workshop involved an overview of the different types of incentives that municipalities can offer, as well as some examples of specific incentives that are either already available or could be made available. Based upon experience in comparable communities, suggestions were offered regarding what is generally applicable and valuable to further explore.

Part 4: Maintenance Standards Review
A review of minimum maintenance standards that can be applied to municipally designated heritage buildings then took place.

Part 5: Questions
The final part of each workshop was left open for any remaining questions from participants.

Much of the workshop feedback included personal experiences and challenges with a variety of heritage property types across the city. The focus of the challenges was primarily the higher costs required to maintain and properly conserve heritage buildings. There were numerous questions about what the HBRP currently offers and which properties are eligible, as well as suggestions for improvement, such as the transparency and accessibility of this information.

In addition to the workshops, a webpage was established on the City’s primary engagement portal: Be Heard Regina. This consolidated information on the engagement process and included a public survey. Finally, feedback and commentary submitted directly to the City was accepted and considered.

5.2 Program SWOT Analysis
The feedback received throughout the engagement process formed the backbone of our program analysis and is organized into the following Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats.

Strengths
- There is a long history of municipal heritage planning in Regina.
- Commercial heritage property owners are taking advantage of property tax exemption incentive.
- Grants are working well, despite the fact there is only an approximately $30,000 annual budget allocation and they are only available to non-profit heritage building owners (generally churches).
- There is general public awareness of the two incentive categories (property tax exemption and grants) currently available.
- The number of heritage designated properties is increasing.
- The heritage site assessment process is robust and yielding greatly improved information.
- There is considerably more local interest in the overall heritage field in the last few years.
- The City has fostered a good working relationship and communicates regularly with Heritage Regina.
- City Council has been very approving of heritage incentive applications.
Weaknesses

- There is a lack of awareness in the community (both property owners and realtors) regarding the actual meaning of designation versus Inventory-listing and there are perceived extreme restrictions of designation.
- The lists of heritage properties (designated and Inventory) are not easily accessible.
- Not everybody understands the value of conserving heritage properties.
- There is a general viewpoint that “heritage” only encompasses “old” houses and does not include the wide variety of other heritage property types (commercial, institutional, multi-family, etc.).
- There is a lack of diversity within the types of incentives offered.
- There are no standards of maintenance for heritage properties, which can lead to unnecessary building demolitions due to neglect.
- The cost of producing necessary heritage documentation for incentive eligibility (namely Statements of Significance and Conservation Plans) can be difficult for certain property owners to afford.
- City Council must approve heritage incentive applications, adding work that may better be suited to either Staff or a heritage committee or board (which does not currently exist).
- Considerable Staff time is spent guiding applicants through the heritage approval process.

Opportunities

- Heritage could be better understood within the community as directly linked to environmental sustainability and neighbourhood vibrancy efforts.
- Community associations could be better integrated into the heritage planning and heritage site identification process.
- Eligibility for incentives could be expanded to include more ownership groups.
- Incentive offerings could be expanded to target additional heritage property types.
- Certain incentives could specifically target maintenance and repair work, as well as heritage documentation.
- A heritage committee or board could be formed to help oversee an expanded incentive program.
- Education and awareness campaigns can help raise public appreciation for heritage properties and heritage conservation throughout the city (and not just within heritage-concentrated neighbourhoods).
- Additional neighbourhoods have the potential to become Heritage Conservation Districts, which help brand areas as historically important on a citywide scale.
- New avenues of communication could be explored to help excite the public about the important and ongoing heritage assessment work underway within the City.
- There could be better access to heritage site and HBRP information on the City’s website.
- The heritage site plaque program could be restarted to recognize and draw attention to the importance of heritage conservation.
- There can be linkages to complementary initiatives, such as the Regina Cultural Trailway.
- High profile heritage projects can serve as examples of the public benefits of conservation (such as the Municipal Justice Building).

Threats

- The incentive program will be challenged to keep up with rising construction costs.
- The HBRP is competing with other budgetary considerations/demands and not everyone is supportive of spending public money on heritage conservation efforts.
- Designations may adversely impact certain property owners if they are not voluntary.
- The intensification levy creates a disincentive to increasing density on heritage lots, which may compromise the long-term viability of certain properties.
5.3 Internal Process Assessment
Working with City Staff, we have analyzed certain internal processes that may benefit from updates to further support the goal of conserving heritage properties throughout Regina. By addressing the following heritage planning protocols, the overall HBRP also stands to benefit from a more robust municipal response to enquiries and future permit applications.

5.3.1 Heritage Flagging System
The Heritage Inventory was established to manage municipally identified and recognized places of heritage value in the city; 290 properties were listed on the Inventory (previously known as the Heritage Holding Bylaw) in 1989 when it was adopted. This program predated Statements of Significance, which are now considered best practice for the recognition, planning, and management of historic places in Canada.

Currently, historic places listed on the City’s Heritage Inventory are tied to a flagging system that is triggered when land-use changes and development and building permits are submitted by an owner. If it is determined that the historic place may be immediately at-risk, the City can institute a 60-day hold to allow for discussions between the City and the applicant to mitigate irreversible interventions to the historic place. However, this process only acts as a layer of protection for sites already included on the City’s Heritage Inventory. Sites that may qualify for the Inventory, but have not yet been identified, may be at risk for demolition simply because they were not flagged. Though age is not the single most significant factor when considering the value of a place, it can be a useful metric for the City to flag potential heritage sites. Further to this, the City could institute a rule by which all buildings (whether Inventory-listed or not) over a certain number of years old (50 may be most appropriate) are automatically flagged in municipal property database systems for further research before any permit decisions are made. This would effectively be a new “demolition delay” tactic that will allow for the analysis of any building greater than 50 years old. The City can take one step further and mandate a formalized Heritage Assessment to be completed (by a qualified heritage professional) for any property over 100 years of age.

5.3.2 Neighbourhood Heritage Planning
As community planning updates occur throughout the city, there should be greater attention paid to potential heritage properties within these communities. A common tool utilized through these plans is a Places of Interest List (POIL), which is a listing of properties that have potential heritage value, but have not yet been recognized as part of the Heritage Inventory. These properties may be over a certain amount of years old, may possess unique/historic aesthetic features, or they may hold specific value to area residents; in any case a process to address these properties through ongoing planning updates should be instituted as an additional layer of heritage planning work that will help to identify valuable properties before they are lost to redevelopment. Additionally, the City could establish an online tool whereby the public can nominate sites to the Heritage Inventory. The portal could be relatively simple, asking nominators for an address, a photo (if possible), a reason for nomination, and any historic information that may be available. This portal could be available all year round and monitored by City Staff, or it could become available at a standard time each year.

5.3.3 Permit Application Review
Reactivating a Heritage Commission, as an advisory body, may help to reduce the burden of Council fully reviewing each heritage property permit application. This may also address the overheated publicity of certain applications since they would be reviewed through a more internalized method.
6. HERITAGE INCENTIVE OPTIONS

Overview
The most effective way to encourage heritage resource owners or potential owners to conserve and invest in the rehabilitation of their properties is by offering incentives. Incentives refer to programs or measures administered by the City or other community-based agencies to encourage the protection and retention of historic resources. Unlike regulatory measures, these tools usually offer something to the owner or developer in return for undertaking rehabilitation work or legal protection. Often, they work hand-in-hand with regulatory policies, in order to offer tangible advantages to heritage property owners. Examples of incentives include grant programs, tax incentives, technical assistance, or agreements that waive or vary standard requirements.

All heritage-listed properties could ultimately become eligible for incentives. A program of effective incentives appropriate to Regina should be created that will strategically encourage authentic conservation and rehabilitation, by encouraging owners to invest in their properties.

After a community decides to expand an incentives program to better encourage the retention, rehabilitation and protection of its heritage resources, there are a number of steps that should be taken in the program upgrade.

A community recognizes the benefits of support to owners of heritage properties when:

- The evolving needs of heritage property owners are identified.
- Support mechanisms are explored and the most appropriate methods are selected.
- The support program is designed, including eligibility criteria, program management, Staff coordination and budgeting. The incentive program may include a variety of components that provide both financial and non-financial support.
- The terms and conditions of receiving incentives are determined (such as the expected level of heritage fabric conservation) based on the owner applying accepted conservation best practices.
- The expanded incentive program is implemented, monitored, and modified periodically to respect the changing needs of property owners and the community.

The City of Regina should provide a broad range of conservation incentives to heritage property owners, including financial and non-financial (developmental and administrative) incentives. These incentives can be provided as an incentives package (including more than one type of incentive) that can be offered in exchange for conservation of the resource and legal protection.

6.1 Financial Incentives
Heritage conservation incentives can be provided through financial support. Each project needs to be individually assessed to determine which incentives may apply, as different levels of assistance may be required to ensure financial viability.

There are a number of financial incentives that the City offers to encourage heritage conservation. The current HBRP encompasses two types of financial incentives: (1) direct grants from the City; and (2) property tax exemptions. Other financial incentives that could be considered include reduced permit fees.

6.1.1 Direct Grants
One of the most motivating incentives, especially for homeowners, can be direct financial assistance. Even modest grants are sometimes extremely effective in promoting conservation
among residential heritage property owners. These are often only seed money or a show of support, rather than reflecting a large share of restoration costs. Grants sometimes “top up” a project so that the specific heritage character-defining elements (for example, porches) can be restored. Sometimes relatively small projects can have a dramatic impact on the appearance of a heritage building exterior (such as the opening of an unsympathetically enclosed verandah, heritage paint colours, or the re-installation of wooden windows and doors). The City of Regina currently offers, through a limited budget, direct grants for designated heritage properties, owned by the non-profit sector. The City could consider allocating an increased budget amount for heritage conservation grants that could be offered to additional ownership groups. A general funding rule, based upon the most successful municipal granting programs, is the allocation of one dollar per resident, per year. Funding a grant program at this level helps ensure the program is predictable and able to offer assistance to a wider variety of projects, on an ongoing basis.

Grants could be used for a variety of heritage conservation activities, including:

*Research and Documentation*
Before conservation work is undertaken, best practice necessitates proper research and documentation to understand a historic resource. Independent contractors are often best suited to undertake this work, yet it can be dauntingly expensive for property owners (especially homeowners) to commission. Grants could be offered to help offset some of these documentation costs, which will ultimately result in projects meeting a higher conservation standard.

*Maintenance and Repairs*
In order to encourage property owners to consistently maintain their heritage buildings, revolving maintenance grants can be offered that will cost-share these activities every so often.

*Physical conservation work*
The cost to perform conservation work (namely rehabilitation and restoration) on historic buildings can be cost-prohibitive without financial assistance. Grants can cost-share heritage conservation projects with property owners.

Additional considerations for an expanded grant program include the following.

*Grant Eligibility*
In order to help a greater number of property owners, grant eligibility could be expanded beyond the non-profit sector, which is the only group currently offered assistance. Grants would be especially useful for research and documentation activities, as well as ongoing maintenance; legal designation could be an expectation when outlaying larger sums of grant funding for physical conservation work. In general, there should be a contractual expectation that properties receiving financial assistance cannot be demolished or significantly altered for a certain period of time. This could range from 10 years for smaller documentation/maintenance grant amounts for Inventory properties, up to a much lengthier amount of time, which would be negotiated with designated property owners.

*Grant Applications*
City Staff currently administers grant applications and City Council is the approving body. This could continue, however the application process will need to adapt to the expected increase in the number and complexity of applications coming from an
expanded program. The preferred alternative to the current arrangement would refer the applications to a new Sector Reference Group. Grant applications for significant conservation work could include a new requirement for a proforma analysis, which would need to indicate the financial viability of these projects. Further study will be needed to confirm the viability criteria that should be included. Applications could also be expected to meet criteria which will help ensure the project meets heritage conservation best practice (Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada). Proposed upgrade projects or changes in use should also meet criteria to ensure they fit well within the neighbourhood. Independent structural reports may also be an appropriate requirement in certain cases.

Future Grant Program Administration
There are a number of municipalities that offer programs through municipally-funded foundations that provide direct financial assistance to the owners of residential heritage properties. In the future, the City may wish to consider the feasibility of establishing a similar heritage foundation, which could be charged with the administration of the grant program. A heritage foundation would also be able to actively fundraise (beyond the annual funding allocation from Council) to fulfill its mandate and establish an identity distinct from the municipal government. Matching funding could be sought through corporate sponsorship, private foundations and other sources. Potential steps in the establishment of a dedicated Heritage Foundation could include:

- **Step One:** Confirm feasibility of a Regina Heritage Foundation that would provide financial incentives for the conservation of heritage buildings.
- **Step Two:** Formally establish the Foundation through a resolution of Council.
- **Step Three:** Through Council, appoint a Board of Directors and identify an annual budget.
- **Step Four:** Initiate a Fund Development Program that could include building an endowment, planned giving, patronage (Honourary and Active), “Friends of the Heritage Foundation,” Corporate Sponsors, etc.

### 6.1.2 Property Tax Exemptions
Currently, if a property owner undertakes a rehabilitation of a heritage building, they usually encounter an increased property tax assessment due to an increase in market value. This, combined with the high cost of meeting building code requirements, can make the upgrade of heritage properties a marginal economic proposition.

Municipalities may choose to forgive all or part of the municipal portion of the property tax on a heritage property as long as the property is legally protected. In these cases, the tax relaxation may be calculated based on the extent and cost of the rehabilitation. The City of Regina currently offers a tax exemption over 10 years for 50% of eligible costs.

Experience in the United States has demonstrated that incentives tied to income tax are amongst the most effective mechanisms for the preservation of heritage buildings. In Canada, federal income tax incentives for conservation do not currently exist, but municipal tax-based heritage grants have been proven to be successful in many cities including Regina. This currently available incentive is generally most attractive to commercial heritage property owners as it helps offset operating costs. Residential heritage property owners do not typically find this existing incentive to be enticing enough to encourage capital-intensive conservation work, as it does not provide any funding up front when project costs are due.
6.1.3 Reduced Permit Fees
The City should review its current permit application procedures to ensure that there are no additional disincentives to proposed heritage conservation (including maintenance) projects. In addition, building permit fees could be waived for heritage property applications; this would not be a large incentive but would send a message of administrative support.

Additional funding assistance may be available from a wide variety of other government and private programs. Private foundations may also be willing to support local heritage conservation efforts.

6.2 Developmental Incentives
Heritage conservation incentives may also be provided through non-monetary support. In addition to the measures listed below, the City could examine heritage policies for their applicability to neighbourhood planning initiatives; integrating heritage conservation within community development goals will help ensure a more culturally and physically sustainable response to city building.

6.2.1 Relaxations/Variances
When approving heritage site permit applications, the City has discretionary powers and may relax some requirements, especially when other amenities are being offered. In return for the conservation/rehabilitation of a heritage building, the City may be able to relax requirements related to parking, setbacks and access. Similarly, some requirements could be relaxed in order to prevent conservation principles and guidelines from being compromised. One example would be a lot with an existing heritage home that is zoned for duplex use. In this case, an infill house could be built on the property instead, and perhaps a slight increase in allowable density could also be allowed. Each situation will be unique and will require special consideration. To date, there appears to be little community appetite for this type of incentive, however, it may become more valuable if attitudes change within certain mature neighbourhoods.

6.2.2 Density Bonusing and Transfers
A powerful heritage incentive that can be offered is the redistribution of density or an increase in allowable density. Sometimes there is an option to increase the allowable onsite density without compromising the context of the heritage building. In general, a 10% increase in allowable onsite density could be offered to designated properties in exchange for the long-term conservation of the heritage building. Larger properties may instead be eligible for subdivisions if additional dwelling units could comfortably and sensitively be added to the neighbourhood.

In other cases, a heritage building may be located on a property that has much higher development potential than currently occupied by the building, meaning that there is residual density that is not being utilized. In this situation, the residual density can be transferred or sold to another property, negating the need to achieve the allowable density onsite. In yet other cases, a conservation incentive – usually used to offset the costs of rehabilitation – may be offered through the creation of an additional bonus density that can be sold to a receiver site, with the resulting financial benefits being considered part of the incentives (compensation) package. Each of these situations require careful study of the potential impact on the heritage site, and an understanding of appropriate receiver sites for transferred density. This incentive has previously been studied and found not to be applicable to the existing context of the city. Again, it may prove to be more useful in the future.
6.3 Administrative Incentives
Incentives can also be provided indirectly to property owners, through the form of administrative protocols. Offering streamlined approval processing helps incentivize heritage projects and demonstrates civic leadership on the topic.

6.3.1 Permit Assistance
Streamlining the development and building permit application processes for heritage properties is a very desirable objective (also known as a “Green Door” policy). Heritage property owners will object to a complicated procedure if they are already concerned about costs. Heritage projects are sometimes more complex and can require additional review, therefore the permit review procedure could be simplified as much as possible. Pre-application meetings are a way for heritage property owners to ensure their application will be met with little resistance within the municipality.

6.3.2 Building Code Acceptable Alternative Solutions
Heritage buildings, as existing properties, often are unable to meet contemporary building code and energy efficient standards without seriously impacting their character-defining elements. Offering options for acceptable alternate solutions to building code compliance may help conserve their heritage character, while also meeting improved building standards. Education and training will need to be offered to the building inspection department since heritage buildings will usually have difficulty meeting all the provisions of existing codes, which have been written for new buildings. There is also an opportunity for the City to pay for a Code Consultant to work on behalf of designated property owners wishing to achieve acceptable alternate code compliance. This would help ensure that identified heritage features of designated properties are conserved, while also meeting present-day life safety objectives.

6.3.3 Heritage Support and Referral Programs
The municipality can provide additional support through:

- the provision of technical advice to heritage property owners regarding how best to conserve heritage buildings;
- referral to other agencies or organizations for further assistance; and
- publishing a list of recommended trades with expertise in heritage conservation.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Recommendations and Implementation Timeline
There will likely be a phased implementation of recommended procedures. Depending on timing, resources, and the levels of community interest and political will, these recommendations may be adapted and integrated into municipal processes as prioritized by Staff and City Council. These recommendations are based upon the results of the community consultation process and have been developed in collaboration with Staff to ensure Administration support.

A. Expanded Incentives: Grant Program
- Expand the HBRP incentive program’s annual budget: consider establishing a new “Heritage Fund” based upon $1 per resident, per year, with a cumulative/roll over provision that lets funds accumulate if budget is not exhausted each year

  **Eligibility and Requirements**
  - Since there will initially be a limited pool of funding to access, grant eligibility could either be:
    - Limited to already designated properties
    - Offered to inventory properties as well, but only in exchange for designation, or only offered at a rate of ~50% of funding otherwise available to designated properties
    - In cases where application demands exceed the available budget, designated properties should take precedence over inventory properties; merit and demonstrated need should also be considered in these situations
    - Retroactive approvals for incentives should not be encouraged, to ensure all applications meet the requirements of the renewed program

  - Permit direct grants to be used for physical upgrade work on all heritage property types and also for additional conservation activities, including research and documentation (Statements of Significance/Conservation Plans), as well as ongoing maintenance for all properties and accessibility upgrades for commercial properties; maintenance grants should be able to be accessed regularly (such as every other year, per property)

  - Require a proforma financial analysis (indicating the “heritage premium costs” and projected revenue, if applicable) to be included with applications for direct grants related to major conservation work

  - Further study of financial implications and the viability of upgrading and conserving heritage buildings would support considerations of the trade-offs between the value of conservation and the financial impact to the City/taxpayers and property owners; local case studies, including examples of commercial and single and multi-family residential projects that have benefitted from heritage conservation efforts could provide lessons learned

  - Independent structural reports should also be required for grants above a certain threshold or when Council is considering designating a property without the owner’s express consent

  **Program Considerations**
  - Administration, not Council, should be responsible for processing and approving grants, as the workload will greatly increase as part of an expanded program; ideally a Sector Reference Group should be established for this specific purpose

  - Grants should be targeted towards those properties otherwise unable to access other financial incentives, however there should be an ability to combine financial incentives when merit is demonstrated and overall program budgets allow

  - This new granting program should also be accessed when Council is considering designating a property without the owner’s express consent; economic viability should be reviewed and a financial incentive package should be offered to the owner, based upon the premium costs of heritage conservation and retention, over and above those that would be expected to be offset in sale proceeds for a fully re-developable parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Council, Administration: Finance and Legal</td>
<td>$250,000 annually; Staff time to intake applications/work with new Sector Reference Group</td>
<td>Wider variety of sites and activities eligible for financial assistance, leading to greater and more frequent conservation efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Information Accessibility and Transparency

- Expand information on the City’s heritage planning webpage to include an easily accessible list of heritage properties (as well as the clearly defined difference between being listed and designated); an introduction to the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada; as well as the promotion of the expanded granting program and application process/requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Administration: Communications</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Staff time to implement</td>
<td>Improved transparency and increased public awareness of civic heritage programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Improved Heritage Building Maintenance

- Establish a standards of maintenance bylaw to be applied to all heritage designated properties
- Require owners to agree to ongoing maintenance provisions when accessing grants/incentives
- Establish process to perform inspections to ensure properties are effectively being maintained; consider linking inspection requirements to interests of public safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Building and Legal</td>
<td>Staff time to implement and monitor</td>
<td>Improved condition of designated heritage buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Public Awareness and Education

- Collaborate with Heritage Regina to offer educational workshops and programming that will increase community knowledge regarding the importance of and benefits gained from heritage conservation/the HBRP; consider highlighting (in a public manner) successful heritage conservation projects; contribute to Heritage Regina’s Cultural Trailway initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Heritage Regina</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Staff time to monitor</td>
<td>Increased public awareness of HBRP and overall civic importance of heritage conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Ongoing Neighbourhood Heritage Planning

- Further integrate heritage planning into the neighbourhood planning process by requiring Inventory surveys and studies (specifically “Places of Interest Lists”) to occur in tandem with community plan updates
- Establish an online public nomination system, whereby members of the public can suggest additions to a Places of Interest List and/or information for local walking tours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Communications</td>
<td>Staff time to design, implement, and monitor</td>
<td>Increased number of sites important to the community considered for heritage status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Building Code Updates

- Work with City building inspectors (including education and training initiatives) to establish code equivalencies and exemptions for heritage buildings, as well as standards for energy conservation and other “green” building policies to link sustainability with heritage preservation; consider offering a new incentive to designated property owners in the form of paying for a Code Consultant to help owners achieve alternative code compliance in permit applications; look to the City of Saskatoon for guidance on alternative code compliance work within the provincial context
- Study how policies (including heritage and building/planning/development) can better integrate with overall civic sustainability/environmental goals, such as landfill diversion requirements that effectively discourage the disposal of historic materials in good condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Administration: Building</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Staff time to study and participate</td>
<td>Reduced conflicts between building codes and existing heritage building realities; increased green initiatives for existing buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Permit Application Processing
- Establish a formal process for pre-application meetings to align civic goals with owner plans, before accepting permit applications for changes proposed to heritage listed properties; offer a list of recommended local trades and professionals experienced in heritage conservation
- Make building permit fees for proposed work on heritage properties eligible for repayment as an incentive
- Consider a zoning bylaw amendment allowing for an increased number of units on designated residential lots in exchange for the long-term conservation of the heritage building; the number should correlate with the maximum allowed as if the lot was theoretically subdivided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Finance</td>
<td>Staff time to implement and administer</td>
<td>Streamlined permit application process for heritage properties, the removal of disincentives for conservation work, and further incentives for the conservation of designated properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Further Expansion of Targeted Incentives
- Evaluate how certain non-standardized property types (such as strata-titled and mixed-use properties) could be specifically targeted within the HBRP, as these properties may have difficulty qualifying for incentives based upon guidelines that may unintentionally favour single-owner and single-use residential or commercial or institutional properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Legal</td>
<td>Staff time to study</td>
<td>Additional site typologies supported by HBRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Heritage Commission
- Consider reactivating a Heritage Commission, which could advise Council on heritage property permit applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Staff time to liaise with Commission</td>
<td>Reduced burden on Staff to review heritage property permit applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Heritage Foundation
- Study the feasibility of establishing an arms-length Heritage Foundation, which could be responsible for distributing grant funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Council; Administration: Finance</td>
<td>Annual budget; Staff time to liaise with Foundation</td>
<td>Reduced burden on Staff to review grant applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. HBRP Evaluation and Future Expansion
- Survey the community in the future to determine how well expanded HBRP is working
- Survey residential owners within historic neighbourhoods in the future to gauge a change in appetite for developmental incentives (infill/duplex, etc.)
- Survey commercial property owners in the future to determine when market conditions may warrant another look at a potential bonus density program for heritage sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Communications</td>
<td>Staff time to design, implement, and analyze surveys</td>
<td>Opportunity to recalibrate and potentially further expand the HBRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Heritage Evaluation and Nomination Recommendations
In 2018, a comprehensive review of the City of Regina’s Heritage Evaluation Program was undertaken, which recommended a substantive, wholescale shift from the original additive system to a values-based system. Since then, the new evaluation tool has been used to assess and provide Statements of Significance for historic places already listed on the City’s Heritage Inventory. The current evaluation system has proven to be a vast improvement from the older, additive system. Sites are now considered through a broader lens of value. However, continuous use of the tool on a variety of heritage resources over the past three years has allowed for the determination of areas for improvement. The City can choose to maintain the status quo or can formally adopt the following measures, which would further strengthen the overall heritage program by ensuring it is on the leading edge of best evaluation practice. It is therefore recommended that the City:

- Institute a two-step evaluation approach:
  - Step 1: Conduct a Heritage Assessment on a potential Heritage Inventory site: if it does not qualify for addition to the Inventory stop here, if it does, proceed to Step 2
  - Step 2: Prepare a Statement of Significance and proceed with review and recommendation for addition to the Heritage Inventory to Council
- Remove the Grade 1/Grade 2 system, as it creates the unintended illusion that Grade 1 sites are inherently more valuable than Grade 2 sites
- Adopt a new Heritage Assessment Form (see Appendix B), which has removed the grading system and instead focuses on linking sites to historic themes as found in the Thematic Framework and Historical Context (which is considered best practice); sites linked to under-represented themes should potentially be considered a higher priority for conservation when questions arise regarding designation or demolition
- Adopt a new Statement of Significance Form (see Appendix B)
- Establish an online public nomination system, whereby members of the public can suggest additions to a Places of Interest List; the City should determine how information will be solicited, how nominations will be monitored, and how often nominations can occur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Administration: Planning</td>
<td>Administration: Communications</td>
<td>Staff time to review documentation and nominations</td>
<td>Alignment of evaluation process with global best practice; prioritization (and potential conservation) of under-represented sites in City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further details on the heritage evaluation and nomination process are found in Appendix B.
APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Character-Defining Elements: the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of a historic place, which must be retained in order to preserve its heritage value.

Conservation: all actions or processes that are aimed at safeguarding the character-defining elements of a cultural resource so as to retain its heritage value and extend its physical life. This may involve “Preservation,” “Rehabilitation,” “Restoration,” or a combination of these actions or processes. Reconstruction or reconstitution of a disappeared cultural resource is not considered conservation and is therefore not addressed in this document.

Guidelines: statements that provide practical guidance in applying the Standards for the Conservation of Historic Places. They are presented herein as recommended and non-recommended actions.

Heritage Value: the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present or future generations. The heritage value of a historic place is embodied in its character-defining materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings.

Historic Place: a structure, building, group of buildings, district, landscape, archaeological site or other place in Canada that has been formally recognized for its heritage value.

Intervention: any action, other than demolition or destruction, that results in a physical change to an element of a historic place.

Maintenance: routine, cyclical, non-destructive actions necessary to slow the deterioration of a historic place. It entails periodic inspection; routine, cyclical, non-destructive cleaning; minor repair and refinishing operations; replacement of damaged or deteriorated materials that are impractical to save.

Minimal Intervention: the approach that allows functional goals to be met with the least physical intervention.

Standards: Norms for the respectful conservation of historic places.
APPENDIX B: HERITAGE INVENTORY NOMINATION TOOL AND EVALUATION PROCESS STUDY

INTRODUCTION

In 2018, a comprehensive review of the City of Regina’s Heritage Evaluation Program was undertaken, which recommended a substantive, wholesale shift from the original additive system (established in the 1980s) to a values-based system. Since 2018, the new evaluation tool has been used to assess and provide Statements of Significance for historic places already listed on the City’s Heritage Inventory (formerly the Heritage Holding Bylaw). 2018-2021 acted as a trial period for the new evaluation system adopted in 2018; to date, 61 combined evaluations and Statements of Significance have been produced using the updated system. The current evaluation system has proven to be a vast improvement from the older, additive system. Sites are now considered through a broader lens of value. However, continuous use of the tool on a variety of heritage resources over the past three years has allowed for the determination of areas for improvement. In the following study, suggestions to improve the current process and its corresponding tools have been provided.
1. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NOMINATION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

1.1 ADOPT A TWO-STEP PROCESS UTILIZING HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS

Heritage Assessments are an important part of the heritage planning process. It is the process through which a place and its associated features and history are critically analyzed against an organized framework. Heritage Assessments involve collecting and analyzing information about a place, its history, and its alterations and changes over time. The purpose of the assessment is to make an informed judgment about a place, in order to make an informed decision about its future.

One common feature implemented by several well-functioning, values-based heritage evaluation systems from around was the preparation of an initial, well-researched Heritage Assessment, prior to establishing any official opinion about a potential historic resource. This process of conducting a Heritage Assessment prior to the preparation of a Statement of Significance (in a Canadian context) is critical. By definition, a Statement of Significance defines and codifies heritage significance, as outlined within the Heritage Value(s) and Character-Defining Elements sections of the document. Therefore, the preparation of a Statement of Significance should wait until the presence of heritage values and historical integrity has been determined. The decision on whether a site has sufficient significance (a combination of heritage value and integrity) to warrant the preparation of a Statement of Significance is an essential first step and should take the form of a Heritage Assessment.

If, through the Heritage Assessment process it is determined that the site does have sufficient heritage value and integrity to be included the Heritage Inventory, a Statement of Significance should be subsequently prepared and its nomination to the Heritage Inventory should be submitted along with the Statement of Significance for approval by the municipal governing body.

If, through the Heritage Assessment process it is determined that the subject site does not have sufficient heritage value and/or integrity to be included on the Heritage Inventory, it will not proceed to the next stage of the planning process, and a Statement of Significance will not be produced.

Assessments ensure that diverse values are considered and that results are as complete and unbiased as possible. A well-designed assessment is one that is replicable; another party should be able to conduct the same assessment and obtain the same (or similar) results. The higher the quality of the assessment design (in this case, the Heritage Assessment form), and its data collection methods and its data analysis, the more accurate its conclusions and the more confident the City and the public will be in its findings.

It is therefore recommended that the City of Regina:

- Adopt a two-step process whereby:
  - Step 1: Conduct a Heritage Assessment on a potential Heritage Inventory site, if it does not qualify for addition to the Heritage Inventory stop here, if it does, proceed to Step 2.
  - Step 2: Prepare a Statement of Significance and proceed with review and recommendation for addition to the Heritage Inventory.
1.2 NOMINATING SITES TO THE HERITAGE INVENTORY

The Heritage Inventory was established to manage municipally identified and recognized places of heritage value in the city; 290 properties were listed on the Inventory (previously known as the Heritage Holding Bylaw) in 1989 when it was adopted. This program predated Statements of Significance, which are now considered best practice for the recognition, planning, and management for historic places in Canada.

The City’s Heritage Inventory has remained relatively static for the past three decades, and while the existing Inventory is presently in the process of being re-assessed and brought to modern standards, the City can continue to solicit potential new additions. Potential Heritage Inventory sites can be identified several ways, including through neighbourhood planning processes; heritage survey processes; and a public nomination process.

Currently, historic places listed on the City’s Heritage Inventory are tied to a flagging system that is triggered when land-use changes and development and building permits are submitted by an owner. If it is determined that the historic place may be immediately at-risk, the City can institute a 60-day hold to allow for discussions between the City and the applicant to mitigate irreversible interventions to the historic place. However, this process only acts as a layer of protection for sites already included on the City’s Heritage Inventory. Sites that may qualify for the Inventory, but have not yet been identified, may be at risk for demolition simply because they were not flagged. Though age is not the most significant factor when considering the value of a place, it can be a useful metric for the City to flag potential heritage sites. Additionally, the City could establish an online tool whereby the public can nominate sites to a Places of Interest List, which could feed into considerations for the Heritage Inventory. The portal could be relatively simple, asking nominators for an address, a photo (if possible), a reason for nomination, and any historic information that may be available. This portal could be available all year round and monitored by City Staff, or it could become available at a standard time each year. A more robust flagging system and a public nomination process would both aid in the identification of potential historic resources to be added to the Heritage Inventory. Most importantly, the processes adopted by the City should be clear, consistent, and reliable.

The City could consider the following:

- Institute a flagging system through the building database whereby sites over the age of X # of years are automatically identified as requiring further analysis. When a permit or zoning change for a site over X # of years is submitted, a member of City Staff can conduct a Heritage Assessment (as outlined in the following pages) or hire a heritage professional to conduct the Assessment; and
- Institute a public nomination system for members of the public to nominate potential sites to a Places of Interest List.
- Institute policies for the survey and identification of potential historic places for possible inclusion to the Heritage Inventory as part of broader neighbourhood or area planning initiatives.

1.3 REMOVAL OF THE GRADING SYSTEM

Aside from instituting a two-step approach – Heritage Assessment before Statement of Significance – it is recommended that the City remove its current grading system entirely which presently classifies historic places as Grade 1 (City-wide significance) or Grade 2 (Neighbourhood-wide significance). Grading systems ultimately diminish historic places not in the highest tier and can create confusion among City officials, staff, and the public about their heritage values and expectation of conservation.

---

1 Requiring a place to be 40, 50, or 100 years old is an age metric used in multiple municipalities, though some use a specific year (e.g., 1970). This latter approach would require updating every few years to ensure it is capturing sites as they age. For example, if the threshold date is set at 1970, in five years it may be required to change this date to 1975, and so on. A sliding scale is therefore preferable. The age is best established through internal City discussions.
A Statement of Significance defines the value of a historic place and justifies its inclusion on a Heritage Value, and therefore, no additional ranking should be required.

Best practice for the evaluation of historic sites during the initial establishment of Regina’s heritage program was a system developed for Parks Canada by Harold Kalman in 1979. Sometimes called the ‘good-better-best’ method, it ranked places based on a set of criteria that are scored numerically. Sites that score higher cumulatively (the ‘churches, schools, and mansions’) are considered more important than representative and typical examples (worker’s housing’) or less aesthetically pleasing and somber sites (jails, asylums, industrial sites). Biases can result in skewed rankings, and numerical codification are difficult to change in the future. Municipalities and jurisdictions across the world have abandoned numerical ranking systems in favour of values-based assessment systems; in turn, ranking historic places in any way has is now generally considered regressive. Despite this, some authorities maintain a grading system which rate some places as ‘higher value’, notably in England (Grade I, II*, and II).

Based on the past three years of trial, utilizing the combination Evaluation and Statement of Significance forms, it has been determined that the grading system is not necessary, and may in fact be detrimental to places scored as Grade 2, even though they have still been determined to be significant historic places. An even ground for heritage places allows each place to be eligible for the same incentives and protections, while the subsequent Statement of Significance defines the unique values for each place.

It is therefore recommended that the City of Regina:
- Remove the grading system and, to that end;
- Adopt the Heritage Assessment Form and subsequent Statement of Significance Form provided at the end of this document.

1.4 LINK THE SYSTEM TO THE THEMATIC FRAMEWORK AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT
The Thematic Framework and Historical Context for the City of Regina was prepared in 2017. Such documents are important tools in defining the historical patterns and trends that produced individual properties and serve as the foundation for decisions about the identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment of historic properties. The report provides the basis for evaluating historic significance and integrity. It answers questions such as:
- What aspects of geography, history and culture shaped a community’s built environment?
- What property types were associated with those developments?
- Why those properties are important?
- What level of integrity is needed for them to qualify as historic resources?

The Thematic Framework and Historic Context are integral planning tools and use a set of interlocking themes based around activities rather than chronology, designed to facilitate a more inclusive approach to the identification of historic places. The intention for each section of the Thematic Framework was that sites would be interpreted from a range of different historical perspectives, including those of indigenous people, minorities and women, rather than just from the perspective of ‘great men and events.’ Frameworks were designed to allow more groups to be represented in the story of a place, and to decide how representative the range of managed historic sites is.

One of the aims of the report was to connect historic sites to broader historic stories, so it would be clear which stories were being told or neglected through the management and interpretation of historic sites. The Framework should cover all aspects of the surviving material heritage and help in prioritizing the heritage items to be conserved. A Thematic Framework should not be an exclusive tool but should be used in conjunction with evaluation of factors such as the aspects of history represented by a site; the physical integrity of the fabric in question; and the contemporary cultural value placed on the site.
by members of communities. Therefore, Thematic Frameworks should be integrated into existing evaluation tools.

The Thematic Framework and Historical Context for Regina helps to further connect the City to a values-based approach to heritage planning and conservation. Divided into five broad Canadian themes, broken into 23 Regina themes, and narrowed further into 40 subthemes, the document provides a means to organize and define historical events, to identify representative historic places, and to place sites, persons and events in an overall, citywide context. It recognizes a broad range of values under which themes can be articulated and has assisted in the development of criteria for the evaluation of sites considered for addition to the Heritage Inventory. Further, it provides a basis for the review of sites already listed on the Inventory and strengthens the reasons for their inclusion.

It is therefore recommended that the City of Regina:
- Continue to link the Thematic Framework to the evaluation tools, and, to that end;
- Adopt the Heritage Assessment Form and subsequent Statement of Significance Form provided at the end of this document.
2. PROPOSED NOMINATION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

As outlined above, the proposed Heritage Assessment tool for the City of Regina will be comprised of a comprehensive framework; the process of completing the document, which will require research and a site visit, will lead the evaluator to determine if the site is eligible for inclusion on the Heritage Inventory. Only those sites that receive a ‘Yes’ in Section 7 (Final Evaluation) of the Heritage Assessment form will go on to have a Statement of Significance prepared and be recommended for inclusion on the Inventory. Historic places will no longer be graded.

ELIGIBILITY
For a place to be considered eligible for the City of Regina’s Heritage Inventory:

- It must be at least 20 years old;
- It must be a building, cultural landscape, and/or engineering work; and
- It must receive a ‘Yes’ in Section 7 (Final Evaluation) of the Heritage Assessment form.

*Note: These eligibility requirements exclude places such as archaeological sites, individual trees unless commemorative, movable objects, and intangible heritage.*

PROPOSED NOMINATION METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA
The methodology comprises three significance criteria, any one of which is sufficient to demonstrate heritage value and meet the Significance threshold. Multiple values can and will often be determined through this values-based approach. Additionally, a resource must *satisfactorily* pass an Integrity threshold. There are seven integrity criteria, and while it is preferable that a heritage resource meet all seven criteria, there may be instances when this is not possible. The final decision regarding the integrity threshold, if a resource has not met all seven integrity aspects, will require a judgment by the evaluator, as well as a written rationale. Both the Significance and Integrity criteria have been influenced by the City of Los Angeles’s Office of Historic Resources and the United States’ National Register respective evaluations. The primary benefit of the proposed evaluation system for Regina is its ease of use, and that it is values-based and self-sufficient as opposed to additive and cumulative; it allows for the greater recognition of intangible cultural heritage within a place and does not promote a significant bias toward architecture.

METHODOLOGY
A values-based approach is the most progressive and preferred approach to heritage conservation, which has been adopted and advocated by major conservation authorities, both at the international level (including the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Getty Conservation Institute) and at a national level (including Australia, U.K., U.S. and Canada). In Canada, *The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places* advocates this values-based approach. Values-based approaches start by analyzing the values and significance attributed to places before considering how those values can be protected most effectively. An introduction of broader, values-based metrics represents a shift away from the traditional emphasis on architectural typologies and aesthetics, and a materials-based approach. Over the past few decades, other holistic approaches to heritage management have been evolving, particularly landscape-based approaches. A greater understanding of the significance of cultural landscapes has developed, leading to a better appreciation of environmental factors, as well as intangible values such as continuity and identity. This advancing view of heritage also recognizes emerging trends in urban development, such as the need to integrate more sustainable city-building methods.
3. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Institute a two-step evaluation approach:
   
   **Step 1:** Conduct a Heritage Assessment on a potential Heritage Inventory site, if it does not qualify for addition to the Inventory stop here, if it does, proceed to Step 2.

   **Step 2:** Prepare a Statement of Significance and proceed with review and recommendation for addition to the Heritage Inventory to Council.

2. Adopt the new Heritage Assessment Form, which has removed the grading system and links the Thematic Framework and Historical Context.

3. Adopt the Statement of Significance Form.

4. Establish an online public nomination system, whereby members of the public can suggest additions to a Places of Interest List. City to determine information solicited, how nominations are monitored, and how often nominations occur.

5. Integrate the survey and identification of potential historic places for inclusion onto the Heritage Inventory into broader neighbourhood and area planning projects and initiatives.

On the following pages, a comprehensive Heritage Assessment form has been provided, followed by a Statement of Significance form. The Statement of Significance form should only be completed if the resource scored a ‘Yes’ in Section 7 (Final Evaluation) of the Heritage Assessment.
4. CITY OF REGINA HERITAGE ASSESSMENT FORM AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE FORM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE NAME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT. RESOURCE NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOURHOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF RESOURCE</td>
<td>☐ Building</td>
<td>☐ Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>☐ Engineering Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL DESCRIPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR BUILT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL OWNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT/DESIGNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYLE/DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OWNED</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right Click > Change Picture
1. RESEARCH PROFILE

Provide a condensed history of the resource.

2. SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

1. ASSOCIATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The resource is closely and meaningfully associated with one or more theme, event, period of time, culture, institution, person, community, or tradition considered important in the city’s history.

2. CONTEXTUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The resource is important in the historic development of the neighbourhood or city.
- The resource, by virtue of its location, its symbolism, or some other element, serves to communicate the heritage of Regina to a broad audience.

3. TANGIBLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The resource is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or represents an important creative achievement in design, architecture, planning, construction, materials, or technology.
- The resource possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of the city’s cultural history.

THRESHOLD FOR SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Has the heritage resource met at least one of the above criteria? □ Yes □ No

Yes is required for inclusion onto the Heritage Inventory.
### 3. INTEGRITY CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. LOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location is the place where the heritage resource was constructed or the site where an historic activity or event occurred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. DESIGN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure and style of the resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment is the physical setting of the heritage resource. Whereas location refers to a specific place, environment refers to the character of the place in which the resource played its historic role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. HISTORIC FABRIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic fabric is the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period(s) or time frame and in a particular pattern or configuration to form the heritage resource. Historic fabric may be obscured by later interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. WORKMANSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history. It is important because it can provide information about technological practices and aesthetic principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. FEELING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling is the resource’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. ASSOCIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association is the direct link between an important historic event, person, or original use and the heritage resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THRESHOLD FOR INTEGRITY CRITERIA**

Does the heritage resource satisfactorily meet the above criteria? *

Yes [ ] No [ ]

*If the Evaluator has selected any ‘No’s’ in the Aspects of Integrity, and determined that the heritage resource has satisfactorily met the Integrity Criteria by selecting ‘Yes’ for the Threshold for Integrity Criteria, please provide a written description in the box below justifying the decision. In addition, please identify any other integrity issue(s).

*If sufficient evidence and/or documentation exists, take into consideration the possible reversibility of unsympathetic past interventions to the heritage resource.*
4. CHRONOLOGY OF PAST INTERVENTIONS

In chronological order, document known and observable alterations to the resource.

YEAR

5. VALUES SUMMARY

In a concise, point form, specify any possible heritage values which could contribute to the overall significance of the resource.

6. THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Select one City of Regina Thematic Framework (2017) theme most appropriate for the primary heritage value noted above. Upon production of a subsequent Statement of Significance, update the primary theme if required.

| 1.1 Natural & Cultural Landscapes | 2.5 Commerce & Service Industries | 4.5 Sports & Recreation |
| 1.2 Enduring First Nations Presence | 3.1 Administration & Politics | 4.6 Exhibitions & Fairs |
| 1.3 Multi-cultural Settlement | 3.2 Law, Order, & Security | 4.7 Social Movements |
| 1.4 Capital City Development | 3.3 Defending Regina | 5.1 Architecture & Design |
| 2.1 Early Economies | 4.1 Spiritual Life | 5.2 Visual & Performing Arts |
| 2.2 Transportation & Infrastructure | 4.2 Education | 5.3 Community Collections |
| 2.3 Communication Networks | 4.3 Heath Care & Social Services | 5.4 Media |
| 2.4 Extraction, Production, & Distribution | 4.4 Community Groups |

7. FINAL EVALUATION

Has the heritage resource met the thresholds for both Significance and Integrity criteria, meriting it for inclusion onto the Heritage Inventory? □ Yes □ No
### 8. ADDITIONAL IMAGES

Additional images can consist of additional contemporary photos, historic photos, plans, and/or maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAGE #</th>
<th>Max. Long Side Length: 6&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPYRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right Click > Change Picture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAGE #</th>
<th>Max. Long Side Length: 6&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Right Click > Change Picture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOTOGRAPHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPYRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Right Click > Change Picture
9. RESEARCH SOURCES

Provide an annotated reference list directly relevant to this resource.
# STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALT. RESOURCE NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITECT/DESIGNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STYLE/DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEMPORARY PHOTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Max. Width: 6” | Max. Height: 4”

Right Click > Change Picture
## DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE

Max. 4000 Characters

---

## HERITAGE VALUE OF HISTORIC PLACE

Max. 4000 Characters

---

## CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS

The elements that define the heritage character of Name of Historic Place include, but are not limited to its:

-
### ADDITIONAL IMAGES

Additional images can consist of additional contemporary photos, historic photos, plans, and/or maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAGE #</th>
<th>Max. Long Side Length: 6&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PHOTOGRAPHER</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>COPYRIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Right Click > Change Picture
Heritage Conservation Survey

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT
01 November 2021 - 13 December 2021

PROJECT NAME:
Heritage Conservation
SURVEY QUESTIONS
Q1 | What best describes you?

- **Owner of a designated heritage property**: 18 (2.6%)
- **Owner of a property on the heritage inventory list**: 10 (1.4%)
- **Member of the public**: 665 (96.0%)

Optional question (693 response(s), 5 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question
Q2  What is your postal code?

Regina, SK, S4W0E7
Regina, SK, S4T1E8
Regina, SK, S4S6R6
Regina, SK, S4R1J4
Regina, SK, S4Y0E6
Regina, SK, S4P2G9
Regina, SK, S4T5W2
Regina, SK, S4P1Z1
Regina, SK, S4W0M1
Regina, SK, S4P0S7
Regina, SK, S4R8B3
Regina, SK, S4X3C5
Regina, SK, S4X4G4
Regina, SK, S4V3G8
Regina, SK, S4N5J3
Regina, SK, S4S6P6
Regina, SK, S4V1R8
Regina, SK, S4T6N3
Regina, SK, S4S7K8
Regina, SK, S4T6N1
Regina, SK, S4S7K1
Regina, SK, S4P1M9
White City, SK, S4L5B1
Regina, SK, S4S1P4
Regina, SK, S4R7S1
Regina, SK, S4S4B4
Regina, SK, S4N5J5
Regina, SK, S4S4T2
Regina, SK, S4P2S1
Regina, SK, S4S0G3
Regina, SK, S4R5A8
Balgonie, SK, S0G0E0
Regina, SK, S4X4L9
Regina, SK, S4X3H3
Regina, SK, S4V1S3
Regina, SK, S4S5T3
Regina, SK, S4X4T2
Regina, SK, S4V3M2
Regina, SK, S4P2E5
Regina, SK, S4V3S7
Regina, SK, S4R3R1
Regina, SK, S4W0P3
Regina, SK, S4T3H8
Regina, SK, S4X0J1
Regina, SK, S4S2A7
Regina, SK, S4S7J6
Regina, SK, S4X4S1
Regina, SK, S4S1W5
Regina, SK, S4R5R8
White City, SK, S4L0A2
Regina, SK, S4X0H1
Regina, SK, S4T2R6
Regina, SK, S4V1X5
Regina, SK, S4S1P7
Regina, SK, S4N4A9
Regina, SK, S4V0L5
Regina, SK, S4V3C5
Regina, SK, S4S6G6
Regina, SK, S4S4G3
Wolseley, SK, S0G5H0
Regina, SK, S4S3T3
Regina, SK, S4W0A3
Moose Jaw, SK, S6J1B3
Regina, SK, S4S1W2
Regina, SK, S4X4L8

Optional question (517 response(s), 181 skipped)
Question type: Region Question
Q3 The primary value in conserving heritage properties is to... (select your top three)

Preserve properties of architectural significance: 516
Maintain the historical character of a neighbourhood: 476
Encourage tourism: 82
Sustainably develop neighbourhoods: 150
Recognize and preserve community history: 486
Other (please specify): 47

Optional question (687 response(s), 11 skipped)
Question type: Checkbox Question
The City provides services that residents depend on every day, ranging from maintenance of Regina’s infrastructure to transit, recreation and more. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the services you value most, where would you prioritize heritage con...

Heritage conservation survey results:

- 10: Most important
- 9
- 8
- 7
- 6
- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1: Least important

Survey report for Heritage Conservation: 01 November 2021 to 13 December 2021
Q4  The City provides services that residents depend on every day, ranging from maintenance of Regina’s infrastructure to transit, recreation and more. On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the services you value most, where would you prioritize heritage con...

Heritage conservation
Q5  What should the City’s role be in maintaining the features you value in older neighbourhoods? Select the answer you most agree with.

- Define regulations to ensure new construction reinforces existing neighbourhood character
- Ensure processes for designation and conservation of heritage properties are clear and well resourced
- Signage for points of interest in neighbourhoods
- Community education and awareness like walking tours and heritage programming
- Encourage property owners to rehabilitate or maintain their heritage properties

Optional question (685 response(s), 13 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question
Q6: What do you think the most significant barriers are for heritage property owners to conserving their property? (Select all that apply)

Return on investment
Lack of information on what is heritage and how to maintain historical character
Heritage permit processes
Adhering to building codes
Processes to register heritage properties
Current incentives do not cover enough of the cost
Additional costs of maintaining heritage properties
Additional costs of preserving heritage properties

Optional question (687 response(s), 11 skipped)
Question type: Checkbox Question
Heritage programs at a municipal level are comprised of several components. From your perspective, what are the most important elements for the City of Regina to include in its conservation program? (Please rank in order of importance with 1 being...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>AVG. RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for encouraging development, conservation and maintenance of historic properties</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory tools that guide/facilitate/enforce conservation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education, programming and awareness</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of places of interest</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional question (673 response(s), 25 skipped)
Question type: Ranking Question
Q8 | What brought you to this survey?

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to the question on how respondents heard about the survey.](image)

**Question options**
- Other (please specify) 23 (3.4%)
- Regina.ca 45 (6.6%)
- Survey link sent to me 18 (2.6%)
- Be Heard Regina 16 (2.3%)
- Word of mouth 15 (2.2%)
- News coverage 27 (3.9%)
- Social media 541 (79.0%)

Optional question (685 response(s), 13 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question
Lead Program Enhancements - Bylaw Changes

Date | March 16, 2022
---|---
To | Mayor Masters and City Councillors
From | Executive Committee
Service Area | Water, Waste & Environment
Item # | CR22-31

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the amendments to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as outlined in the discussion of this report to implement the approved enhancements to the Lead Service Connection Management Program as outlined in CR21-90.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare an amendment to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as generally described in Appendix A to this report, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of the recommendations in this report by City Council.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare amendments to *The Regina Administration Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 2003-69 to allow for the lead service connection equalized payment plan program participants to continue to participate in the Tax Installment Payment Plan Services (TIPPS).

HISTORY

At the March 9, 2022 meeting of Executive Committee, the Committee considered the attached EX22-23 report from the Citizen Services Division.
The Committee adopted the following resolution:

1. Approve the amendments to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as outlined in the discussion of this report to implement the approved enhancements to the Lead Service Connection Management Program as outlined in CR21-90.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare an amendment to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as generally described in Appendix A to this report, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of the recommendations in this report by City Council.

3. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare amendments to *The Regina Administration Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 2003-69 to allow for the lead service connection equalized payment plan program participants to continue to participate in the Tax Installment Payment Plan Services (TIPPS).

4. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.

Recommendation #4 does not require City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk 3/11/2022

ATTACHMENTS
EX22-23 - Lead Program Enhancements - Bylaw Changes
Appendix A - Proposed Changes to The Water Bylaw
Appendix B - Service Connection Diagram
Appendix C - 2022 Affordable Access Application
Lead Program Enhancements - Bylaw Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 9, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Citizen Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Water, Waste &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>EX22-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Committee recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the amendments to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as outlined in the discussion of this report to implement the approved enhancements to the Lead Service Connection Management Program as outlined in CR21-90.

2. Instruct the City Solicitor to prepare an amendment to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 as generally described in Appendix A to this report, to be brought forward to the meeting of City Council following approval of the recommendations in this report by City Council.

3. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.

ISSUE

On May 26, 2021 City of Regina (City) Council approved a number of changes to the Lead Service Connection Management Program (LSCMP). The program changes require amendments to *The Regina Water Bylaw*, Bylaw No. 8942 (Water Bylaw). This report details the bylaw changes resulting from *CR21-90 Lead Service Connection Management Report* (CR21-90), that resolved:

1. To amend the Water Bylaw to include the following regulations:
   a. The mandatory replacement of the privately-owned lead service connections (LSCs)
when a City-owned LSC is replaced.

b. Outlining an interest-free coordinated agreement, where the private and City-side of the LSC are replaced at the same time and including the following payment options for property owners:
   
   i. Direct payment to contractor at the time of replacement.
   ii. Five-Year Equalized Payment Plan, plus up-front administration fee of $240.
   iii. Ten-Year Equalized Payment Plan (available only to property owners who meet the City’s Affordable Access Program criteria).

c. Outlining an interest-free agreement available to property owners with private side lead to replace their LSCs, where the City-side is not lead with the following payment options:
   
   i. Five-year Equalized Payment Plan, plus up-front administration fee of $240.
   ii. Ten-year Equalized Payment Plan (available only to property owners who meet the City’s Affordable Access Program criteria).

IMPACTS

Financial Impact
Providing property owners with deferred payment options will result in a financial impact averaging $1.8 million per year, until all deferred payments are received, up to a maximum of ten years after the final replacements occur. Over the life of the Utility model, this portion of the funding will be paid back by residents. The financing of this program will be funded by the General Utility Reserve (GUR), and the GUR would be maintained within the minimum ($25 million) and maximum ($90 million) reserve balances.

Risk/Legal Impact
On July 3, 2020, amendments to The Cities Act came into force that allow the City to enter into agreements with property owners to finance private side infrastructure replacements. Under the new provision, the City can pay the upfront capital cost of the LSC replacement of the private side and allows the property owner to reimburse the City for this expenditure over time, without interest.

The unpaid balance will be added to the taxes over multiple years without late payment penalties, as long as the person is making the payments according to the Lead Service Connection Replacement Program (LSCRP) agreement. The Water Bylaw will be amended to include provisions for an interest-free agreement over five years, or ten, for the private side lead replacements. The ten-year deferral is only available if the property owner(s) qualifies for the City’s Affordable Access Program.

Policy/Strategic Impact
The LSCMP is consistent with Design Regina: The Official Community Plan (OCP) as follows:

- Additional financial resources to replace City-owned LSCs helps make the City’s LSCMP accessible to all property owners of Regina (OCP D11 Goal 5 - Social Inclusion: 13.19).
- The 2022 updates to the LSCMP require the replacement of the private side LSCs when City-
owned LSCs are replaced, helping to improve the condition of existing housing stock (OCP D6 Goal 2 - Existing Housing Stock: 8.9).

Environmental Impact
City Council set a community goal for the City of achieving net zero emissions and sourcing of net zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The recommendations in this report are administrative in nature and are expected to have limited direct impacts on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

OTHER OPTIONS

Other support options were explored in CR21-90.

COMMUNICATIONS

Information regarding the current LSCMP is available at Regina.ca/leadservice. In the fall of 2021, the LSCMP annual notification letters were provided to residents and owners of properties serviced by City-owned LSCs. Included in the 2021 notifications were program details for the 2022 upcoming changes to the LSCMP.

Education and awareness about enhancements to the LSCMP will continue in 2022. Communications will focus on providing information to residents that may have City-owned or privately-owned LSCs, including notification of mandatory replacement of privately-owned LSCs and financial payment options available to assist with the replacement. Communications will include:

- Improved accessibility to information on Regina.ca/leadservice, including online application forms for the filter program and payment options for mandatory replacement.
- Annual notification letters that include information on impacts on lead in drinking water, updates to the LSCMP along with free filter and water testing options.
- Notification letters to property owners affected by construction, where City and privately-owned LSCs will be replaced as part of a project.

The Administration will continue to establish relationships with community partners and groups to develop better collaboration methods to reach residents and increase water filter distribution.

DISCUSSION

The proposed amendments will be made to the Water Bylaw. The amendments to the Water Bylaw will be modelled after the City of Saskatoon’s bylaw with modifications to definitions/terms to fit within the context of Regina bylaws. The general details of the amendments to the Water Bylaw can be found in Appendix A.
The proposed amendments to the City’s Water Bylaw are in accordance with *The Cities Act* and allow the City the general power to pass bylaws in relation to the following:

- The safety, health and welfare of people and the protection of people and property.
- Services provided by or on behalf of the City, including establishing fees for providing those services.
- Respecting public utilities.
- Requiring construction, maintenance, repair, or replacement of a service connection by the owner of a parcel of land, with the costs being an amount owing by the owner.

The Water Bylaw will be amended to include the following provisions:

**Mandatory Private Side Replacement**

Replacing only the City-owned portion of LSCs does not solve the issue of lead in drinking water if lead plumbing materials also exist on the private side. Disturbing the service connection without completing a full LSC replacement has been shown to increase lead concentrations in the tap water supplied to residents immediately after replacement and has not been shown to significantly reduce lead levels over time.

Replacements will occur in conjunction with infrastructure renewal projects and will be mandatory for property owners to replace the private side of their LSC when a City-side LSC is also present. In cases where there is no City-side LSC present, but the private side is still lead, the property owner will not be required to replace the private side of the LSC. If the property owner wishes to replace the private side where the City-side has been replaced, they will have access to the deferred payment options in the LSCR.

In cases where the replacement occurs due to an emergency break on the City-side LSCs, the property owner will have 60 days to replace the private side of their LSC. During this time, the City will facilitate the replacement of the private side of the LSC for the property owner and the property owner will have access to the deferred payment options in the LSCR.

The City is responsible for the City-owned portion of the service connection from the water main to the property line. The property owner is responsible for the privately-owned portion of the service connection from the property line into the home, as well as in-house plumbing (Appendix B).

The Administration will continue to coordinate with the Residential Road Renewal Program (RRRP) as well as other infrastructure renewal projects to create a block-by-block program for the replacement of LSCs. This approach will help to manage impacts to roadways, create an efficient schedule to coordinate with residents, and help to minimize mobilization costs between replacement locations.
The City does not maintain records of the material used in the private side of service connections. To ensure that all lead is removed from the LSC at the time of replacement, each location will need to be investigated prior to the replacement to determine where lead exists. This will entail entering residents' homes to inspect the private side of the service connection.

When replacing the LSC, the City will:

- Provide residents and/or homeowners advanced notice of replacement.
- Obtain the necessary permits for the full replacement.
- Replace the City-owned and private side of the LSC.
- Provide interior flushing instructions post replacement of the LSC.

To complete the replacement, the contractor needs access to the water meter inside of the property. If access is not provided, the City will replace the City-owned portion of the LSC and turn off the curb box which shuts off water to the property until such time as the property owner allows the contractor to enter the property to access the water meter and complete lead service connection replacement.

When the replacement of a LSC takes place, damage or failure of the existing sewer service connection can also occur. If the private side of a sewer service connection requires replacing when an LSC is also being replaced, the property owner can include the cost of the replacement as part of the deferred payment options in the LSCRP up to the maximum amount permitted under the program, which is $10,000.

**Deferred Payment Options**

In conjunction with mandating the private side replacements, the City is offering residents deferred payment options, recognizing residents may not have planned on a replacement for when the work is being completed. Deferred payments are also available to properties with private side lead service connections to complete their replacements using a contractor from the City’s approved underground contractor list.

Once the replacement has been completed, the City will inspect the installation and, if completed properly, the City will pay the contractor on the property owner’s behalf.

The property owner will be able to finance the private side replacement of an LSC (and any necessary sewer replacement) up to a maximum cost of $10,000.

Property owners interested in the deferred payment options will be required to enter into a financing agreement with the City. The agreement requires the cost of the replacement be registered as a pending liability on the property tax information and the replacement cost is registered as a lien against the property until the total replacement amount is paid in full.

The deferred payment options available to residents for the replacement of private-side LSCs are:
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- An interest free, five-year equalized payment plan (plus an up-front administration fee of $240)
  - The purpose of the up-front administration fee of $240 includes the cost of applying the amount to the property taxes and the time required to process the equalized payment program.
  - In this case, the City pays the contractor and attaches the cost for the private side replacement to the property owners’ taxes. One fifth of the total amount is then due and payable when your taxes are due. In each year thereafter, one fifth of the amount is due and payable until the amount is paid in full. If property owners are on the TIPPS program, you would make 60 equal payments after the replacement has been completed.

- An interest free, ten-year equalized payment plan for residents that meet the City’s Affordable Access Program criteria. Please refer to Appendix C for an example of the City’s Affordable Access Program Application, which will be amended to reflect the lead service connection program, if approved by Council.
  - There is no up-front administration fee if the property owner is eligible for the ten-year equalized payment plan option.
  - In this case, the City pays the contractor and attaches the cost for the private side replacement to the property owners’ taxes. One tenth of the total amount is then due and payable when your taxes are due. In each year thereafter, one tenth of the amount is due and payable until the amount is paid in full. If you are on the TIPPS program, you would make 120 equal payments after the replacement has been completed.

If an LSC at a property is replaced on or before September 30, the amount due, if unpaid, will be added to the tax roll of the property on January 1 of the next calendar year.

If an LSC at a property is replaced after September 30, the amount due, if unpaid, will be added to the tax roll of the property and form part of the taxes on January 1 of the year following the next calendar year.

**Failure to Pay**

Included in the agreement is the acknowledgement and agreement of the property owner that if there is a failure to make any of the required payments on the due date(s), then the City is entitled to collect the same as the property tax arrears, together with the City’s normal penalties and interest through the City’s property tax collection system.
If the property is sold or the property owner dies, a representative of the estate shall notify the City within 60 days of the sale or transfer of the property. The City will then send out notice that the remaining replacement cost is now due and owing, unless the City has agreed to another arrangement for repayment of the remaining replacement cost with a subsequent owner, to collect the same as property tax arrears.

If the property owner or a representative does not repay the City upon transfer of ownership, the City is entitled to recover the unpaid portion of the replacement cost, from any subsequent owner of the property.

A clause will be added under the Offences, Penalties and Enforcement section of the bylaw that states no person shall fail to notify City with false or misleading information on an application under the deferral program; or fail to notify the City of the death of a taxpayer or the sale of property which could lead to discontinuation of service.

DECISION HISTORY

In 2017, (Lead Service Connection Management Program Report CR17-74), City Council approved additional elements for the LSCMP including testing and a water filter program for residents.

In 2018, (Lead Service Connection Management Program Report CR18-27), City Council was provided with an update of 2017 and proposed 2018 program activities. Administration was directed to provide a report to Public Works & Infrastructure (PWI) Committee annually on the progress of the LSCMP.

In April 2019, (Lead Service Connection Management Update Report PWI19-9), a report was submitted to PWI to provide an update on the progress of the LSCMP.

On December 3, 2019 (Accelerating the Lead Service Connection Management Program MN19-23), Council approved a motion that required that Administration prepare a report for Public Works and Infrastructure Committee in March 2020 that considers and analyzes potential enhancements to the LSCMP.

On March 25, 2021, as part of the 2021 Utility Budget, City Council approved a continuous supply of water filters for eligible residents as part of the LSCMP.

On May 26, 2021, (Lead Service Connection Management Program CR21-90), City Council approved:

1. A fifteen-year LSC replacement program with mandatory private side replacement, with a target completion year of 2036.
2. Program support options with payment options up to ten years for qualifying residents for full
LSC replacements.

3. A two-percent Utility Rate increase beginning in 2022

The recommendations contained in this report require City Council approval.

Respectfully Submitted,  

Prepared by: Laine Froehlich, Technologist II-Water & Sewer Services

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A - Proposed Changes to The Water Bylaw
Appendix B - Service Connection Diagram
Appendix C - 2022 Affordable Access Application
Appendix A: The Water Bylaw – Proposed Amendments

The Lead Program Enhancements – Bylaw Changes Report proposes the following changes to the Water Bylaw:

Add new section setting out the purpose and the authority for the Water Bylaw as follows:

The purpose of this Bylaw is to establish conditions and procedures for accessing water service, fire hydrant use, fees for water use, water meter requirements, water pipes and fixtures, replenishment of Wascana Lake, water management, cross connection and backflow prevention, construction and installation of private water service connections including accessing the City’s service

The authority for the proposed changes to the Water Bylaw are found in clauses 8(1)(b), (i) and (j), and sections 19, 22, 244, 333 and 361 of The Cities Act.

Add the following new definitions for the purpose of implementing the Lead Enhancement Program

“lead service connection” means a service connection that is made of lead pipe;

“parcel of land” means a parcel of land within the meaning of The Cities Act;

“service connection” means a service connection within the meaning of The Cities Act;

“specifications” means the current version of the City of Regina’s Standard Construction Specifications and Drawings for Roadways and Water and Sewer;

Amend section 2.1 to add the word “storage”.

Delete the current Section 19 which reads:

19(1) On the expiration of the lifetime of a service pipe, as specified by the City at the time the work was constructed, the City may repair, maintain, replace or reconstruct the service pipe.

(2) Where a service pipe is replaced or reconstructed pursuant to Subsection 1:

(a) the owner of standard residential premises serviced by the pipe in question shall pay to the City a charge established by Item #11 of Schedule “A”; and
the owner of multi-residential or commercial premises serviced by the pipe in question shall pay to the City a charge as calculated by the City.

(3) The City may enter into an agreement with an owner liable for a charge under Subsection 2(a) to amortize the charge, including interest, over a payment period not to exceed five years in duration.

And replace it with an updated Section 19, addressing the replacement of Lead Service Connections, which will read:

General
The City Manager may establish specifications governing the construction, installation and repair of service connections and any fees associated therewith.

Every service connection must be constructed, installed, and repaired in accordance with such specifications.

A contractor, approved by the City, shall be responsible to pay all fees associated with the construction, installation, repair or maintenance of the service connections as set out in the specifications.

All service connection work, including the construction, installation, maintenance, repair and replacement must be undertaken by a contractor approved by the City.

Add New Section That Identify The Requirements For The New Program For Replacement Of Lead Service Connections

This section applies to all lead service connections which have failed or which the City requires be replaced.

Notwithstanding that a lead service connection has not failed, the City may require that the owner of a parcel of land replace the lead service connection serving the parcel of land at the owner’s cost if the City:

(a) is upgrading the main lines of the system and the parcel of land is adjacent to the main lines being upgraded;

(b) is performing a major roadway treatment in the right-of-way adjacent to a parcel of land; or

(c) for any reason, is not satisfied with the construction, maintenance, repair or replacement of the lead service connection; and

When a lead service connection must be replaced as required by this section:
(a) the property owner is entirely responsible for the replacement of and cost of replacement of the portion of the lead service connection from the outside foundation of the premise to the water meter; and

(b) for the portion of the lead service connection from the outside foundation of the premise to the property line, the property owner may:

(i) choose to have the work done by a City approved contractor hired by and paid for by the property owner; or

(ii) choose to have the work done by the contractor retained by the City to replace the City’s portion from the water main to the boundary of the property line.

If the owner chooses to use the City’s contractor, pursuant to clause ______ above, the owner may be eligible to participate in the City’s Lead Service Connection Replacement Program identified in this Bylaw and have access to the deferred payment options.

If the property owner neglects or refuses to replace the owner’s portion of the lead service connection as required by this section, the City may do any one or more of the following:

(a) upon 30 days’ written notice to the owner, discontinue providing water service until the owner’s portion is replaced as required by this Bylaw;

(b) upon 30 days’ written notice to the owner, discontinue providing water service and replace the portion of the lead service connection that the City is responsible for, but the City shall not allow its water service line to be connected or reconnected to the owner’s lead service connection until the property owner replaces the owner’s portion from the boundary of the property line to the water meter with materials approved by the City;

(c) upon 30 days’ written notice to the owner, discontinue providing water service and have the City’s contractor replace the portion of the lead service connection that the owner is responsible for in accordance with section 22 of the Act and add the cost of such work to the tax roll for the property in accordance with sections 22 and 333 of the Act.

Where the City’s contractor acts pursuant to the section ______ (c), the property owner shall not be eligible to participate in the City’s lead service connection replacement program for the replacement of a lead service connection.

**Common Trench Lead Water Service Line Connection**

A common trench lead service connection installation means an installation of a lead service connection servicing adjacent properties that are in a common trench or located so
close to one another that one cannot be replaced without damaging, or be at serious risk of
damaging, the other.

If either lead service connection in a common trench must be replaced, then both must be
replaced.

If one property owner wishes to voluntarily replace a private side lead service connection in
a common trench, then that initiating owner shall obtain written consent of the non-initiating
owner to the replacement, failing which, no voluntary replacement of a lead service
connection shall be permitted.

Add the following section, which is required to implement the City's Lead Service
Connection Replacement Program and Repayment Plan as follows:

PART XX TAX DEFERRAL PROGRAM FOR MANDATORY LEAD SERVICE
CONNECTION REPLACEMENT

In this Part:

(a) “Affordable Access Program” means the City’s program that provides reduced
City fees for specified City programs where the household has an income
threshold below the low income cut off or as specified in the Affordable
Access Programs' requirements;

(b) “amount due” means the cost of work or services required and performed by,
or performed at the request of, the City in connection with replacement of a
lead service connection, and, where applicable, concurrent replacement of a
sewer service connection, and includes a fee to administer the five-year
equalized payment plan program as set out in section ___ below;

(c) “equalized payment plan program” means the Lead Service Connection
Replacement Program established pursuant to this Bylaw;

(d) “equalized taxes” means taxes, equivalent to the amount due, which have
been added to the tax roll of a property:

(i) pursuant to sections 22 and 361 of The Cities Act for work or services
performed by the City and provided to the property; and

(ii) which is the subject of a payment plan agreement with the City
resulting from the City mandating lead service connection
replacement;

(e) “household” means a person or group of persons consisting of a family who
occupy the same dwelling unit and do not have a usual place of residence
elsewhere in Canada or abroad and includes household members who are temporarily absent elsewhere;

(f) “low-income cut-off” means an income threshold determined by Statistics Canada by analyzing family expenditure data, below which families will devote a larger share of income to the necessities of food, shelter and clothing than would the average family;

(g) “principal residence” means the primary location that a person inhabits and is limited to one principal residence;

(h) “property” means a property with a lead service connection which the City has mandated be replaced, and includes a property at which a lead service connection has been replaced under the equalized payment plan program;

(i) “residential property” means land and improvements used or intended to be used for a residential purpose; and

(j) “taxpayer” means the person whose name is shown on the tax roll for each taxable property that is serviced by a lead service connection which the City has mandated be replaced.

Equalized payment plan program established
The Lead Service Connection Replacement Program is hereby established.

Eligibility requirements for five year equalized payment plan program
To qualify under the five year equalized payment plan program, the taxpayer must meet the following eligibility requirements:

(a) the taxpayer must own the property in their own name or as a joint owner with another person; and

(b) the taxes on the property, with the exception of the amount deferred under the equalization payment plan program, must be paid in full within the current taxation year and a property in tax arrears is not eligible under the deferral program.

Additional requirements for ten-year equalized payment plan program
In addition to the above requirements in the section above, to be eligible for a ten-year equalized payment plan program the taxpayer must meet the following requirements:

(a) the taxpayer must be an individual;

(b) the property must be residential property;
(c) the property must be the principal residence of the taxpayer;

(d) the taxpayer’s annual household income must qualify for the City’s Affordable Access Program.

**Agreement to pay**

If the City requires replacement of a lead service connection pursuant to section above in this Bylaw and the taxpayer meets the requirements of the program set out in Part ____ of this Bylaw, the taxpayer may enter into an agreement to pay the City the amount due over time.

The amount due shall include a $240 fee to administer the five year deferral equalized payment plan program.

There is no equalized payment plan program fee for taxpayers qualifying for the City’s Affordable Access Program.

**Lien**

The amount due is a lien on the property.

**Amount due added to taxes**

If a lead service connection at a property is replaced on or before September 30, the amount due, if unpaid, may be added to the tax roll of the property on January 1 of the next calendar year.

If a lead service connection at a property is replaced after September 30, the amount due, if unpaid, may be added to the tax roll of the property and form part of the taxes on January 1 of the year following the next calendar year.

Prior to adding the amount due to the tax roll of the property, the City may register it as a pending liability.

**Equalization repayment plan**

The City may enter into an agreement with a taxpayer to defer taxes for five years or ten years depending on the taxpayers’ eligibility as provided for in sections ____ and ____ above.

Payment of the deferred taxes shall be as follows:

(a) for a five-year deferral, one fifth of the deferred taxes becomes due and payable on June 30 of the calendar year in which the amount due is added to the tax roll of the property, with one of the remaining fifths becoming due and payable on June 30 of each of the subsequent four calendar years; or

(b) for a ten-year deferral, one tenth of the deferred taxes becomes due and payable on June 30 of the calendar year in which the amount due is added to the tax roll of
the property, with one of the remaining tenths becoming due and payable on June 30 of each of the subsequent nine calendar years.

**Council approval of equalization repayment plans**

Council shall, on an annual basis, consider and approve the deferral of taxes as set out in section ___________.

**Registration of Lien**

To ensure repayment of the deferred taxes under the equalization repayment plan program, the City may register a lien against the property.

The lien shall remain on the title of the property for as long as there are deferred taxes unpaid with respect to the property.

The lien shall be removed by the City upon repayment of the deferred taxes.

**Repayment of deferred taxes**

Notwithstanding section _____ the total amount of the taxes deferred under the equalized repayment plan program shall be repaid to the City upon:

(a) failure to pay the deferred taxes;
(b) failure to keep taxes other than the deferred taxes current on the property;
(c) the death of the taxpayer;
(d) sale of the property; or
(e) the City becoming aware that the taxpayer has provided false or misleading information on their application under the equalized payment plan program.

**Duty to notify city**

A taxpayer who sells a property that is subject to a tax deferral under the equalization payment plan program shall, within 60 days of the sale, notify the City that the property has been sold.

If a taxpayer dies, a representative of the taxpayer’s estate shall, within 60 days of the taxpayer’s death, notify the City that the taxpayer is deceased.

**Notice to repay deferred taxes**

Where the City becomes aware that one of the circumstances in subsection __ above has occurred, the City shall send out a notification to the taxpayer or the taxpayer’s estate showing the amount of the deferred taxes that remains to be paid.

The deferred taxes shall be due and payable to the City within 30 days after the notification in subsection __ is sent out, unless otherwise agreed to by the City Manager.
If the deferred taxes remain unpaid after 30 days, the City may impose penalties on the taxes outstanding at the rates established by Bylaw No. 2003-69, *The Regina Administration Bylaw*.

**Voluntary repayment**

The taxpayer may, at any time, repay the deferred taxes under the equalized payment plan program without penalty if at the time of repayment the taxpayer is not in default of the requirements in the equalization payment plan agreement.

**The following clauses are proposed to be added to section 25 of the Water Bylaw:**

25 No person shall:

   (p) provide the City with false or misleading information on an application under the equalized payment plan program; or

   (q) fail to notify the City of the death of a taxpayer or the sale of property pursuant to section __ of the Bylaw.

**Schedule A is amended by:**

Delete line items relating to section 19 which section has now been deleted.
Note: While the water meter is inside the home, it is City-owned and maintained by the City.

Credit: City of London
APPENDIX C - AFFORDABLE ACCESS APPLICATION

Please complete this application form and attach the required income verification. Incomplete applications will be returned to you with instructions as to what is missing. Your application is important to us and will be processed in the order it is received. The average processing time is 2-3 weeks from the date received at the Affordable Access Program office. Processing time may vary based on the volume of mail received. If you have questions or require additional information, please visit Regina.ca, call 306-777-7733, or email affordableaccess@regina.ca.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliver in person between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. 7 days a week (except holidays) to one of the following:</th>
<th>OR Fax to:</th>
<th>OR email to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Leisure Centre, 1127 Arnason Street</td>
<td>306-777-6831</td>
<td><a href="mailto:affordableaccess@regina.ca">affordableaccess@regina.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportplex, 1717 Elphinstone Street</td>
<td>Be sure to send both pages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Schmirler Leisure Centre, 3130 East Woodhams Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate which program(s) you are applying for?

☐ Affordable Fun (recreation programs and leisure passes)  ☐ Affordable Transit Pass

### MAIN APPLICANT INFORMATION – USE LEGAL NAMES (PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address (PO Boxes will NOT be accepted)  

City  Regina  Postal Code  Home Phone  (  )  Alternate Phone ☐Cell ☐Work  (  )  Email

Date of Birth  Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL FAMILY INFORMATION – USE LEGAL NAMES – Must ONLY include your spouse or partner (if they live with you) and your dependants UNDER 25 years of age. All other household members need to apply separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>MIDDLE NAME (S)</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP TO APPLICANT</th>
<th>GENDER Identify using legend below</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH MM/DD/YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required – Please make an appropriate choice using the information below and insert into above Gender column:

M – Male  F – Female  T – Transgender  G – Gender Queer/Androgynty
Along with this application form you must include one of the following:

- **Canada Revenue Agency Notice of Assessment (NOA)** from the last year for all persons 18 years of age or older living in the household.
  
  If the total income from line 15000 of all persons 18 years or older living in the household is less than the amounts listed below, you are eligible for the Affordable Fun Program. If you do not have a copy of your NOA, please obtain a copy by calling the Canada Revenue Agency at 1-800-959-8281 or visit [www.cra.gc.ca/myaccount](http://www.cra.gc.ca/myaccount).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 PERSON</th>
<th>2 PERSONS</th>
<th>3 PERSONS</th>
<th>4 PERSONS</th>
<th>5 PERSONS</th>
<th>6 PERSONS</th>
<th>7 PERSONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$23,861</td>
<td>$29,706</td>
<td>$36,520</td>
<td>$44,340</td>
<td>$50,290</td>
<td>$56,718</td>
<td>$63,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A letter from a Registered Social Worker on letterhead that includes:**
  - A list of all applicants (including dependants).
  - That the writer is aware of the income eligibility rates noted in the above table and confirms that the applicants qualify.
  - The writer’s contact information and title.

- **Confirmation of Permanent Residence or Refugee Protection Claimant Documents, with arrival dates within one year for each person applying.**

- **Monthly statement of income for CPP Disability** (including the income verification for your spouse/partner).

- **Confirmation of Saskatchewan Assured Income for Disability (SAID).** (If applying for Transit, you will be eligible for the Discount Pass Program. Visit Regina.ca/transit for more information.)

If you have questions regarding required income documents, please call the City at 306-777-7733 for assistance.

---

**AFFORDABLE ACCESS PROGRAM TERMS & CONDITIONS**

1. You must be a resident of Regina, SK in order to be eligible for the Affordable Access Program.
2. Affordable Access Program privileges **expire on December 31** of each year. You will be required to reapply annually.
3. Applications for the upcoming year will be accepted beginning December 1st.
4. Leisure passes may be purchased at the Sportplex, Sandra Schmirler Leisure Centre, and the North West Leisure Centre.
5. Leisure passes are non-transferable. Punch passes are not available through the Affordable Access Program.
6. Transit passes may be purchased at the Transit information Centre or Transit Operations Centre. Transit passes are non-transferable.
7. You must present your leisure pass when entering a leisure centre. You must scan your Transit pass when boarding a bus.
8. Upon Affordable Fun approval, you may register for programs by calling the Playline at 306-777-7529, online at Regina.ca, or in person at the Neil Balkwill Civic Arts Centre, Sportplex, Sandra Schmirler Leisure Centre, or the North West Leisure Centre. Upon Affordable Transit approval, you must take your approval letter to the Transit Information Centre or Transit Operations Centre to purchase a pass.
9. The City of Regina reserves the right to close all or part of any facility for regular maintenance and/or special bookings.
10. Providing incorrect information or otherwise fraudulently using the Affordable Access Program may result in privileges being revoked.

---

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I have read and understood the terms and conditions listed for this program.
I also agree to abide by the terms and conditions as outlined above.

**MAIN APPLICANT’S SIGNATURE**

**DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)**

---

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:**

- **Date Received:**
- **Approved**
- **Denied**
- **Out of Town**
- **Over LICO.**
- **Letter Sent**

Privacy – All personal information collected on this form is handled and maintained in accordance with the City of Regina’s Customer Privacy Policy which is available on our website at Regina.ca. Income documents will be destroyed as soon as the information has been verified for program eligibility. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your privacy, please contact the City’s Access to Information and Privacy Coordinator at 306-777-7070.
Presentation to City of Regina on March 16, 2020

Motion MN22-1 Regulate the non-essential (Cosmetic) use of Pesticides

1. The Calling Lake Ecomuseum (CLEM) is the grass roots arm of the United Nations and works very closely with the Saskatchewan Regional Center of Expertise on Education for Sustainable Development at the University of Regina. We believe in the 17 goals of Sustainable Development which means we believe in development (as decent jobs are important) and we also believe that development must be thoughtful, spark robust conversation to ensure it is sustainable.

2. We applaud the City of Regina for starting this conversation about non-essential pesticide use. Dr Peter Leavitt from the U Of R has spent 28 years collected data on the health of the Qu’Appelle River System. He has told us at a number of presentations that we much have look at non-essential use of pesticides due to the impact it is having on water quality.

3. Goal #17 is Partnership – we applaud the City of Regina to reaching out to researchers on the science on the effects of pesticides on birds, fish, bees and water quality. We suggest you reach out to Dr Christie Morrissey with the Toxicology Centre at the U of S. [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/pesticide-contaminating-prairie-wetlands-scientist-1.2482082](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/pesticide-contaminating-prairie-wetlands-scientist-1.2482082)

4. Goal #11 is Sustainable Cities and Communities – we applaud the City of Regina for engaging the community for comments on this motion. A low cost measure initiative like this would have desirable improvement downstream. The Qu’Appelle River system has been labelled as stressed. We are experiencing more and more cyanobacteria events. [Haig et al Pasqua Blue Ice LRM 2021.pdf](Haig%20et%20al%20Pasqua%20Blue%20Ice%20LRM%202021.pdf)

5. Goal #14 is life below water – we applaud the City of Regina for created this conversation to protect fish, aquatic life and ensure downstream water quality. We suggest you reach out to Dr Peter Leavitt at the U of R and to reach out to FSIN re Indigenous Ecological Knowledge.

The Calling Lakes Ecomuseum will lean in and ensure that we share this conversation with our downstream communities on FaceBook, through our newsletters and contacts with the Fort Times.

Sincerely

Aura Lee MacPherson

Chair of CLEM
Presentation to City of Regina Council on Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

March 16, 2022

I am Gail Fennell in Ward 6 represented by Dan LeBlanc. I am speaking in favour of the motion to regulate non-essential pesticide use. Thank you to the Councillors sponsoring the motion.

I am one of the Nature Regina volunteers who cares for a public garden at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and am speaking on behalf of Nature Regina.

For almost 30 years, Nature Regina volunteers have shown a garden can be successfully cared for with no pesticides or herbicides. Pesticides and fertilizers would have been easily available through Wascana Park. We chose instead to create a healthy sustainable urban habitat using neither.

The biodiversity in this one garden is far beyond that of the much larger area of the park surrounding it. The garden is a thriving community of 120 native plant species growing in a healthy clay soil, 45+ resident and migrating bird species, 80 identified pollinator and invertebrate species and several small mammal species.

The garden could not be a designated Monarch Way Station nor a designated David Suzuki Foundation Butterflyway pollinator hotspot if we used chemicals to control the unwanted plants and insects or to enhance plant growth.

In December 2021, the Society for Organic Urban Landcare awarded Greener Greenspaces recognition to the Nature Regina garden at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and to the Peace Garden at Knox Metropolitan United Church along with 24 other public gardens across Canada.

Greener Greenspaces recognizes sites that exemplify greener greenspace stewardship. The program showcases examples of ecologically-focused land care as a means to inspire others across Canada.

Forward thinking landscape designers and land care companies are making the change away from chemicals and carbon-expensive yard care to methods causing less collateral damage to non-target species, including humans, and the environment.

I understand that some people worry Regina will be overrun with weeds if cosmetic use of pesticides is restricted. Yet, restricting cosmetic use of pesticides is an important and easily attainable component
of urban land care. Fears and myths around restrictions are being dispelled as more cites turn to regulation for aesthetic purposes.

Wise choices in plants and care techniques means there is no space for unwanted plants to gain a foothold and beneficial insects are in sufficient numbers to control any outbreaks of unwanted insects. This in turn limits aesthetic damage to plants. All done without any chemicals.

There are successful alternatives to chemicals for aesthetics. Regulation will support and complement green infrastructure which in turn will reduce the cost of maintaining and renovating landscaped spaces.

2022 is SOUL’s Year of the Ecological Garden. Volunteers caring for the public gardens at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and Knox Metropolitan United Church have shown that healthy, biodiverse chemical-free gardens can be successfully maintained over many years.

Councillors, will you celebrate healthy, sustainable care of Regina’s greenspaces in 2022 by committing to join the 300+ Canadian communities and 7 provinces who regulate cosmetic chemical use for yard care?

Can I and Nature Regina count on you, Mayor Masters and Councillors, to make Regina a healthier place for people, pets, birds and pollinators by voting in favour of the Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides?

Thank you for the time to speak to you this afternoon.

Respectfully submitted,
Gail Fennell

Nature Regina volunteer garden leader
David Suzuki Foundation Butterflyway volunteer Ranger
Ward 6 represented by Councillor Dan LeBlanc

---

I am speaking today in favour of City Council’s motion to undertake a review of the regulation of non-essential (cosmetic) use of pesticides.

I am a member of Regina’s Bird Friendly City team, which comprises members of Nature Regina, Nature Saskatchewan, concerned citizens of Regina from the scientific and naturalist community, as well as other wildlife organizations.

As one of only nine “Tree Cities of the World”, Regina has created an urban forest that is home to a vibrant bird community; Wascana Park alone has 276 different species. Many of Regina’s residents are avid bird watchers and become citizen scientists by participating in such programs as Project FeederWatch in the winter and the Great Backyard Bird Count in February, the five-year SK Breeding Bird Atlas, Owl surveys and more. Members of Nature Regina have participated in the annual continent-wide Christmas Bird Count for over 70 years. Since 2010, Nature Saskatchewan has hosted an Annual Christmas Bird Count for children (CBC4Kids) with attendance increasing annually.

Nature Regina’s Get Outside! Kids Club, sponsored by the City of Regina and Sask Lotteries, has introduced more than 2,000 young people to birdwatching in the last two years. The Get Outside! Preschool Club, a pilot project courtesy of funding from the City of Regina in partnership with Nature Regina, has introduced around 500 children and their parents to birdwatching at Les Sherman Park and A.E. Wilson Park this year. All of the kids have loved birdwatching! These have been some of the best nature experiences and many families are now keen birdwatchers. Facebook views for Nature Regina’s Outdoor Adventure Guides/Wandering Wednesdays program, which is sponsored by the Community Initiatives Fund and the City of Regina Community Grant Program, reached around 22,000 for the Backyard Birdwatching guide.

So now you know that many citizens of Regina love having birds in our city. As bird lovers, they are very concerned about them. Here’s why:

In 2019, Researchers at Cornell’s Lab of Ornithology and Canada’s National Wildlife Research Centre found that wild bird populations in the continental U.S. and Canada have declined by 29 percent since 1970. In fifty years, 3 BILLION birds have been lost (and much of these losses are caused by human activities) – “…steep, long-term losses across virtually all groups of birds in the US and Canada.”

According to Nature Canada the five major threats to birds in Canada are:

- Habitat loss
- Pesticides and contaminants
- Invasive species and cats
- Collision
- Climate crisis
“Industrial-scale use of chemical pesticides in agriculture and forestry pose a major contemporary threat to a large number of bird species in Canada. These poisons kill insects that birds feed on, and plants that birds, or their insect prey, feed and live on. Birds that feed on insects, especially aerial insectivores, birds that feed almost exclusively on insects while on the wing, show some of the steepest declines of any bird group.”

Also in September 2019, Dr. Margaret Eng and Dr. Christy Morrisey of the University of Saskatchewan, and Dr. Bridget Stutchbury of York University published a study showing that widespread use of a neonicotinoid insecticide could be contributing to steep declines in songbird populations.

“… results seem to be associated with the appetite suppression effect of imidacloprid,” says Dr. Margaret Eng. “The dosed birds ate less food, and it’s likely that they delayed their flight because they needed more time to recover and regain their fuel stores.” Neonicotinoids like imidacloprid are the most widely used group of agricultural insecticides in the world. They have been shown to have toxic effects on insects, and this study adds to growing evidence that the negative impacts extend to other organisms as well. “Neonics have far-reaching effects in the ecosystems where they are released,” says Dr. Silke Nebel, Vice-President of Conservation and Science at Bird Studies Canada. “The continued use of neonics in Canada directly contributes to the decline of our bird populations, and their insect prey.”

If you haven’t heard of neonicotinoid pesticides (or neonics), they are similar to nicotine, which is naturally found in nightshade plants like tobacco. Neonics are supposedly less harmful to humans but are poisonous to bees and many other insects and animals (including birds).

The threat of neonics and other chemical pesticides to bird populations is not exclusive to agriculture and forestry. These chemicals are common in many gardening products used for insect control at various stages, such as seed treatment or spray. “Several pesticides like herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides, etc. are applied unintentionally at higher concentrations even in small urban areas such as lawns, gardens and impermeable surfaces. Consequent to their indiscriminate use, both extensively and intensively, in the urban areas, contamination of pesticides poses a serious threat to the environment, living organisms and food safety.”

Let’s not forget when it comes to getting rid of “pests” we can let the birds here do some of the work. For a nesting pair of chickadees to produce three healthy, 10-gram fledglings by the end of their 16-day nesting cycle, they must supply 390-570 insects PER DAY for their young to survive and leave the nest. Flying insects make up 99% of a Barn Swallow’s diet and they can consume as many as 60 insects per hour.
Why are birds important? In addition to their essential role in maintaining healthy and resilient ecosystems by insect control and plant pollination and dispersal, David Sibley, author and illustrator of Sibley’s [bird] Guides, answers that well.

“Birds make any place a chance for discovery, they make a garden seem wild, they are a little bit of wilderness coming into a city park, and for a bird watcher every walk is filled with anticipation. What feathered jewel might drop out of the sky next?”

It is my sincere hope that this review reaches the conclusion that the city needs to move away from the use of non-essential cosmetic pesticides and that “non-essential” does not end up with a narrow definition.

Mayor Masters and Councillors, I ask you to vote in favor of MN22-1 Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Ehman
Bird Friendly City Team

---

i NatureCanada-BirdCity-V5.pdf
ii Nature In Wascana | Wascana Centre
iii Birding | Nature Regina
iv Get Outside! | Nature Regina
v Bird Populations Declining Fast Across North America - Emagazine.com
vi Manuscript_fig (cornell.edu)
vii Major Threats to Birds in Canada | Birds Canada | Oiseaux Canada
viii Neonics Harm the Birds AND the Bees | Birds Canada | Oiseaux Canada
ix Neonicotinoid pesticides | The Great Sunflower Project
x https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969719346030
xi A Chickadee’s Guide to Gardening: How to Create Habitat for Birds in Urban Settings - Ecological Landscape Alliance (ecolandscaping.org)
My name is Sarah Valentine.

I wish to discuss the medical implications of pesticides on citizens, wildlife, and the ecosystem at large. I believe it is in Regina’s best interest for the longevity of the city to consider banning the use of pesticides and would like to discuss this with the council.
Presentation of the Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides (SNAP) to the Regina City Council about the Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

by Paule Hjertaas, President and spokesperson of SNAP, the Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides.

3 march 2022

Thank you for allowing the Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides (SNAP Inc) to speak today in favour of a pesticide bylaw in Regina.

I have suffered severe health issues from pesticide exposure, repeatedly making me sick for several days at a time. This led to me researching the health and environmental effects of pesticide use. As a result of this research, and my health condition, I became an advocate for alternatives to pesticides. I founded SNAP in order to collate the results of my studies, and provide a way of informing people on those topics as well as pesticide alternatives available.

Twice before, SNAP has spoken to the city of Regina in support of a pesticide bylaw, in 2002 and 2012. I have links to the previous documents and presentations on SNAP web site (1)

The City of Regina set up an IPM (Integrated Pest Management) Committee from 2004 to 2007 which managed to accomplish little to nothing in the realm of pesticide reduction. I described it as “the blind leading the blind” and it was disbanded after 3 years.(3) This result unfortunately matches other IPM efforts and results. (10,11,12)

Then Regina hired a Parks director with prior experience in these cultural approaches to weed and insect control and the administration culture began to change. This resulted in a significant decrease in all pesticide use and I can now use the parks most of the time to the exclusion of Wascana, which still seems to spray as much as before.

How far has Regina come? When I started requesting a pesticide bylaw in Regina, city staff only responded to complaints and there were a lot more about weeds than spraying. Now, we can see a massive change in the city’s direction through its Official Community Plan, with the park administration’s approach, as well as in the public. The native plant garden at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum is popular, as is its annual plant sale. There is increasing popular concern about pollinators and wildlife. More natural products are available at retailers such as corn gluten meal and even organic manure. People want pollinator gardens. People are concerned that the bedding plants they purchase have been treated with neonicotinoids that would kill their pollinators. Some large retailers have responded by offering neonic-free plants. It seems to me that citizen awareness is there and all we need now is a push to educate people on these alternatives and ensure that natural lawn care services are available.

Councillor Stadnichuk’s motion is striking in that it does not question the effects of pesticides on wildlife, pets, people and the environment. It states them as facts in whereas 3 and 4, facts that are backed up by hundreds if not thousands of studies. It also builds on Regina’s current commitment to environmental sustainability, health, and well-being through its to Official Community Plan (whereas 2). Also noted are the therefore of the motion. Councillor Stadnichuk is not asking for someone to go
plagiarize the home page of the PMRA web site to justify current pesticide use. No. She is asking for review of the research on how the elimination of cosmetic pesticides protects our biodiversity, especially birds and pollinators like bees and butterflies. The SNAP web site has a large wildlife section (5) with research on negative effects of pesticides on wildlife and on bee die-off (6). I would be happy to help with this research if needed. There is no mention of researching the effects of pesticides on human health. In case anyone wants to know, the SNAP web site also has an extensive section of human health effects. (9) Also requested is that the administration summarize the best practices in Canada to maintain green spaces and yards without the cosmetic use of pesticides; that would mean going to other municipalities who have been successful with these methods such as Toronto, Halifax, Peterborough, etc. One can even talk to the Mr Yeaman, P.A. park director, who has even tried a steam weeder to replace Roundup uses. Once more, the SNAP web site has resources under alternatives and programs (7,8)

In conclusion, there is so much overwhelming evidence of the harm caused by pesticides to people, wildlife, pollinators and the environment, that we are now taking that harm for granted. There are now many municipalities with successful chemical-free programs and bylaws that Regina only has to ask to share others’ experience. Regina has also already started educating through the City of Regina Pests and Wildlife page (4).

We’ve taken the first steps. Let’s finish the journey.

I am happy to answer any questions on any topic mentioned above.

Thank you.

References:
1. https://www.snapinfo.ca/issues/bylaws/provincial/Saskatchewan
2. www.snapinfo.ca
5. https://www.snapinfo.ca/info/wildlife-section/insects also pages on birds, aquatic organisms, mammals, endangered species, etc.
6. https://www.snapinfo.ca/issues/bee-die-off
7. https://www.snapinfo.ca/info/alternatives-to-pesticides, several pages for insects, weeds, diseases, mammals
9. https://www.snapinfo.ca/info/health with many pages on most body systems.
11. In April 2003, Quebec was the first province to regulate the use and sales of cosmetic pesticides, when it introduced the Quebec Pesticides Management Code. The May 1991 cosmetic pesticide bylaw
by the town of Hudson was the first cosmetic pesticide bylaw in Canada. The 2001 Spraytech v Hudson case set the precedent in the Supreme Court of Canada as regards the enforcement of municipal by-laws against pesticides. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pesticides_in_Canada#cite_note-14 )

Presumably to avoid further bylaws, the lawn care industry claimed to be using IPM which would bring a reduction in pesticide use. Unfortunately for them, the Quebec Government keeps track of pesticide sales. The government data indicated an increased pesticide use during that period, rather than a decrease. (personal communication, Michel Gaudet)

12. https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2021/10/ipm-integrated-pest-management-fails-to-stop-toxic-pesticide-use/ “The research team, all of whom have worked as IPM scientists and proponents, seems to mourn that IPM has “lost its way” over the decades — moving from ecological and health concerns as primary to its current state, in which (usually chemical) control methods are central. They note, “In cases where the concept of ecology is used in IPM, environmentalism is referenced more often than ecology, i.e., the aim to reduce negative environmental impacts, rather than using ecological processes to replace chemical pesticides.”
Submission to Regina City Council

Re: Motion to Regulate the Cosmetic Use of Pesticides

Submitted by Phil Johnson

This submission to Council is in support of the motion to regulate the cosmetic use of pesticides in Regina.

I have owned property in Regina for nearly thirty years. I grow food, ornamental plants, and have a small lawn. It is a pollinator garden, with many native perennials, shrubs and trees, and it is alive with bees, beneficial insects, and birds.

I am a certified Organic Master Gardener, and accredited practitioner member of the Society for Organic Urban Landcare, a national organization. I provide professional gardening advice and assistance to private homeowners. I also advise and assist community groups with their gardening and landcare projects.

A nearly completed project I’m involved with is the renovation and expansion of the Peace Garden at Knox-Metropolitan United Church, in a very visible location along Victoria Avenue in the downtown. This is an ecological garden, comprised of perennials, including many native plants, that are not only beautiful but that also provide food and habitat for pollinators, beneficial insects and birds.

Another project beginning this year is the planning and development of a Food Forest in the existing Art Park on 11th Avenue. This project is under the auspices of the Heritage Community Association in conjunction with Nature Regina and the Every Bite Project.

I do not use pesticides in my own garden, in clients’ gardens, or in community-based projects. Pesticides create more harm than good, and simply are not needed.

I support the motion because of the impact of pesticides on both human health and on the environment.

I accept the research now linking various pesticides to disease in humans. Of course, this research is always challenged by the chemical pesticide industry. The most commonly used herbicide in the world (and likely in Regina too) is glyphosate, which is the active ingredient in Roundup. The International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified glyphosate as “probably carcinogenic to humans”. Since 2015, in the U.S., there have been 100,000 lawsuits settled against Roundup maker Monsanto (now Bayer) on behalf of people who regularly used Roundup in their employment and who developed cancer, primarily non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Monsanto/Bayer has so far paid out $11 Billion in settlements, with another 26,000 lawsuits pending. Nevertheless, the company still refuses to provide warning labels on the Roundup container, though it has stated that it will take the product off the U.S. market in 2023.

I am also concerned about the effects of pesticides on the environment and particularly on our rapidly declining insect and bird populations. Most insects are not annoying mosquitoes and hornets. Most insects are beneficial and actually do most of the world’s pest control work, free of charge. We seldom
see these predators at work, but they are very effective if we let them do their jobs. This means that we need to stop killing them with insecticides, and stop destroying their habitats with herbicides.

The famous biologist E.O. Wilson said that “if insects were to vanish, the environment would collapse into chaos”. Far from being bothersome pests, the vast majority of insects are our allies. They keep pests in check, they pollinate many of our food crops and almost all plants on earth, and they are food for birds. In another famous phrase from E.O. Wilson, insects are “the little things that run the world”.

Fortunately, there are successful alternatives to the chemical pesticide model. The City of Regina already uses organically approved bacterial pesticides for mosquitoes and canker worms. However, this method also impacts the food supply and populations of many beneficial insects and birds. Another approach to pest management is to create habitat for beneficial insects and birds in backyards and in parks. This is quite easy to do, since beneficial insects are attracted to colourful flowers, as are we, and to the nectar flowers provide. Insects come for the nectar, birds come for berries and seeds, and stay for the protein meal if they find a few caterpillars or beetles dining on nearby leaves.

What we are asking the City of Regina to do is not radical or impossible. Some 200 municipalities across Canada have already banned the cosmetic use of pesticides. A ban is good for people, and it is good for the environment. Pesticide use in the city may already be declining. Still, homeowners should not be subject to the pesticide drift from the neighbour spraying his lawn or shrubs. Many here in Regina are already in transition, as home gardeners and landcare professionals recognize that a continued pesticide assault on insects, birds and plants is unsustainable if we want a livable planet. We need to save the pollinators, the monarchs, and the birds - we rely on them, and they depend on us. And that is why I support this motion.

Thank you.

Some useful websites:

[Lawsuit-information-center.com](http://Lawsuit-information-center.com)  Provides background and updates on the ongoing Roundup lawsuit in the U.S.

[Cwf-fcf.org](http://Cwf-fcf.org)  The Canadian Wildlife Federation website has articles on pesticides and pollinator-friendly gardening.

[Snapinfo.ca](http://Snapinfo.ca)  The Saskatchewan Network for Alternatives to Pesticides website focuses on the effects of pesticides and alternatives to their use.

[Xerces.org/pesticides](http://Xerces.org/pesticides)  Xerces is an organization focused on the conservation and importance of insects.
Request to speak to Council

Regarding the Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

To be discussed by Council on March 16, 2022

Presenter – Dr. Robert Wright, Vegetation Management Specialist and Plant Ecologist

I would respectfully ask to relate to Council my experience with the control of Leafy Spurge, a serious invasive noxious weed, in the Saskatchewan Provincial Park system.

Leafy Spurge is an invasive exotic weed that threaten the biodiversity of native vegetation. Over a period of 10 years, I advised a program for control this species in several parks of the Saskatchewan Provincial Park system. We employed prescribed burning, herbicide applications (e.g., tordon, etc.) and leafy spurge beetle establishment to attempt to achieve control.

Our experience was that burning and herbicide applications, alone, were not sufficient to control Spurge. With Leafy Spurge, herbicides had a short-term effect on the abundance of the plant but resurgence from the seed bank and the deep root system quickly re-established the dominance of the species in problem areas. Our application of beetles was successful at White Butte Recreation Site in that the population became established but we failed to monitor for long enough to know if the beetles could effectively reduce the prevalence of Leafy Spurge.

The problem with using herbicide is that there is a very negative impact on native plant species as they are also killed by herbicide. Herbicides never succeed in controlling exotic weeds unless the entire plant community is destroyed and then established again from seed. That is not a feasible alternative in native vegetation.

I believe, from our experience in the Provincial Park system, that the missing pieces in the control puzzle are grazing and patience with the beetles. I believe introducing grazing, along with a much longer time expectation for reducing leafy spurge through the establishment of spurge beetles, is probably the only feasible long-term strategy for controlling this weed.

Leafy spurge, and many other invasive exotics, are here to stay. They are part of the new natural but we certainly don’t want them to dominate that new natural. To achieve control of Leafy Spurge, so that it stays as a minor part of the vegetation, it is my professional opinion that the City of Regina ought to rely on establishing beetle populations and then use targeted grazing, perhaps with goats, to control bad infestations and to re-establish the dominance of more desirable plant species.

With Respect,

Dr. Rob Wright.
Submission to Regina City Council

Re: Motion to ban cosmetic use of pesticides

Submitted by:

Devon Anderson

I am writing to support the motion to ban cosmetic pesticide use.

I have been a homeowner in Regina for almost 30 years, and we have never used pesticides in our yard. Once we learned how dangerous these supposedly ‘harmless’ or ‘benign’ chemicals were, we simply didn’t use them. In spite of that fact, many people think we have a pretty nice yard – it was one of the yards on New Dance Horizon’s Secret Gardens Tour not many years ago.

Are there any of us who don’t know anyone with cancer? It’s an epidemic, and if there’s even just a chance pesticides contribute to it (let alone a proven fact), I don’t think we should be taking that chance. The toxic elements in these pesticides get into the soil, into the water, into the food we eat, and into the air we breathe. I don’t want to go for a walk on a nice spring day only to be forced to breathe in toxic substances any time I go by an area where someone has used a pesticide or herbicide – where is my choice in that? Does anyone want their children or grandchildren unknowingly playing on grass covered with a possibly cancer-causing substance?

No doubt some will complain they need to use pesticides/herbicides because they won’t have a so-called ‘perfect’ lawn without the use of these substances, and they know no alternative method of yard care. I think as a society we’ll soon get over that. When smoking was first banned many people were upset but we went ahead anyway, knowing it was for the good of the whole. Most of us got used to it - I doubt many of us want to go back to the days when nearly every public space was filled with cigarette smoke! We got used to wearing masks during the height of the pandemic. I’m confident the same will happen with banning cosmetic pesticide use – we’ll get used to it and eventually we’ll wonder why we ever did it any other way.
Our environment is critical to our health. What are we putting into it?

The wide-scale use of chemical pesticides, designed to repel, incapacitate, or kill weeds and pests in agriculture, or for cosmetic uses on lawns, gardens, parks and golf courses, have unintended impacts by inundating our environment\(^1\), contaminating wildlife, our food\(^2\), waterways, drinking water\(^3\), and even finding their way into our bloodstream\(^4\) and breast milk\(^5\).

A recent UN report\(^6\) outlines how pesticides adversely impact our human rights to health and a healthy environment, explaining that national and international legislation fails “to protect humans and the environment from hazardous pesticides… and to effectively apply the precautionary principle” (resisting the introduction of new products with disputed or unknown ultimate consequences). The many useful recommendations in the UN report, to protect human health and the environment, are actively being stifled by pressure from the chemical pesticide industry.

Certain pesticides endanger our food supply, for example, neonicotinoids (neonics) that are thought to be disabling our bee population\(^7\) and therefore wiping out the pollinators crucial for our food production, not to mention the “superweed” crisis brought on by glyphosate pesticides. Recent research shows that pesticides residues are found in most non-organic foods\(^8\), from our cereals to nutraceuticals and baby foods\(^9\). Since pesticide legislation has been identified\(^10\) as the major challenge in striving towards global health, food safety and security\(^11\), we need to work in our city to reduce pesticide use as much as possible.

Our health, and the health of our communities, are on the line here. Exposure to avoidable environmental pollutants, including pesticides, can cause oxidative stress in cells that hamper fetal development and make our children more prone to disease\(^12\). Children interact with their physical environment in a very different manner than adults, and so are uniquely susceptible\(^13,14\) to environmental toxicants. I have watched a toddler in a city space rip out grass and pop it in their mouth, adjacent to a herbicide application sign that went unnoticed by his mother, and many pesticides are prone to drift in strong Saskatchewan winds, even when applied carefully. With many schools shifting to an outdoor learning focus, a great example of which is Prairie Sky School, it becomes imperative that we can offer a healthy and safe environment for our children.

But it’s not just our little ones — we adults are far from immune. In your daily life, it is likely that you are unwittingly exposed to numerous harmful pesticides. One recent study\(^15\) describes how environmental toxins, including pesticides, can short circuit our stress response pathways and lead to psychological disorders, which should be especially disturbing in the midst of multiple Canadian mental health crises.

Organochlorinated and organophosphate (glyphosate, found in Roundup) pesticides act as endocrine disruptors, causing oxidative stress to our cells that can lead to disrupted metabolism\(^17\), breast cancer, ovarian problems, cancer of the testes, thyroid eruptions, Alzheimer disease, schizophrenia, and nerve damage. Exposure to pesticides further increases the risk of multiple myeloma, cancer of the white blood cells\(^18\), blood cancer...
that originates in the bone marrow, ageing of stem cells that are needed to regenerate our organs, and Parkinson’s disease thought to be partially brought on by oxidative stress. This is one of the things we have studied in my laboratory – the oxidative stress caused by common pesticides such as 2,4-D.

Remember, it’s not just disease that threatens our health — we also need clean food, water and air to live healthily. The ecological impact on our environment is enormous, underscoring the need to keep our environment clean and consider alternatives to chemical pesticides. There are many alternatives without such harmful impacts. The ancient practice of bacterial pesticides ultimately led to the development of our 20th century genetically modified Bt (Bacillus thuringiensis) pesticide that we use in the city. The use of phytochemicals (biologically active compounds from plants) and essential oils also originated in ancient times, with renewed contemporary interest including antibacterial, antifungal and pest deterrent properties for air quality, agricultural food preservation, pesticides and insecticides. Many of these alternatives, including the precautionary principle, are clearly outlined in the UN report. These options are usually inexpensive and accessible — we only need the political will to enact them.

Reducing pesticides makes dollars and sense. Toxic chemicals, including pesticides are tied to almost 340 billion in annual US spending, for costs to the health system and lost wages — almost double that of the European Union which better limits exposure through more stringent regulations. So armed with all of this information, why are we not protecting our environment for us, future generations, ensuring our health legacy and our provincial financial stability by eliminating or reducing chemical pesticide use? We need to be thinking upstream, using the precautionary principle before releasing pesticides into the environment and limiting the use of pesticides.

There is a great deal we can do in our lives to reduce chemical pesticide exposure, including alternative methods for lawn and garden care. Let’s make this motion a first step towards a healthier Regina. Please vote in favor of MN22-1 Motion to Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides.


MOTION TO REGULATE THE NON-ESSENTIAL (COSMETIC) USE OF PESTICIDES

My name is Catherine Gibson and I am speaking on behalf of myself and any others who believe we have the right to a Healthy Environment. For many years I have wanted a regulation that would ban the cosmetic use of pesticides on lawns and gardens in the city of Regina. The whys and wherefores are adequately spelled out in the WHEREAS portion of the motion. On the one hand, this may seem like small potatoes given the global atmosphere in which we live and about which we can do next to nothing. On the other hand, this is OUR small potatoes and we can DO something about it. The can has been kicked down the road for far too long. There have been countless studies. By now there must be more than enough information on best practices. Given the lead time necessary for retailers to adjust their annual purchases, there will be ample time for public consultations in that period. The good people at Saskatchewan Environmental Society in Saskatoon prepared a proposal for Regina and recommended a city wide ‘ban’ as the best option. I presented the executive summary of it to a Safety Committee in March of 2017. In a nutshell it encompasses the Precautionary Principle with the Do Unto Others Golden Rule.

My personal experience with herbicides of the Roundup Glyphosate type was encountering, at face level, a drift from aerial spraying. It amounted to two seconds of exposure and seven months of respiratory distress. The SES study indicated that the intensity of use by householders was 4 times that of agriculture use and was reported as tonnes per hectare. I consider myself to be fluent in weights and measures from Apothecary, Avoirdupois to British Imperial and Metric but I cannot convert tonnes per hectare to how much to apply on the front lawn. It is not an issue since I do not use it but I understand why household use might be so high.

I suspect there might be pushback from industry and possibly retailers. This is because of the close connection between Monsanto and NRC Saskatoon where the genetic engineering for Roundup Ready Canola was done and also between Monsanto and the College of Agriculture at U of S.

Please fast track this motion and its implementation.

Catherine Gibson
MOTION

March 16, 2022

To: Mayor Masters and City Councillors

Re: Regulate the Non-essential (Cosmetic) Use of Pesticides

WHEREAS we all desire a safe and healthy environment in Regina for the wellbeing of all residents;

WHEREAS the Official Community Plan identifies the significance of environmental sustainability, health, and well-being;

WHEREAS we need to protect biodiversity in nature and create a healthy environment for birds and pollinators like bees and butterflies;

WHEREAS the cosmetic use of pesticides is unnecessary, creates needless exposure to toxic substances and poses health risks to humans, pets and other animals, birds and beneficial insects;

WHEREAS the province of Saskatchewan is one of only three provinces that does not regulate the cosmetic use of pesticides;

WHEREAS the City of Regina has reduced its use of cosmetic pesticides in its parks but has no bylaws regulating the cosmetic use of pesticides on city or private property;

WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in the landmark decision Canada Ltee (Spraytech, Societe d’arrosage) v. Hudson (Town), [2001] 2 S.C.R 241, 2001 SCC 40 that municipalities have the right to act in the public interest by restricting cosmetic pesticide use on both public and private property;

WHEREAS over 200 municipalities across Canada, and the entire province of Ontario, have regulated or banned the cosmetic use of pesticides -- in some cases for over 20 years; and

WHEREAS hundreds of cities and towns across Canada with bans on cosmetic pesticides continue to have beautiful lawns, gardens, parks and green spaces by using non-toxic alternatives to control weeds or insects

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Regina City Council direct Administration to prepare a report for Executive Committee by Q4 of 2022 that includes:

1. A review of the research on how the elimination of cosmetic pesticides protects our biodiversity, especially birds and pollinators like bees and butterflies;
2. A summary of the regulation and best practices in Canada to maintain green spaces and yards without the cosmetic use of pesticides;

3. Feedback from the public through community engagement on a cosmetic pesticide ban; and

4. Recommendations and implications of implementing a cosmetic pesticide ban and the funding requirement for a public education and communications plan on such a ban including the promotion of safe alternative products and best practices for yards, gardens and parks.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Stadnichuk
Councillor – Ward 1

Andrew Stevens
Councillor – Ward 3

Dan LeBlanc
Councillor – Ward 6

Shanon Zachidniak
Councillor – Ward 8

John Findura
Councillor – Ward 5
Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation - Appointment of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Mayor Masters and City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>CR22-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

That City Council:

Authorize the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability, as the City’s proxy, to exercise the City’s voting rights at the upcoming Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation (BPWTC) membership meeting to elect the following individuals to the Board of Directors for a three-year term, ending April 30, 2025:

- Judy May (re-appointment); and
- Dale Schoffer (re-appointment).

**HISTORY**

At the March 9, 2022 meeting of the Executive Committee, the Committee considered in private session, the attached E22-6 report from the Financial Strategy & Sustainability Division.

The Committee adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.
Recommendation #2 in the attached report does not require City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk 3/11/2022

ATTACHMENTS
E22-6 Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation - Appointment of Directors
Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation - Appointment of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 9, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Financial Strategy &amp; Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>E22-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Committee recommends that City Council:

1. Authorize the Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability, as the City’s proxy, to exercise the City’s voting rights at the upcoming Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation (BPWTC) membership meeting to elect the following individuals to the Board of Directors for a three-year term, ending April 30, 2025:
   Judy May (re-appointment); and
   Dale Schoffer (re-appointment).

2. Approve this report at its March 16, 2022 meeting.

ISSUE

Administration requires delegated authority from City Council to exercise the City of Regina’s voting rights at a BPWTC membership meeting in accordance with the direction provided by City Council.
IMPACTS

The Governance and Nominating Committee has recommended the re-appointment of the two individuals listed below as desirable appointees to the Board of Directors. Each will be appointed for an additional three-year term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPWTC Board of Directors</th>
<th>Term of Office Expires</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy May</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
<td>Reappointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schoffer</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
<td>Reappointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these appointments, the seven members on the new BPWTC’s Board of Directors will comprise of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPWTC Board of Directors</th>
<th>Term of Office Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Boots</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Posehn</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Warsaba</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Richards</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Ring</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schoffer</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy May</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER OPTIONS

Pursuant to a Unanimous Membership Agreement (UMA) between the City of Regina, City of Moose Jaw and the BPWTC, Directors of the BPWTC are to be nominated by a Governance and Nominating Committee, which consists of two members of the current Board and the City Managers or their respective delegates from each city. The Executive Director, Financial Strategy & Sustainability served as the City of Regina’s member on the Committee. Once a slate of candidates is put forward by the Governance and Nominating Committee, each City Council may vote to appoint the slate of candidates or direct that the Governance and Nominating Committee bring forward an alternative slate of candidates. If the Cities cannot agree to appoint the slate of candidates being proposed after two attempts, then a final slate of candidates will be brought forward to each Council, but only the approval of the City of Regina will be required, as the City of Regina is the majority membership owner.

COMMUNICATIONS

After all Board appointments are finalized, the BPWTC will notify the successful appointees.
Effective January 1, 2016, Buffalo Pound Water Treatment Corporation (BPWTC) was incorporated under The Non-profit Corporations Act, 1995 (Saskatchewan) (the Act), with the City of Regina and City of Moose Jaw being the voting members. The Articles of Incorporation and UMA provides for a BPWTC Board of Directors between five to nine voting directors. The Board of the BPWTC is currently comprised of the following seven directors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffalo Pound Water Board of Directors</th>
<th>Term of Office Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Boots</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Posehn</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Warsaba</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Richards</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Ring</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schoffer</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy May</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The board appointment process has recently been reviewed and revised to include best practices and include multiple inputs with self-assessments, peer-to-peer review, identification of growth objectives and tie performance to the Strategic Plan’s Balances Score Card. The revised process, facilitated by a third party, serves as an input into the suitability of current Board members and potential recommendation of individuals for reappointment. Where no individuals are identified for re-appointment, or where a skill or experience gap is identified, new Board members would be sought using the open recruitment process.

The Board commenced the new process in 2021 and this is the second year using the process. Both incumbent directors whose three-year terms are expiring in April 2022, Judy May and Dale Schoffer have expressed their interest in being re-appointed. Based on the performance evaluation of Judy May and Dale Schoffer, the BPWTC Board supports their re-appointment. Based on this recommendation and given the BPWTC is in the process of launching a major water plant renewal project, the Governance and Nominating Committee is recommending their re-appointment. Judy May has a deep corporate and customer services expertise and has served on several boards and councils. Dale Schoffer is a Chartered Professional Accountant and currently a partner and senior consultant with Integrity Frameworks.
In summary, the Governance and Nominating Committee has identified the two individuals listed below as desirable appointees to the Board of Directors. The reappointments and appointment to the BPWTC Board would be for three-year terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPWTC Board of Directors</th>
<th>Term of Office Expires</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy May</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
<td>Reappointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schoffer</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
<td>Reappointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these appointments, the seven members on the new BPWTC’s Board of Directors will comprise of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPWTC Board of Directors</th>
<th>Term of Office Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Boots</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Posehn</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Warsaba</td>
<td>April 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Richards</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Ring</td>
<td>April 30, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Schoffer</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy May</td>
<td>April 30, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is seeking delegated authority to exercise the City’s voting rights to fill the two positions on the Board of Directors.

Nominations are tentatively scheduled for consideration at the regular meetings of both Regina City Council on Wednesday, March 16, 2022, and Moose Jaw City Council on Monday March 14, 2022.

**DECISION HISTORY**

The recommendation contained in this report requires City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,  
Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Abi Yusuf, Coordinator Financial & Business Support
Advance Notice of Water Shutoff Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Mayor Masters and City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Water, Waste &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>CR22-33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council remove item MN21-12, Advance Notice of Water Shutoff, from the List of Outstanding Items for City Council.

HISTORY

At the March 9, 2022 meeting of Executive Committee, the Committee considered the attached EX22-25 report from the Citizen Services Division.

The Committee adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Respectfully submitted,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk 3/11/2022
ATTACHMENTS
EX22-25 - Advance Notice of Water Shutoff Update
Appendix A - Municipal Scan
Advance Notice of Water Shutoff Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 9, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Citizen Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Water, Waste &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>EX22-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Executive Committee recommends that City Council remove item MN21-12, Advance Notice of Water Shutoff, from the list of outstanding items for City Council.

**ISSUE**

This report responds to Motion *Advance Notice of Water Shutoff (MN21-12)*:

1. Options to improve the advanced notice provided to citizens whose:
   a. Water service is going to be shut off; or
   b. Road is going to be temporarily closed.

2. A plan that shall include the above options to be implemented for the 2022 construction season, and the development of the Advanced Metering Infrastructure System for the 2023 construction season and onwards; and

3. Shall expressly consider the following two factors for the advance notice:
   a. The preferability of notice to be provided at least the evening before the anticipated work; and
   b. The preferability of electronic notification of disruption - much as is currently provided for garbage and recycling pickup.
To address MN21-12, the Administration reviewed the City of Regina’s (City) processes and conducted jurisdictional scans to inform a review of the City’s water shutoff notification processes.

IMPACTS

Financial Impact
The Administration has reviewed the current vacant Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) and decided to reallocate resources to ensure water notification process is improved in the future. There is no additional budget required to implement the planned changes.

Policy/Strategic Impacts
The Advance Water Notification is consistent with Design Regina: The Official Community Plan (OCP) as follows:

- Advance water notification meets industry best practices for operations of infrastructure (OCP D4 Goal 1 - Safe and Efficient Infrastructure).
- Advance water notification will improve the level of service to our customer (OCP D4 Goal 2 – Asset Management and Service Levels).

Environmental Impacts
City Council set a community goal for the City of achieving net zero emissions and sourcing of net zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The report has limited direct impacts on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

COMMUNICATIONS

Advance notification letters advising of water outages and road restrictions will be delivered to households where planned maintenance work is scheduled within the next ten days. Letters will be delivered, at least, the evening before the anticipated work and a door-knocker the morning of the repair. This will allow time for residents to draw enough potable water for use in advance of water being shut off. Water outages and service updates for planned maintenance will be available on Regina.ca/wateroutages to provide residents with up-to-date information about temporary water outages in their area. The webpage also includes steps residents can take both to prepare for the water outages and after water supply is resumed.

DISCUSSION

The City is responsible for monitoring and maintaining over 1,200 kilometres of watermains. The
watermain network also contains over 74,000 water service connections, 12,500 water valves and approximately 5,000 fire hydrants. The total replacement cost of the City’s water network is approximately $2.63 billion.

City crews coordinate up to 1,000 planned repairs across the city each year while addressing emergency repairs as needed. The City currently completes water repairs and upgrades using internal construction crews or contractors depending on the repair and project. Watermain breaks occur throughout the year and typically increase during hot, dry summers and the coldest winter months from December to February.

In a standard work week, the City construction crews complete approximately 20 water system repairs and provide approximately 1,000 “Temporary Water Service Outage” door-knockers to residents. On average, the City receives two to three service requests a week about the current water outage notification process.

**Current Water Outage Notification Process**

**City Construction Crews:**

- **Capital Construction Locations**
  A construction notice is delivered to homes approximately one to three weeks in advance of any work starting, informing residents of the upcoming work, what to expect, road closures and start dates. This letter is a general letter explaining that the location is part of the Street Infrastructure Renewal Project (SIRP), Residential Road Renewal Program (RRRP) or a stand-alone water project and within the project water and sewer assets will be getting replaced.

- **Planned Maintenance Locations**
  Once crews are dispatched to a location to complete a repair, the current procedure is for the crew to perform door-to-door notification to residents, advising them that the water will be turned off within the next 30 minutes. If a resident is not home at the time, a blue door-knocker is provided with appropriate information. Water repairs are typically done within four to six hours but are dependent on the complexities of the job. This notice allows residents time to draw enough potable water for drinking and cooking while the work is being completed. If the City is aware that businesses will be affected, we work with the Saskatchewan Health Authority (SHA) and the Water Security Agency (WSA) to provide as much notice as possible and temporary water solutions to the affected businesses.

- **Emergency Locations**
  The construction crews meet daily to evaluate and prioritize their workload with emergency water main breaks and leaks considered the highest priority. Emergency repairs may require early
morning and last-minute rescheduling changes and are unpredictable. The same notification procedure for planned maintenance locations occurs for emergency repairs.

A watermain repair is deemed an emergency when:

- A watermain break is flooding the streets and encroaching into a residence and/or business and there is a risk to the health of the public.
- An occupied property is without water service for longer than a 24-hour period.
- Water service is impacted at priority locations such as daycares, schools, nursing homes, hotels, hospitals, and large businesses.

This process can be disruptive to residents but there are situations where work must be completed immediately for the safety of the public, employees and to avoid property damage.

**External Construction Crews:**

- **Capital Construction Locations**

A construction notice is delivered to the residents approximately one to three weeks in advance prior to any work starting, informing residents of the upcoming work, what to expect, road closures and start dates. This is a general letter explaining that the location is part of SIRP, RRRP or a stand-alone water project and within the project water and sewer assets will be getting replaced.

Most temporary water outages are scheduled in advance. For this type of scheduled service outage, the current procedure is as follows:

- A door-knocker notice with appropriate information, including the time and date of the scheduled water outage, and contact is delivered to each residence.
- These notices are delivered at least the evening before the anticipated work.
- Typical water service outages last four to eight hours, barring unforeseen circumstances during construction.
- For water service outages where it is not possible to provide notice at least the evening before the anticipated work, the contractor performs door-to-door notification to residents, advising them that the water will be turned off. If a resident is not home at the time, they leave a door-knocker notice with appropriate information.

**2022 Water Outage Notification Process Improvements**

The City understands that lack of water service outage notification can be disruptive to residents and are working on options to improve the water outage notification process. Below are some of the
changes that have been implemented and some changes that will be occurring before the 2022 construction season.

- Capital Construction Locations
  - Updated the “Temporary Water Service Outage” door-knocker to provide more information on water maintenance work and direct residents to Regina.ca/wateroutages to learn more.
    - These notices are provided as early as 7:00 a.m. for every repair when the construction crew arrives at the work site.
  - Updated advanced notification letters for capital construction locations
    - Letter is delivered to the residents approximately one to three weeks in advance prior to any work starting, informing them of the upcoming work, what to expect, road closures and start dates.
  - Created a “Temporary Water Service Outage” poster for apartment and condominium buildings.
    - This will allow tenants to see the notice and not rely on the notice from the building manager.
  - Added water outage notifications for major roadways into the daily road report on Regina.ca.
    - This information is also shared with local media outlets and posted on social media.
  - Implemented having the City’s internal maps highlight businesses such as hospitals, schools, care homes and daycares for better planning.

- Planned Maintenance Locations
  - Create advanced notification letters for any planned maintenance work:
    - These letters would be provided, at the least, the evening before the anticipated work and explain that a construction crew will be attending the location within the next ten days, barring unforeseen circumstances and what to expect during the construction work and how to prepare.
    - Resident would still receive the “Temporary Water Service Outage” blue door-knocker the morning of the water outage.
  - Water Service Outage information made available on Regina.ca/wateroutages:
    - Planned maintenance work updated daily.
    - Frequently asked questions and answers section.

2023 and Beyond Notification Process Improvements

- Online Utility Customer Software
  The City is currently undertaking a Water Meter and Automatic Meter Infrastructure Project. As part of this project, software will be implemented that will allow subscribing customers to view their daily
water usage and monthly bills. It also will have the added functionality of providing the City with the ability to communicate directly with those same customers via email and/or text. Water related campaigns and conservation ideas can be communicated to all subscribers or targeted messages sent only to selected customer types (i.e., commercial, residential, etc.). As well, the Administration would be able to send specific messaging regarding upcoming water outages or other advisories to specific customers in selected geographical area. It is anticipated through this software that water outage notifications, including emergency water outages, can be electronically provided to affected residents at least the evening before, in most cases.

**Survey of Other Municipalities**
Administration has completed a review of information provided online and through conversation with staff from other municipalities in Canada regarding advance notification to residents that will be having the water shut off. The purpose of this was to review how they inform residents in a timely manner. Generally, municipalities deliver letters or door-knockers to residents who may be affected by a water outage. For more detailed information on this review, see Appendix A.

**DECISION HISTORY**

On October 13, 2021, City Council adopted *MN21-12* and requested options to provide advanced notice of water shutoff that will outline the resources necessary to provide notice, at least, the evening before the anticipated work, and that the information be included in the report prepared in response to item *MN21-12*.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Kurtis Doney, A/Executive Director, Citizen Services

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A - Municipal Scan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Planned/Maintenance Work</th>
<th>Emergency Work</th>
<th>Website Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regina - Current State</td>
<td>Deliver “Temporary Water Service Outage” door-knockers to residents the morning of the work.</td>
<td>Deliver “Temporary Water Service Outage” door-knockers to residents the morning of the work</td>
<td>City Website: Currently have general information about water main break, construction work, frozen water connections, and water meters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina - Future State</td>
<td>A letter would be provided to resident affected at least the night before construction work would take place and a “Temporary Water Service Outage” door-knocker would be provided to residents the morning of the work.</td>
<td>If residents have signed up for customer portal then they would receive a notification at least the night before construction work would take place in most cases</td>
<td>City Website: Water outages page on the City website with up-to-date information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>Deliver notice in advance of the work, currently a letter but are working towards transitioning to all door-knockers. The notice states a construction crew will be onsite within 1 to 14 days pending weather and any unforeseen emergencies.</td>
<td>Try to deliver notice as soon as possible through a contracted courier service.</td>
<td>City Website: Online interactive construction map – maintenance work is very high level. Upload a PDF of the construction notice to the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>Deliver notice at least 1 to 2 weeks in advance of the construction work, pending weather, and any unforeseen emergencies.</td>
<td>Try to let residents know as soon as possible once the immediate threat to residents’ health and/or their property is eliminated. This can mean that a resident’s water may be shut off without us letting them know beforehand. When we inform the residents, we typically knock at the door and attempt to hand deliver a notice, allowing them the chance to speak to someone face to face and ask questions. The odd time emergency work happens overnight and the water is shut off, we would deliver a notice into a mailbox and wouldn’t be doing any door knocking.</td>
<td>City Website: General Water and Waste Department page with water main activity page featuring ‘myutilityinfo’ map. This map showcases areas where water mains may be shut down or reduced flow for repairs as well as water main flushing, water tank placement and the lead testing program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>No information provided at this time.</td>
<td>Generally, the Water Trouble Truck are the first responders and will also notify customers that are impacted by a shutdown by talking directly with customers or leaving a door-knocker. In most cases, they contact the Dispatch team to help make phone calls to notify customers, particularly if we need to contact a facility manager or something for large buildings and apartments.</td>
<td>City Website: Customer-facing water outage map that shows three different colors depending on leak situation. Red - crews are responding (customers may be out of water), Yellow - crews are responding (customers are not out of water) and Green - Watermain break has been repaired (awaiting surface restoration).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cemeteries Funding Structure, Fee Schedule and Bylaw Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Mayor Masters and City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation &amp; Cultural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>CR22-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

1. Approve the recommended Cemeteries Financial Model in Appendix A which proposes funding major capital infrastructure projects – specifically upgrades to the Administration Building, maintenance shops and future expansions - from current contributions to capital.

2. Approve the Cemeteries Fee Schedule for 2022, 2023 and 2024, as set out in Appendix C, and that the 2022 rates come into effect on the first date of the month following passage of the fee schedule by City Council.

3. Approve the amendments to *The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27* as described in this report and Appendix B.

4. Direct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary amendments to *The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27* to give effect to the Fee Schedule and the additional amendments as described in this report to be brought forward to a meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations by City Council.

HISTORY

At the March 9, 2022 meeting of Executive Committee, the Committee considered the attached EX22-26 report from the City Planning & Community Development Division.
Kenton de Jong, Regina, SK, addressed the Committee.

The Committee adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report after amending the maximum size of the ceramic plaque outlined in Appendix B on page 15, under the “Upright Memorials, Repeal and Replace” section referencing 12.7 cm (5”) be adjusted to read as 13 cm (5 1/8”).

Recommendation #5 does not require City Council approval.

Respectfully submitted,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

[Signature]

3/11/2022

ATTACHMENTS
EX22-26 - Cemeteries Funding Structure, Fee Schedule and Bylaw Amendments
Appendix A - Cemeteries Financial Model Funding Options
Appendix B - Proposed Bylaw Amendments
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Appendix D - Western Canada Cemetery Fee Review
Appendix E - Western Canada Cemetery Funding Models
Cemeteries Funding Structure, Fee Schedule and Bylaw Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 9, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>City Planning &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation &amp; Cultural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>EX22-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Committee recommends that City Council:

1. Approve the recommended Cemeteries Financial Model in Appendix A which proposes funding major capital infrastructure projects – specifically upgrades to the Administration Building, maintenance shops and future expansions - from current contributions to capital.

2. Approve the Cemeteries Fee Schedule for 2022, 2023 and 2024, as set out in Appendix C, and that the 2022 rates come into effect on the first date of the month following passage of the fee schedule by City Council.

3. Approve the amendments to The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27 as described in this report and Appendix B.

4. Direct the City Solicitor to prepare the necessary amendments to The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2008-27 to give effect to the Fee Schedule and the additional amendments as described in this report to be brought forward to a meeting of City Council following approval of these recommendations by City Council.

5. Approve these recommendations at its meeting on March 16, 2022.
ISSUE

Through the 2022 budget process, Council approved $1.7 million in funding from the Cemeteries Reserve to expand the Riverside Memorial Park Cemetery (Riverside Cemetery). While this expansion is required to accommodate the interment needs of the community, the funding of the project creates a deficit in the Cemeteries Reserve of $395,000.

In addition to the Riverside expansion, major capital projects anticipated at the cemeteries within the next 10 years include upgrades to both the Riverside maintenance shop and the Riverside Administration Building at an estimated cost of $3.6 million. It is important to note that smaller annual capital projects such as new columbaria, fence repairs at Regina Cemetery, and other general capital maintenance are also required. Given the need for these capital projects to proceed so that reliable service can be maintained and the fact that the Cemeteries Reserve is currently in a deficit position, Administration is recommending a new financial model for the cemeteries program.

This report also recommends updates to The Cemeteries Bylaw 2008-27 (Cemeteries Bylaw), the majority of which are housekeeping changes or revisions to add more information or clarity to current processes.

IMPACTS

Financial Impact:

Cemeteries Financial Model
A Cemeteries Financial Model has been developed to assess and monitor the revenues and expense of the cemetery service and ensure there are adequate funds to continue to provide consistent and reliable services. The Financial Model can be adjusted to the changing economic climate and priority of capital projects. The Model is intended to provide a long-term financial plan to the Cemeteries operations and will be reviewed annually as part of the budgeting process.

With major capital projects required in the next 10 years, it is recommended that major capital projects – specifically, upgrades or replacements of the Administration Building, maintenance shops and future expansions - be funded by current contributions to capital and that all remaining capital expenses be funded by cemetery revenues. Within the first 10 years, the two projects identified in the Model include the planned upgrades to the Riverside maintenance shop and the upgrade and potential expansion of the Riverside Administration Building. These projects have an estimated cost of $3.6 million over the next 10-year period (2032).
Funding major capital projects from the general capital fund will require the projects to be prioritized against other capital projects and will limit the financial impact on the Cemetery Reserve. At the end of 2021, the Cemetery Reserve’s balance is a deficit of $395,000. Within the recommended financial model it is estimated the Cemetery Reserve will remain in a deficit until 2029.

**Cemeteries Bylaw & Fee Schedule**

Approval of the proposed fee schedule will help ensure there is funding available to meet increased operating expenses and inflation while continuing to address smaller capital infrastructure requirements. The cemeteries expenditures and revenues reflected in the proposed 2022 Operating and Capital Budgets are based on the overall fee increase included in this report.

**Policy and/or Strategic Impact:**

The recommendations proposed in this report support long-term management and maintenance of cemeteries assets. This initiative supports the *Design Regina: The Official Community Plan Bylaw 2013-48* (OCP), specifically:

- **Financial Policies**
  - Goal 1: Use a consistent approach to funding the operation of the City
  - Goal 2: Ensure the City services and amenities are financially sustainable
  - Goal 3: Ensure the sustainability of the City by understanding and planning for the full cost of capital investments, programs and services in advance of development approval and capital procurement

- **Infrastructure Policies**
  - Goal 1: Meet regulatory requirements and industry best practices for design, construction and operation of infrastructure.
  - Goal 2: Ensure infrastructure decisions result in long-term sustainability.
  - Goal 3: The infrastructure needed for growth will be planned from a long-term perspective.

**Environmental Impact:**

City Council set a community goal for the City of achieving net-zero emissions and sourcing of net-zero renewable energy by 2050. In support of this goal, City Council asked Administration to provide energy and greenhouse gas implications of recommendations so that Council can evaluate the climate impacts of its decisions. The recommendations in this report have limited direct impacts on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions.

**OTHER OPTIONS**

Option 1 – Status Quo: Cemetery fees funds all operational and capital expenses, including major capital infrastructure projects. Annual fee increases remain at four per cent.
• This option has the benefit of not impacting the amount of general revenue currently set aside for funding general capital projects.
• However, this option is not recommended as the revenue generated will not be sufficient to cover either the operating or capital costs anticipated for the next few years resulting in a deficit balance in the Cemeteries Reserve until 2035.

Option 2 – Increase fees by eight per cent per annum and continue to fund all capital expenses from the reserve.
• This option has the benefit of not impacting the amount of general revenue currently set aside for funding general capital projects and it results in a positive balance in the Cemeteries Reserve by 2027.
• However, this option is not recommended as increasing fees eight per cent annum would have a significant financial impact to the customer and the City has historically positioned its cemetery services as an affordable option to the community

A summary of all three funding model options is presented in Appendix A.

COMMUNICATIONS

Information about the new rates will be distributed to funeral homes and monument suppliers in the Regina area and will be available at City Hall, Riverside Cemetery and Regina.ca/cemeteries. Administration will work with Communications & Engagement to ensure the public is made aware of any fee changes.

DISCUSSION

The City has provided cemetery services since 1883 and operates two municipal cemeteries, Regina Cemetery and Riverside Cemetery. Regina Cemetery is a historical cemetery and as such has limited capacity to accommodate future internments. Riverside Cemetery, which opened in 1953, serves as the main City operated cemetery. It is home to the cemeteries administration and operations staff and it accommodates approximately 97 per cent of all City interment services. There is also one privately owned cemetery within the Regina area, Regina Memorial Gardens, which offers a range of services, including premium interment options.

City cemeteries consider the needs of all citizens, with designated areas for different cultural and religious groups, while providing affordable options to the community. Cemeteries are regulated provincially by The Cemeteries Act, 1999 (the “Act”), which sets out requirements related to consumer protection as well as maintenance of cemeteries. The City is required by the Act to provide lots at no charge for indigent burials when requested to do so by the Provincial government.
Proposed Funding Model

The City cemeteries have operated on a cost recovery basis since 1987. Any operating surpluses are transferred to the Cemetery Reserve. Conversely, any operating deficits are withdrawn from the Reserve to fund the shortfall. The Reserve is used to fund minor capital projects and infrastructure restoration projects within the cemeteries program.

Revenues come from two main sources: fees and charges for goods and services provided and interest income generated by the Perpetual Care Trust Fund, which has a balance of $2.2 million and generates approximately $101,000 in interest revenue each year. The money held in this fund is required by the Act to be held in trust for the long-term care and maintenance of the cemeteries, therefore the income earned by the fund is required to be used only for the care and maintenance. Under the Act (section 26), the City would not be permitted to use the money from the Perpetual Care Trust Fund to pay for capital projects.

In the past two decades, there has been minimal capital investment in the aging infrastructure at the City’s cemeteries. However, the Riverside Cemetery requires development of additional internment space as the existing space is almost depleted. Consequently, through the 2021 and 2022 budget cycles, Council approved $1.7 million in funding from the Cemeteries Reserve to undertake this expansion resulting in a deficit balance in the Reserve of $395,000.

In addition to the Riverside expansion, cemeteries asset condition assessments indicate that $3.6 million in major capital projects are required within the next 10 years including upgrades to both the Riverside maintenance shop and the Riverside Administration Building.

To plan for these pressures, the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Department began working with the Financial Services Department to create a Cemeteries Financial Model that would fund the upcoming capital investments and return the reserve to a positive balance. The recommended model assumes full cost recovery for operations and annual minor capital repairs and refurbishment. It also accommodates planning for major infrastructure renewal and/or expansion while considering shifting consumer preferences regarding services.

As part of the development of the model, several options were explored, ranging from increasing cemeteries fees to help fund capital requirements, to using general revenues as the funding source. Administration has also explored the funding models of other municipalities in Western Canada, as detailed in Appendix E.

In creating the model, the following assumptions were considered:
- Interest earned through the Perpetual Care Trust Fund has been used to subsidize annual operational expenses of the two municipal cemeteries since 1999 and this practice will
continue going forward. On average over the last three years, the fund has generated approximately $101,000 annually.

- Interment frequency has remained consistent over the past number of years, at an average of 600 interments annually. This limits the opportunity for increased revenue to fund rising operating costs and planned capital expenditures without raising fees and charges for the goods and services provided.

- Interment type trends have shifted over the years from traditional (casket) interments to cremation interments. In 2021, the City’s traditional interments were 36 per cent of the total compared to 44 per cent in 2009. As cremation services are more economical, this change has an impact on revenues, the balance in Cemeteries Reserve and planned capital expenditures.

- An inflation factor of up to three per cent has been applied to annual operating expenses such as labour, equipment, material, fuel, and utility costs. This is Administration’s best estimate while taking into account the current volatility in inflationary pressures.

- The cemeteries capital program provides resources for the installation of new cemeteries assets, infrastructure, preventative maintenance of existing assets, and a variety of both in and above ground cremation options.

To keep fees affordable, the recommended model, included in Appendix A, includes:

- Funding the major capital projects such as the planned upgrades/expansion of the Riverside Cemetery’s maintenance shop and administration building from general revenues through Current Contributions.
  - This practice is in alignment to the policy of other western municipalities as outlined in Appendix E. Cemetery services in almost every major municipality reviewed receive funding through general revenue in some way. Typically, to help with capital expenditures.

- Increasing fees by approximately four per cent each year to cover inflationary operating costs as well as minor capital maintenance.
  - In the municipalities reviewed, operational expenses are mostly covered by revenues, however, no municipal cemetery advised that they were solely funded by cemetery fees & charges.

Proposed Fee Schedule
As a result of the above analysis, for most fees, Administration is recommending a four per cent fee increase effective April 1, 2022, January 1, 2023, and January 1, 2024. This approach was
developed to ensure the cemeteries have sufficient revenue to maintain service levels, support restoration of assets and provide for additional interment options to meet customer needs.

The proposed fee schedule is provided in Appendix C. These fees are consistent with those provided by other municipally operated cemeteries in the prairie provinces. It should be noted that several fees in the proposed schedule will remain unchanged. These items generate minimal sales yet represent a reasonable value to the customer. Other fees will be increased to maintain cost recovery levels.

There are also four new fees in the schedules to accurately reflect the services offered, as outlined below.

a) Oversize Opening for Casket Interment - This fee is required to accommodate for the additional time and labour it takes to dig a wider hole. This new fee is similar to the current oversize urn charge.

b) Infant Casket Disinterment - Currently the City does not have a fee to cover this specific service.

c) Cremation (Niche) Disinterment - Currently the City does not have a fee to cover this specific service.

d) Purchase and Installation of Precast Monument Foundation (child) - The foundations for a child lot are much smaller than a foundation for an adult traditional lot. As such there should be a lower associated fee instead of charging the adult fee.

Proposed Bylaw Amendments
In addition to amending the Bylaw with the new fees schedule, Administration is proposing several amendments to provide more information on current business practices and provide better transparency and clarity around cemeteries rules and regulations. Most of the new information being added is surrounding interment scheduling and memorial installations and removals.

As to many of the other Bylaw amendments, the information has remained much the same but has been reworded, moved to a new section or put under a new heading as part of general housekeeping practices. Appendix B outlines all the proposed amendments. The most significant proposed amendments to the Bylaw are highlighted below:

a) Change to the definition – “Authorized Decision Maker” to “Interment Rights Holder”

Change in terminology for clarification as “Authorized decision maker” is a term used in The Funeral and Cremation Services Act for a different purpose. Throughout the Bylaw,
“Licensee, or if the Licensee is deceased, the authorized decision maker” is replaced with “interment rights holder”.

b) Removing Non-Conforming Memorials
   There is no consistency or guidelines as to why a non-conforming memorial should be approved or denied. Schedule “C” and Schedule “D” outline detailed specifications to be followed to ensure consistency, safety to visitors and staff and allow for operational accessibility. With the Riverside Expansion Project going forward, it is even more important to maintain consistency into the future.

c) New Offenses and Penalties:
   “No person shall advertise, host or carry on any tour, event or commercial activity to be held in a cemetery or offer any goods or services in a cemetery except pursuant to a written contract between the City and the person”
   This language will be consistent with our Cemetery Tours and Event Policy currently being developed.

DECISION HISTORY

2008 - The Cemeteries Bylaw-2008, was developed and approved by Council. The Bylaw outlines cemeteries rules, regulations, memorial specifications and fees.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A - Cemeteries Financial Model Funding Options
Appendix B - Proposed Bylaw Amendments
Appendix C - Schedule A - Proposed Fee Schedules
Appendix D - Western Canada Cemetery Fee Review
Appendix E - Western Canada Cemetery Funding Models
### CEMETERIES MODEL

#### Recommendation to Council

**Increase Fees 4% & Mill Rate Pays for Maintenance Shop Upgrades (2025/2026), Admin Building (2029/2030)**

**2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** | **2026** | **2027** | **2028** | **2029** | **2030** | **2031** | **2032**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
**Revenue** | 1,580 | 1,809 | 1,716 | 1,787 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 2,022 | 2,108 | 2,197 | 2,291 | 2,389 | 2,491 | 2,598
**Revised Revenue (10% contingency)** | 1,545 | 1,608 | 1,675 | 1,745 | 1,819 | 1,897 | 2,062 | 2,150 | 2,242 | **2,339**
**Revenue Growth** | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30%

**Expenses**

| **Operating** | 1,316 | 1,335 | 1,367 | 1,393 | 1,419 | 1,446 | 1,473 | 1,501 | 1,530 | 1,559 | 1,589 | 1,700 | 1,733 |
| **Overhead** | 45 | 43 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 53 | 55 | 57 | 60 | 62 | 73 | 76 |

**Total Cost**

| **Operating** | 263 | 474 | 305 | 352 | 397 | 447 | 500 | 556 | 615 | 677 | 743 | 731 | 803 |

#### Option 1 - Current Status

**Increase Fees 4% & Cemeteries Pays for all Capital Projects**

| **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** | **2026** | **2027** | **2028** | **2029** | **2030** | **2031** | **2032**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
**Revenue** | 1,580 | 1,809 | 1,716 | 1,787 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 2,022 | 2,108 | 2,197 | 2,291 | 2,389 | 2,491 | 2,598
**Revised Revenue (10% contingency)** | 1,545 | 1,608 | 1,675 | 1,745 | 1,819 | 1,897 | 2,062 | 2,150 | 2,242 | **2,339**
**Revenue Growth** | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30%

**Expenses**

| **Operating** | 1,316 | 1,335 | 1,367 | 1,393 | 1,419 | 1,446 | 1,473 | 1,501 | 1,530 | 1,559 | 1,589 | 1,700 | 1,733 |
| **Overhead** | 45 | 43 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 53 | 55 | 57 | 60 | 62 | 73 | 76 |

**Total Cost**

| **Operating** | 263 | 474 | 305 | 352 | 397 | 447 | 500 | 556 | 615 | 677 | 743 | 731 | 803 |

#### CEMETERIES MODEL

**25 YEAR PLAN**

| **Revenue** | 1,580 | 1,809 | 1,716 | 1,787 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 2,022 | 2,108 | 2,197 | 2,291 | 2,389 | 2,491 | 2,598 |
| **Revised Revenue (10% contingency)** | 1,545 | 1,608 | 1,675 | 1,745 | 1,819 | 1,897 | 2,062 | 2,150 | 2,242 | **2,339** |
| **Revenue Growth** | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.20% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% | 4.30% |

**Expenses**

| **Operating** | 1,316 | 1,335 | 1,367 | 1,393 | 1,419 | 1,446 | 1,473 | 1,501 | 1,530 | 1,559 | 1,589 | 1,700 | 1,733 |
| **Overhead** | 45 | 43 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 53 | 55 | 57 | 60 | 62 | 73 | 76 |

**Total Cost**

| **Operating** | 263 | 474 | 305 | 352 | 397 | 447 | 500 | 556 | 615 | 677 | 743 | 731 | 803 |

#### Option 2 - Increase Fees 8%

**Increase Fees 8% & Cemeteries Pays for all Capital Projects**

| **Revenue** | 1,580 | 1,809 | 1,716 | 1,787 | 1,861 | 1,939 | 2,022 | 2,108 | 2,197 | 2,291 | 2,389 | 2,491 | 2,598 |
| **Revised Revenue (10% contingency)** | 1,484 | 1,597 | 1,719 | 1,852 | 1,996 | 2,139 | 2,323 | 2,674 | 2,919 | **3,152** |
| **Revenue Growth** | 8.00% | 7.70% | 7.70% | 7.80% | 7.80% | 7.90% | 7.90% | 7.90% | 7.90% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% |

**Expenses**

| **Operating** | 1,316 | 1,335 | 1,367 | 1,393 | 1,419 | 1,446 | 1,473 | 1,501 | 1,530 | 1,559 | 1,589 | 1,700 | 1,733 |
| **Overhead** | 45 | 43 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 53 | 55 | 57 | 60 | 62 | 73 | 76 |

**Total Cost**

| **Operating** | 263 | 474 | 305 | 352 | 397 | 447 | 500 | 556 | 615 | 677 | 743 | 731 | 803 |

#### Key Assumptions:

- Annual operating expense growth rate of 2% each year
- Capital projects assumed 1.03% inflation each year
- Capital cost increase of 3%
## The Cemeteries Bylaw No. 2008-27

### Proposed Amendments 2022/2023/2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries Bylaw #2008-27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “authorized decision maker” means the executor or administrator of the estate of a deceased person, or any other person authorized by law to act in the circumstances; and if no one can be located using reasonable efforts, or no one is willing to act or the identity of the deceased is not known, the Director may make any decision required to be made by an authorized decision-maker pursuant to this Bylaw;” | “interment rights holder” means the licensee or, if the licensee is deceased, the executor or administrator of the estate of the licensee, or any other person authorized by law to act in the circumstances;  
*“Licensee, or if the Licensee is deceased, the authorized decision maker” is replaced with “interment rights holder” throughout the bylaw.* | Change in terminology for clarifications as “Authorized decision maker” is a term used in another Act for a different purpose. The Director’s authority is moved to subsection 3(2) of the Bylaw. |
| **decoration** means anything placed in the cemetery, whether on a memorial or not, that is not in accordance with the specifications set out in Schedule “C”, such as cut flowers, spiritual or religious objects or mementos; | **decoration** means anything placed in the cemetery other than a memorial or an item permanently affixed to a memorial, and includes but is not limited to: artificial or natural flowers, fencing, solar lights, chimes, rocks, flags, stuffed animals and statues; | Clarification to the definition. Decorations do not need to refer to Schedule “C” as this schedule only refers to memorials |
| "Director" means the Director assigned responsibility for City-owned cemeteries by the City Manager and includes anyone acting as his or her designate in carrying out the provisions of this Bylaw; | **Director** means the director assigned responsibility for cemeteries by the City Manager and includes any designate of the Director;  
*”his or her” is also replaced throughout the bylaw.* | Gender neutral language. |
| **“human Remains”** | New Definition:  
**“human remains”** means a dead human body, but does not include cremated human remains; | Definition as taken from *The Cemeteries Act, 1999*, for clarification purposes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;interment rights&quot;</strong> means a license granted by the City to a person to allow the interment of human remains or cremated human remains in a designated plot, niche or mausoleum in accordance with this Bylaw and <em>The Cemeteries Act, 1999</em>;</td>
<td><strong>“interment rights”</strong> means the right to use a lot, columbarium or mausoleum for interment in accordance with this Bylaw and <em>The Cemeteries Act, 1999</em>;</td>
<td>Definition updated to better align with the wording in <em>The Cemeteries Act, 1999</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;license&quot;</strong> means the interment rights for a lot or niche within a Cemetery</td>
<td><strong>“license”</strong> means the cemetery license agreement granting interment rights within a cemetery;”</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Licensee&quot;</strong> means a person to whom a license has been issued pursuant to this Bylaw;</td>
<td><strong>“licensee”</strong> means a person to whom a license for interment rights in a lot, columbarium or mausoleum was initially issued upon purchase or has been transferred to pursuant to this bylaw;”</td>
<td>Clarification to differentiate the original licensee from their legal representative authorizing an interment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3.**  
New subsection  

(2) Where the Director considers it necessary to make a decision related to a lot, niche or memorial, such as related to repair and maintenance of the lot, niche, memorial or cemetery, and if no one can be located using reasonable efforts or no one is willing to act or the identity of the deceased is not known, the Director may make any decision required to be made by an interment rights holder pursuant to this Bylaw. For greater certainty, this section does not allow the Director to authorize interments, transfers or returns.  

This new subsection (2) is moved from the definition of “authorized decision maker” and edited to reflect its original intention.  

The existing (2) and (3) are being moved to The Regina Administration Bylaw – see consequential amendments at the end of this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deferred Payment Plan</th>
<th>New Heading for section 4.1</th>
<th>Adds a heading to the existing section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 (2) A person who purchases a license or cemetery goods and services under the Deferred Payment Plan shall also pay the Deferred Payment Administrative Fee set out in Schedule &quot;A&quot;.</td>
<td>(2) In order to commence a Deferred Payment Plan the purchaser shall complete the application required by the Director and make an initial payment of 25 per cent of the total fees plus the Administration Fee set out in Schedule &quot;A&quot;. (3) Purchasers have 12 months to pay for their purchase in full. Where payment in full is not received within 12 months, the contract is terminated and the purchaser(s) will be entitled to a refund of all monies paid, without interest and less the Administration Fee set out inSchedule &quot;A&quot;.</td>
<td>Adds information on current process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interments</th>
<th></th>
<th>Adds information on current process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 The Licensee of a lot, niche and, subject to subsections 3(2) and (3), mausoleum or columbarium or authorized decision-maker thereof shall, prior to any interment:</td>
<td>5(1) No interment shall be scheduled or permitted until: (a) all required documentation is completed by the interment rights holder and approved by the City; (b) a license for a lot or niche has been issued or use of a lot, in relation to which a license has previously been issued, is duly authorized by the interment rights holder and all required documentation evidencing the authority with respect to the use of the lot has been submitted and approved by the City; and (c) all required fees are paid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) provide to the Director a properly authorized burial permit or cremation certificate;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) complete and submit an application form approved by the Director;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) pay all required fees in full in accordance with Schedule &quot;A&quot;.(#2014-80, s. 13, 2014)</td>
<td>(2) All of the requirements of this section must be met by 12:00pm at least two business days before the proposed date of interment, provided there are no intervening statutory holidays. The following schedule shall apply, subject to any necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decision-maker shall give the Director at least two business days notice before the proposed time of interment.

The notice requirement may be amended by the Director to accommodate a pressing circumstance which does not include late or incomplete submission of documents.

(3) Interment arrangements with respect to dates, times and site locations are the sole responsibility of the interment rights holder; the City shall be entitled to rely on the documentation signed off by the interment rights holder or funeral home.

**Required Documentation**

6(1) The following documentation shall be submitted before an interment will be permitted:

(a) Signed Interment Order in the form required by the Director, if using a funeral home;

(b) for traditional casket burials, the original burial permit;

(c) for interment of cremated remains, the original cremation certificate;

(f) any other documentation that may be required by the City in relation to the interment.

(2) If the licensee of the lot is deceased and is not the subject of the interment, interment in the licensee’s lot will only be permitted if not contrary to...
any instructions provided to the City in writing by the licensee and authorized by an interment rights holder of the licensee as evidenced by submission of the following documentation to the City:

(a) if an executor, will or letters probate;

(b) if an administrator, letters of administration as defined in The Administration of Estates Act;

(c) if an executor is acting for another executor who is deceased pursuant to section 18.1 of The Administration of Estates Act, will or letters probate for both the deceased licensee;

(d) if another person authorized by law, documentation sufficient to verify the legal requirements of the authorizing law have been met;

(e) death certificate of the licensee unless the City’s records reflect that the licensee is interred in the Cemetery;

(f) death certificate of executor if proposed executor is an alternate as set out in the will or letters probate or in the circumstances described in (c),

(g) photo identification; and

(h) any additional documentation required by the Director to verify the authority of the interment rights holder to act in the circumstances.”
### Interment of Indigent Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>No one may install a memorial on a lot utilized for the interment of an indigent person until the Care and Maintenance Fee as set out in Schedule &quot;A&quot; has been paid.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change:</td>
<td>13.1 (3) No one may install a memorial on a lot utilized for the interment of an indigent person until the Care and Maintenance Fee and applicable Memorial Fees as set out in Schedule &quot;A&quot; have been paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This fee may also apply when someone requests to install a memorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disinterments

The disinterment of human remains, shall be permitted only:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>by order of the Chief Coroner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>upon issuance of a disinterment permit from the Minister of Health or his or her designate issued pursuant to an application under The Public Health Act, 1994 and the Disease Control Regulations; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>where The Public Health Act, 1994 does not apply, upon application by the authorized decision-maker in the form prescribed by the Director;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and upon payment of the required fee as set out in Schedule "A" and subject to any conditions as determined by the Director.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14(1)</td>
<td>The disinterment of human remains shall be permitted only:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>in accordance with requirements of this section and all other applicable laws, including but not limited to: The Cemeteries Act, 1999, The Public Health Act, 1994 and The Coroners Act, 1999 and the regulations to those Acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>subject to (c), upon issuance of a disinterment permit pursuant to The Public Health Act, 1994 or by order of the Chief Coroner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>where The Public Health Act, 1994 does not apply, the interment rights holder shall submit a disinterment application to the Director for approval;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>upon payment of the required fee as set out in Schedule &quot;A&quot;; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>subject to any conditions as determined by the Director.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarification on current process
A person making an application pursuant to subsection (1) shall ensure that a licensed funeral director is present during the disinterment for the handling and transportation of the human remains.

| (2) | The removal of cremated remains from any lot or niche for any reason is subject to subsection (1). |
| (3) | Human remains will not be handled by City staff. All applications for disinterment of human remains must be through a licensed funeral home or other person authorized by law to handle human remains. The interment rights holder shall be responsible to ensure that a licensed funeral director or other person authorized by law to handle human remains is present at all times for the disinterment and transportation of human remains. |

## License Returns

(5) Upon return of an unused niche or lot, the Licensee or authorized decision-maker as the case may be, shall be entitled to the following:

1. for lots or niches with the care and maintenance fee prepaid:
   - 85% of the original fee paid including the care and maintenance; or
   - if original proof of purchase price cannot be located or otherwise determined then a refund of $75.00 will be provided.

2. for lots without the care and maintenance fee prepaid:
   - 85% of the original fee paid; or
   - if the original proof of purchase price cannot be located or otherwise determined then no refund will be provided.

15.1 (5) and (6) are replaced with:

(5) Upon return of an unused lot or niche, the interment rights holder shall be entitled to 85% of the original fee paid less the license transfer fee and any applicable fee for removal of a foundation or marker.

(6) Upon return of a used niche, the interment rights holder shall be entitled to 85% of the original fee paid less:
   - the license transfer fee;
   - 10% of the original fee paid for each full or partial calendar year the niche was occupied;
   - any applicable fee to replace a memorialized door, which must be obtained only through the cemeteries office in order to maintain consistent design.

## Clarification on current process

a) 85% of the original fee paid including the care and maintenance; or
b) if original proof of purchase price cannot be located or otherwise determined then a refund of $75.00 will be provided.

2. for lots without the care and maintenance fee prepaid:
   a) 85% of the original fee paid; or
   b) if the original proof of purchase price cannot be located or otherwise determined then no refund will be provided.

(6) Upon return of a used niche the Licensee or authorized decision-maker as the case may be, shall be entitled to 85% of the original fee paid, less 10% of the original fee paid for each full or partial calendar year that the niche was occupied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorial Applications</th>
<th>New Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Information currently</td>
<td><strong>Memorial Applications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20(1) No memorial or memorialization shall be installed until an application in the form approved by the Director has been submitted and approved in writing by the City and all applicable fees are paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) An application for memorial installation or memorialization shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) be submitted by the memorial supplier;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) include the site location, memorial type(s) and dimensions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) any additional information required by the Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Memorials and memorialization without prior written approval will not be permitted to be installed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adds information on current process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Installation</td>
<td>New Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information currently</td>
<td><strong>Memorial Installation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 (1) No one may install a memorial or make any alteration to any structure in a Cemetery for any lot, niche or mausoleum for which the Care and Maintenance Fee has not been paid until such fee is paid to the City in full.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) All memorials and memorialization shall be in accordance with the specifications set out in Schedule “C” and Schedule “D”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Memorials or memorialization that do not comply with the provisions of this bylaw will not be permitted to be installed. It is the responsibility of the purchaser of the memorial or memorialization to ensure it complies with the requirements of this bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) It shall be the responsibility of the memorial supplier to restore the landscaping surrounding a newly installed memorial to the satisfaction of the Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) After a memorial or memorialization has been installed, the City will perform an inspection to verify that it complies with all of the specifications in Schedule &quot;C&quot; and Schedule “D” and that the surrounding landscaping has been restored. If a memorial or memorialization is found to be non-compliant or the landscaping has not been restored the memorial supplier shall be notified of the deficiency and required to remove the memorial or memorialization or restore the landscaping, as the case may be, at the cost of the memorial supplier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adds information on current processes as well as actions to be taken for non-conforming memorials. Non-conforming memorials will no longer be an option subject to approval. Memorial specifications are set out in Schedule “C” and Schedule “D”
(6) Every memorial supplier who receives a notice of non-compliant memorial or memorialization pursuant to subsection (4) shall remove the memorial within 30 days of the notice. Should the supplier fail to remove the memorial the City may remove the memorial pursuant to section 21.2 and seek recovery of the costs of removal from the supplier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorial Maintenance</th>
<th>New Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Information currently</td>
<td><strong>Memorial Maintenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1 Memorials and memorialization are the personal property of the interment rights holder for the lot. The interment rights holder is responsible at all times for the condition of the memorial and memorialization. The City is not obligated to report or repair any vandalism or damage caused by natural causes, third parties or unknown causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adds information on current process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorial Removal</th>
<th>New Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Information currently</td>
<td><strong>Memorial Removal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.2(1) The City shall have the right to remove, repair or put into a safe state without compensation to any person, any memorial or memorialization that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) does not meet the specifications set out in this bylaw;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) in the City’s opinion is unsafe; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) in the City’s opinion is not compatible with community standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) memorials or memorialization shall be subject to the specification requirements in place at the time they were installed. If a non-conforming memorial or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adds information on current process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
memorialization is replaced, it must meet the specifications in place at the time of installation.

21.2 If a niche replacement door is required for any reason, the niche replacement door must be purchased through the Cemeteries Administration Office.”

| 22 | Section 22 is repealed | Non-conforming memorials will no longer be an option subject to approval. Memorial specifications are set out in Schedule “C” and Schedule “D” |

| Decorations | Add: New Heading | Decorations should be separated from memorials as they are two different items |

| 27 | (2) No person may, in a Cemetery: (i) place any plant material; or (ii) construct any fence, railing, trellis or coping. | (i) and (ii) are repealed and replaced with: |

<p>|  | (2) No person may, in a Cemetery: (i) place any plant material; (ii) place any decoration except on a lot, niche or memorial; (iii) place or construct any fence, railing, trellis, coping or other structure. | Clarification on current process |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 28      | Section 28 is repealed and replaced with:  
28 (1) The Director may remove and dispose of any decoration at any time without notice. The City shall not be required to retain any decoration left at the cemetery.  
(2) Decorations that are removed and considered to be of value by the Director will be stored for 30 days then disposed of in accordance with section 362.1 of *The Cities Act*.  
(3) The City shall not be required to compensate any person for removal and disposal of decorations left at the cemetery. | Replaced by new section on memorials/removal of them  
Current section 29.1 deals with removal of decorations.  
Provides clarification on current processes |
| 29.1    | Section 29.1 is repealed | Information moved to relevant Sections 27 & 28 |
| 30      | Section 30 is repealed | Information moved to relevant Section 21(1) |
| **Offenses and Penalties** | new 39 (4) No person shall advertise, host or carry on any tour, event or commercial activity to be held in a cemetery or offer any goods or services in a cemetery except pursuant to a written contract between the City and the person. | This language will be consistent with our Cemetery Tours and Event Policy currently being developed |
### Consequential Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# (1) The City Manager or designate is delegated the authority to negotiate and approve on behalf of the City an agreement with any person for the construction, purchase and maintenance of, columbaria, lots, mausoleums or memorials for the exclusive use of that person or an agreement setting aside an area of the cemetery as a designated area. |

# (2) Notwithstanding any fee set out in *The Cemeteries Bylaw, 2021*, the City Manager is delegated the authority to negotiate and approve fees and charges in relation to: cemetery license, memorials and memorialization, care and maintenance and lot or niche purchases as part of the agreement in subjection (1). |

No wording changes. Moving to the Administration Bylaw

These sections are moved into the Administration Bylaw for consistency with other contract approval delegations

### Schedule “A” Fees and Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversize opening for casket interment</td>
<td>New Fee $400</td>
<td>In order to accommodate for the additional time and manpower it takes to dig a wider hole, a similar charge like we have for an oversize urn should be charged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterment Infant Casket (up to 2 feet) or infant cremated remains</td>
<td>New Fee $585</td>
<td>Currently we charge the cremation disinterment fee. This new fee will be slightly cheaper than the cremation disinterment fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
<td>New Fee</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterment Cremation (Niche)</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>Currently we charge the cremation (niche) interment fee. It is a similar process as interring, it should be reflected in service fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and Installation of Precast Monument Foundation (child)</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>The foundations for a child lot are much smaller than a foundation for an adult traditional lot. As such there should be a lower associated fee instead of charging the adult fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Domes (2021 Prices)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our supplier increased prices between 7% and 17% for 2022, due to rising COVID costs, our fees will need to increase accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Adult $280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/ Base/Adult $137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Child $129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Fees by more than 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Adult $330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/ Base/Adult $147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Child $142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule “C” Memorials and Memorialization of Burial Lots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restriction for Flat Marker Memorials</th>
<th>New: (4) Restriction: Flat markers must be one solid piece of granite</th>
<th>This is to specify that a flat memorial must be one solid piece of granite and not pieces of granite glued together, which can be susceptible to breaking when equipment drives on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change: Child Memorials</td>
<td>Change: Separated Infant Memorials under its own heading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New:

**Restriction:**
(a) Child Lots without a strip foundation will be subject to monument foundation fees in order to install a headstone

---

**Infant Memorials**

New:
(b) Infant Memorialization in Block 111R and 111S includes name engraving on a shared infant memorial at no additional fee

---

**Upright Memorials**

Ceramic plaque can be affixed to the Top of the memorial with a maximum size of 10.1 cm (4”) wide x 12 cm (4 3/4“) high.

Repeal and Replace:
Ceramic plaque can be affixed to the Top of the memorial with a maximum size of 17.8 cm (7”) x 13 cm (5 1/8”).

A larger plaque size has been desired from the public and monument companies. As the uprights can be much larger memorials, administration agrees this can be accommodated in the options area of the cemetery only

---

**Type 3 Memorials**

Type 3 Memorials include any memorials not covered by Type 1 or 2. Type 3 Memorials will be allowed only in accordance with sections 23 to 25. The specifications of Type 3 Memorials also apply to mausoleums.

Remove

There is no consistency or guidelines as to why a non-conforming memorial should be approved or denied. Schedule “C” and Schedule “D” outline detailed specifications to be followed to ensure consistency, safety to visitors and staff and allow for operational accessibility.

---

**Schedule “D” Memorialization on Columbarium Niches**

<p>| 1. Prairie Lane (1, 2, 3) | Add: 6. Prairie Lane (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) | New units were installed in 2019 and 2020 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorials Walls</th>
<th>New:</th>
<th>Add:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Add:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prairie Lane (Columbarium 4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Method: Granite plaque; must be purchased from Cemeteries Administration</td>
<td><strong>Prairie Lane (Columbarium 4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lettering: Modified Roman</td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaque: 10.1 cm (4”) wide x 7.5 cm (3”) high</td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement: Inset into the columbarium wall</td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vases: Not Permitted</td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic Plaques: Not Permitted</td>
<td><strong>Memorials Walls</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new plaque wall is located on columbarium 4, which was installed in 2019.
## Appendix C

### Schedule “A”

**2022, 2023 and 2024 CEMETERIES FEE SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Schedule</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries License Fees – Lot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Lots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (limited availability)</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
<td>$2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Strip Foundation</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td>$2,615</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Area Strip Foundation</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
<td>$3,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>$685</td>
<td>$685</td>
<td>$685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cremation Lots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Strip Foundation</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
<td>$2,090</td>
<td>$2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option Area Strip Foundation</td>
<td>$2,470</td>
<td>$2,570</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field of Honour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran (traditional or cremation)</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemeteries License Fees – Columbarium Niche</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor/Outdoor Columbarium - Standard</td>
<td>$4,140</td>
<td>$4,305</td>
<td>$4,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor/Outdoor Columbarium - Premium</td>
<td>$4,510</td>
<td>$4,690</td>
<td>$4,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Columbarium - Family</td>
<td>$5,370</td>
<td>$5,590</td>
<td>$5,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Rose Columbarium (Regina Cemetery)</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Casket (over 4 feet)</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>$1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Casket (up to 4 feet)</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Casket (up to 2 feet) or infant cremated remains</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ground Cremation (Maximum 18”x 18” opening)</td>
<td>$435</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche/ Scattering/ Ossuary</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversize opening for casket interment</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversize opening for in ground cremation interment/ additional cremated remains in niche same time same opening</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urn placed in Casket/ additional cremated remains in niche same time same opening</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late afternoon surcharge - for interment services leaving after 4 p.m.</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Surcharge - traditional</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$775</td>
<td>$805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Surcharge – cremation</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday/Holiday Surcharge – traditional</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday/Holiday Surcharge - cremation</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disinterments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Casket (over 4 feet)</td>
<td>$3,920</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Casket (up to 4 feet)</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$2,310</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Casket (up to 2 feet) or infant cremated remains</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremation (in ground)</td>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremation (Niche)</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorial and Memorialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Flat Marker (small)</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Flat Marker (large)</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and Installation of Precast Monument Foundation</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and Installation of Precast Monument Foundation (child)</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Precast Monument Foundation or Flat Marker</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Plaque</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$515</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Plaque - Group Memorials and Prairie Lane Plaque Walls</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Bookings (for each full or partial hour)</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Columbarium Vase</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$295</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urn Vault</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Adult</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/ Base/Adult</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Dome/Child</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling and Set-up Fee</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fee (applied to deferred payment plan)</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Transfer Fee</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Service Rate</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record Search</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 records</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 records</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 records</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50 records</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Request</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Care and Maintenance Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and Maintenance - Riverside</td>
<td>25% of current plot price</td>
<td>25% of current plot price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and Maintenance - Regina</td>
<td>25% of current plot price</td>
<td>25% of current plot price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed New Fee**
Price Increase higher than 4% due to supplier price increase
Appendix D

Western Canada Cemetery Fee Review
Regina
Riverside

Cemetery License Fees
Standard
Standard - Strip Foundation
Option Area - Strip Foundation
Child

$1,835
$2,415
$2,855
$645

Regina FH
&
Cemetery
(formerly
Memorial
Gardens)

$2,150.00$3,260.00
N/A
N/A
$445.00$670.00

Saskatoon
Woodlawn

Moose
Jaw

Calgary

Edmonton

N/A
$1,850
$2,410

$1,670
N/A
N/A

N/A
$3,590
$4,456

$570

$651

$990

$5,198.00

Infant

$260

N/A

$190

N/A

$990

$930

N/A

$1,900

$750

$1,794

$930
$695

N/A
N/A

$1,900
N/A

$433
$957

50% of reg
fee
50% of reg
fee
$1,237
$2,475

$1,389

$3,465

$1,232$2,000

Prince
Albert

Prince
Albert

$2,000
$2,250

$690

$700

$25,000
N/A
$29,000

Medicine Hat
Private

North

Lloydminster

Battleford

$1,840
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

$450- $2563
N/A
N/A

$2,615
$2,811
N/A

$1,000$1,250
N/A
N/A

$1,565
N/A
N/A

$450- $1090

$1,112

$500- $675

$615

$920

N/A

$287

N/A

$2,000$4,000

$370

N/A

$450- $1090

$741

$300- $350

N/A

$1,535

$1,000

N/A

$1,375

N/A

$1204- $2251

$2,296

No Charge

N/A

N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A

$1204- $2251
N/A

$836
$989

No Charge
$500-$700

N/A
$795

$1,450

N/A

N/A

$861- $970

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

$3,900$4,270

$2,430$3,840

$3,800$5,500

$2,575

$3,650

$2,934

$2049$3187

$1,800$2,500

$1,411- $1,549

$3,629$3,856

$1,225$2,250

$1,155$1,770

$1,080

$1,400

$1,035

$1,145

$450- $1024

$1,044

$800- $850

$785-$1,220

$1,422

$455
$282
N/A
$495
$248

$605
$305
$350
$555
$245

$150- $520
$150- $520
N/A
$200- $416
N/A

$531
$354
N/A
$424
$474

$500- $550
$400- $450
N/A
$400- $450
N/A

$387- $615
$387- $615
N/A
$196- $467
N/A

$821

$180
$510
$370

N/A
$200
N/A
$575
$325

$375
$188
$240
$245
$167

$165
$120
$100
$100

$575
$325
N/A
$575

N/A
N/A

$104
N/A
N/A
$180
N/A

$150- $200
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

$154
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

$221

$80

$95

$4,210$13,740

N/A

N/A

$3,951$24,136

$4,210$13,740

$3,140- $3,550

$2,384$3,242

$4,014$11,220

$1,275

$1,210$1,620

$1,460- $3,240

$1,164

$1,829

Child
Infant
Set-up Fee
Cremation
Cremation Surcharge

$500 $485- $650
N/A
$215
N/A
$230
$595
$420
N/A
$200

$570- $820
$130
N/A
$700- $880
N/A

$579
N/A
$89
$348
$433

$1,010
$734
$519
$125

$550
N/A
$250
$525
N/A

Niche
Niche Surcharge
Ossuary
Scattering
Urn placed in casket
Memorialization

$200
$110
$200
$200
$110

$475
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

$280
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

$146
N/A
N/A
$231
N/A

$519
$519
$180
$150
N/A

$275
N/A
N/A
$275
$199

$305
N/A
Included in
Niche
purchase
$40
N/A
N/A
N/A

$530
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

$102- $269
N/A

$110

N/A

N/A

$68

N/A

$130

N/A

N/A

N/A

$.26$.46/Inch

N/A

N/A

Application Fee

$160

N/A

$51- $300

$200

$99

$129

$430

N/A

$420- $800

N/A

$517

N/A

$214.00$770.00

$640$2,000

Flat Marker Installation
Remove Foundation

$250.00$340.00
$235

N/A
N/A

$250- $310
N/A

N/A
N/A

$373
$218

$430$1,819
$199

$223

$450- $550

N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A

$200- $400
$200

N/A
N/A

$235
$475
$475

N/A
N/A
N/A

N/A
$360

N/A
N/A
$565

$218
N/A
N/A

$199
N/A
N/A

$120
$370
$328

$60

$200- $300
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

$200
N/A
N/A

N/A
N/A
N/A

$514

$182 per
half hour
after 3:45

$360 per
hour after
3:30 p.m.

$250

$140 per
half hour

$135 per
half hour

$385

$370

$160

$1,277

$794$1,136

N/A

Foundation Installation

Late Fee

$629$1,023

N/A
$920

$3,980$5,165

$295 per
hour after
3 p.m.

$1,474$2,041

N/A
N/A

$3,980$4,335

Remove Flat Marker
Legacy Plaque
Bronze Wall Plaque
Other Fees

Swift
Current

$4,200$10,000

Indoor Columbarium

$1,190- $1,370

$2,090$2,600
$2,620
$3,140

Saamis Prairie Medicine
View
Hat

$650
$825

Cremation Plot - Strip Foundation

Standard

Vancouver

$1,220$1,950

$1,930- $1,475.00$2,375 $1,525.00

Outdoor Columbarium
Interments

Lethbridge

Private

Field of Honour - Standard
Field of Honour - Cremation
Single Cremation Plot

Winnipeg

$150-$190 per
hour after 4
p.m. not posted

$833

$52.83/hour

Traditional Supplemental Saturdays

$715

$370

$650

$460

$1,277

$306

$935

$1,200

$545

$525

$469 not posted

Min. $400$450

Cremation Supplemental Saturdays

$480

$370

$360

$240

$332

$153

$328

$350

$545

$325

$190- $227 not posted

Min. $400$450

$244

*$2,097

$244

*$1042

Traditional Supplemental Sundays and
Holidays
Cremation Supplemental Sundays and
Holidays

Interesting fees

$895

$370

$910

$460

$480

$370

$500

$240

winter/ summer
fees incl in
interment costs

$1,277

$514

$935

$332

$257

$328

Snow
Removal
$150

Winter Fee
$130 (NovApr)

$1,440
$720

$1,200

$1,635

N/A

$528 not posted

Min. $400$450

$350

$1,635

N/A

$199- $302 not posted

Min. $400$450

Watch
Winter
Backfill $250- Fee $140
$500 (Nov-Apr)
Pall Bearer
$300
2021 Rates

Winter
Fee $195

Winter $135

$244

*$2,097

$244

*$1,042

*OT charges
are Winter /Summer
calculated fees included in
@ side interment costs


Cemetery Funding Models
Western Canada

Research and consultation with other major municipalities provided valuable insight into how Canadian Cemeteries are able to fund operations, land acquisition and capital projects. Almost every major municipality receives funding through the mill rate in some way. The majority of mill rate funding is to help with Capital expenditures. Operational expenses are mostly covered by revenues, but no municipal cemetery responded they were 100 per cent cost recovery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost Recovery %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>*100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn, Saskatoon</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkton</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill, PA</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td><strong>Revenue from sales, plus tax support, to cover operating costs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* City of Calgary funds expansion projects from the Mill Rate
** Did not provide actuals
CNC22-02 2020 and 2021 Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Mayor Masters and City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Regina Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Office of the City Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>IR22-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

That City Council:

Receive and file this report.

HISTORY

At the March 8, 2022 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the Commission considered the attached report RPC22-11 from the Office of the City Clerk

The Commission adopted a resolution to concur in the recommendation contained in the report.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION

Elaine Kohlke, Council Officer  3/10/2022
ATTACHMENTS
RPC22-11  2020 and 2021 Annual Report
Appendix A Approved Street Names 2020
Appendix B 2018-OCC-G0005 - Civic Naming
Appendix C 2021 Annual Report Approved Names
Appendix D Annual Civic Naming Committee Statistics-W29921-2
CNC22-02 2020 and 2021 Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>March 8, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Regina Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>City Clerk's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Office of the City Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>RPC22-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

Regina Planning Commission recommends that City Council:

Receive and file this report.

ISSUE

The Civic Naming Committee is required to bring forward an annual report for the years 2020 and 2021.

IMPACTS

There are no policy/strategic, financial, environmental, risk/legal, or other implications or considerations.

OTHER OPTIONS

There are no other options as to this report.

COMMUNICATIONS

An annual report celebrating all successful applicants during a calendar year is brought forward to City Council through the Regina Planning Commission.
DISCUSSION

Applications in 2020 and 2021 continued at historic lows due to the combined factors of slow growth and the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdowns.

In 2020, the Civic Naming Committee heard 5 applications for street and park names.

Biographies for 2020 approved applications are attached as Appendix A.

The Civic Naming Committee Guidelines are attached as Appendix B.

In 2021, the Civic Naming Committee heard 12 applications for street and park names.

Biographies for 2021 approved applications are attached as Appendix C.

In 2021, five names on the “Approved But Not Yet Used List” were moved to the used list on The Street Where You Live List for health and safety reasons. The five names (Fiacco, Kinsmen, Kiwanis, Lions and Optimist) are already in use as a park name or asset name within the City of Regina.

Statistics on approved street and park names for 2020 and 2021 are attached as Appendix D.

DECISION HISTORY

The Civic Naming Committee Guideline was created using public engagement and was approved by City Council on November 26, 2018 (CR18-116).

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk
2/16/2022

Prepared by: Dana Turgeon, Historical Information & Preservation Supervisor
ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A Approved Street Names 2020
Appendix B 2018-OCC-G0005 - Civic Naming
Appendix C 2021 Annual Report Approved Names
Appendix D Annual Civic Naming Committee Statistics-W29921-2
Appendix A Approved Street and Park Names

Added to Street Where You Live List

Buffalo Meadows

American Bison are divided into two groups: plains bison and wood bison. Wood bison are larger and have a squarish hump, making them the heaviest and longest animal in North America and the second tallest after the moose. While American Bison are often called “buffalo”, true buffalo are an Old World species. The name “buffalo” has referred to the animals in the taxonomy of American Bison since the 1600s, however, and the two terms “bison” and “buffalo” are used interchangeably in North America. At the height of its historical range, American Bison could be found from Alaska to the Gulf of Mexico and east to the Atlantic Seaboard from Florida to New York State. Bison are not an easily domesticated animal because of their large size, their ability to jump 6 feet in the air if agitated, and their speeds of 55-65 km/h. They have been known to run right through fences, including razor wire, and bison ranchers sink steel I-beams into concrete to construct fencing that can withstand bison herds. The importance of the American Bison to Indigenous peoples cannot be overstated, for food, spirituality and survival.
LaFayette

Edward Hans Earl LaFayette (1940-2020) was born in McGee, SK to a pioneering African-Canadian family, the fourth of eight children. He moved to Regina when he was 14 and worked hauling gravel with his father, Karl LaFayette. He soon found work in the construction industry. He later started L&B Roofing Ltd. with William Beattie in 1971. He ran that business successfully with his partner for several years and then later on his own for many years until his retirement in 2014.

Ed was a well-known and highly-respected businessman who served on various construction associations and organizations. He was the first contractor of African-Canadian heritage to hold the title of President of the Saskatchewan Roofing Contractors Association, which awarded him their “Distinguished Service Award” in June 2002 in recognition of his many years of continuous service. They noted “his time & exemplary dedication as a Director & President has made a significant contribution to the Saskatchewan Roofing Contractors Association” and his service as a director of the board from 1990 to 1992 and again in 2009. The Canadian Construction Association (of which he was a member) awarded him their “Gold Seal Certificate” in June 1997. In April 2017 (though he retired in 2014), Ed was recognized and awarded “Honorary Membership” in the The Canadian Roofing Contractors Association “In recognition of his contribution to the advancement of the industry and of the association.”

Ed was also a member of the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada (HUDAC), serving as Director and/or Second Vice President with the Regina branch and with the Saskatchewan Council on numerous occasions. He was the winner of the HUDAC Regina 1983 Maple Leaf Award. He was also presented the HUDAC Rooftop Club Certificate of Merit (for outstanding service in the field of membership recruitment) and the HUDAC Presidential Award of Honour (in recognition of outstanding accomplishment).
Ruth “Jessie” Carlson is a longtime Regina resident and volunteer. She was a charter member of the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses and held executive positions including secretary-treasurer and vice-president. She was a member of the NDP Executive in Palliser and Pasqua ridings and on multiple NDP committees and groups. Jessie was a member of the Family Service Bureau and served as President for multiple terms and Secretary. She was a founding member of Sunset United Church and volunteered for multiple groups and positions there, including Sunset Ladies Fellowship, Sunset Youth Leader, Sunday School Teacher and the Presbytery executive. She was a member of the Inner Wheel Club and served in both local and national executive positions in the organization. Jessie has volunteered for many local charities as organizer and canvasser, including Meals on Wheels, CNIB, Canadian Diabetic Association, Heart and Stroke Foundation, Kidney Foundation, Cancer Foundation, MS Society, Alzheimer’s Society and the Regina United Way Residential Canvass. A lifetime member of the Regina Horticultural Society and a member of the South Saskatchewan Lily Society, she is a frequent exhibitor and organizer for both groups.

Gary C. Carlson, a resident of Regina for over 55 years, has volunteered for and founded multiple community organizations. He was the founder of the Saskatchewan Agricultural Hall of Fame and its Chairman for 10 years. He founded the Saskatchewan Farm Vacations Association, now the Saskatchewan Country Vacation Association, in 1972 and established the Canadian Agricultural Travel Scholarship Association to support the Nuffield Farm Scholarship Program, now known as Nuffield Canada. He was co-chair of the Leisure Centre Planning Committee and led the campaign to construct the South Regina Leisure Centre. Gary was a founder and first President of the Canadian Federation of Human Rights and the Civil Liberties Association. He was Chair of the Century Regina committee that celebrated Regina’s settlement in 1982. Gary was a charter member and director of the Saskatchewan Home-Based Business Association. Along with his wife Jessie, Gary was one of the founding and charter members of the Sunset United Church and served in multiple capacities within the Sunset United Church and the United Church of Canada. He has served on the executive of multiple volunteer organizations, including Regina Eastview Rotary Club, South Zone Recreation Board, Regina Horticultural Society, South Zone Dance Club, Council of Canadians, Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists, the Canadian Mental Health Association and the Regina Lawn Bowling Club. He was a member of the executive for the Palliser NDP Federal Riding Association and the Regina Lewvan Federal Riding Association. He was a member of the University of Saskatchewan Senate and has served on multiple boards and scholarship panels for the University of Saskatchewan.
Corporate Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline Title:</th>
<th>Applies to:</th>
<th>Reference #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Naming Committee Guideline</td>
<td>Civic Naming Committee; All Employees; City Clerk; City Council</td>
<td>2018-OCC-G0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy # 2018-4-CC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dates:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total # of Pages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td>Effective:</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Planning Commission and City Council</td>
<td>26-Nov-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Review:</td>
<td>01-Jan-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Review:</td>
<td>28-Jun-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 001-GEN-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Purpose

To establish a guideline for the naming and renaming of parks and streets where the sponsorship and naming rights policy does not apply.

This guideline is used to provide a framework for adjudicating applications submitted to the Civic Naming Committee. This guideline is also used to provide a framework for departments as applicable.

This guideline is driven by the Cultural Plan and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Calls to Action. In accordance with the Cultural Plan, the naming of streets and parks will celebrate Regina’s unique history and cultural diversity and tell the whole story of Regina.

2.0 Scope

This guideline applies to the Civic Naming Committee and departments as applicable.

This guideline does not address issues relating to sponsorship by third parties. Refer to the sponsorship policy.

3.0 Definitions

*Arterial Road* – a high-capacity urban road, the primary function of which is to deliver traffic from collector roads to feeders or expressways at the highest level of service possible
Civic Naming Committee – Administrative committee that adjudicates street and park naming applications based on the approved Guidelines.

Collector Road – a low-to-moderate-capacity road which serves to move traffic from local roads to arterial roads and which is designed to provide access to residential properties.

Directionals – words that incorporate a cardinal or ordinal direction (e.g. North, South, Northwest, etc.)

Duplicate Names – names of honourees that are spelled identically, even if pronunciation differs between two honourees.

Knowledge Keepers/Elders – a person recognized by a First Nations community as having knowledge and understanding of traditional culture of the community. Individuals possess knowledge and wisdom of spiritual and social traditions, coupled with the recognition and respect of community members. “Elder” is the most common contemporary English word for these individuals, although many First Nations utilize different traditional terms to describe these individuals.

Local Road – a low capacity road which provides access to residential properties. Local roads typically connect to collector roads.

Master List of Street and Park Names – a subset of the Street Where You Live dataset that includes all names approved by the Civic Naming Committee for use as a street or park name. Names may be reserved for a specific development or available for general use. List is available online at the Open Data website at http://open.regina.ca/dataset/street-where-you-live-list.

Name Suffix – the way designator that accompanies a commemorative or administrative name to create a total name (e.g. Way, Road, Street, Crescent, etc.)

Soundalike Names – names that sound alike when the name is spoken aloud but that may be spelled differently, or that sound sufficiently similar that a person in distress may mispronounce the name in such a way to cause confusion for way finding (e.g. Hutchison, Hutchinson; Smith, Smyth; Johnson, Johnsen).

Street Where You Live – a dataset of names that have been used as street or park names or are approved to be used in future as street or park names. The dataset includes all non-numbered names of public and private roads, park names, and names that have been approved but not yet assigned to a street or park, also known as the Master List of Street and Park Names.

Theme Naming – names within a neighbourhood or subdivision that have a commonality to create a sense of place or belonging.

Topographic Feature – surface feature or geographical contours of the land, both natural and manmade.

Total Name – street name that includes both the commemorative or administrative name and the name suffix (e.g. Wascana Parkway, Albert Street).

Tradition bearer – a person or group of people (living or deceased) with a high degree of knowledge of and the skills required to perform or recreate specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, especially aspects that may be rare or in danger of being...
lost, including oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practices that involve nature and the universe, traditional craftsmanship or knowledge of traditional activities related to living off the land and to household economy

_Treaty 4 Area Language Groups_ – Language groups that can be found within the Treaty 4 area, whether signatories to Treaty 4 or not, including Cree, Saulteaux, Michif, Siouan (Lakota, Nakoda, Dakota), and Dene

### 4.0 General Guidelines for Street and Park Names:

4.1 All materials submitted to the _Civic Naming Committee_ in conjunction with street and park name applications will be considered public information;

4.2 All new park and street names within the City of Regina must be approved by the _Civic Naming Committee_ in accordance with these guidelines;

4.3 There will be no use of awkward, corrupt, discriminatory or derogatory names, and no discrimination with regard to religion; creed; marital status; family status (parent-child relationship); sex (including pregnancy); sexual orientation; disability (physical or mental); age (18 and over); colour; ancestry; nationality; place of origin; race or perceived race; receipt of public assistance; and gender identity in adjudicating names in accordance with these guidelines. Proposed names must be in compliance with the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code;

4.4 Approved names for streets and parks must not be problematic for dispatching emergency services personnel (i.e. _duplicate_ or _soundalike names_.) Health and safety is the highest priority in street and park naming;

4.5 _Theme naming_ for streets and parks within a neighbourhood or subdivision is permitted so long as the theme is in accordance with the guidelines. _Theme naming_ that utilizes a common word as a prefix to the street name (e.g. Wascana, Green) will not be permitted;

4.6 All street and park names, regardless of language of origin, must be rendered in the modern English alphabet on the primary signage on the pole to facilitate way-finding and mail delivery. Additional signage featuring syllabics in one of the _Treaty 4 Area Language Groups_ or other cultural groups with a strong connection to the area may be added as secondary signage;

4.7 _Directionals_ may not be incorporated into the prefix of a street or park name (e.g. North Victoria Avenue, Northeast Pasqua Street, etc.);

4.8 Street and Park Naming Honours:
4.8.1 A person or persons who have:

4.8.1.1 Performed actions which have brought special credit to the City of Regina, Province of Saskatchewan, or Canada;

4.8.1.2 Fostered equality, enhanced community and/or reduced discrimination within the City of Regina, Province of Saskatchewan, or Canada;

4.8.1.3 Served in an elected capacity at the municipal, provincial, federal or Indigenous government level representing Regina and district for at least two terms;

4.8.1.4 To qualify under 4.8.1.1, an individual must have gone above and beyond the successful completion of duties associated with their profession. Longevity of service does not qualify as service above and beyond the successful completion of duties associated with their profession;

4.8.1.5 If a person qualifies for honour but is not in compliance with 4.4, the person’s name shall be added to the Street Where You Live spreadsheet under the existing duplicate or soundalike street or park name;

4.8.1.6 In the case of an Indigenous person, the honouree may specify if they would like to use their English surname or a translated name or Indigenous name.

4.8.2 Concepts, traditions or tradition bearer(s) within the Indigenous community;

4.8.3 Names, titles or properties associated with the Royal Family, in keeping with Regina’s nickname of “The Queen City”;

4.8.4 A topographic feature within the neighbourhood in which the street or park resides:

4.8.4.1 A topographic feature name must not duplicate a street named for the neighbourhood;

4.8.4.2 A topographic feature name may honour a topographic feature that was formerly located in or near the neighbourhood where the street currently resides (e.g. a hill that has now been flattened, a creek that has now been diverted, a landmark now removed);
4.8.4.3 A topographic feature name may be either in English or one of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups. If an existing street or park name in English has been derived directly from a Treaty 4 Area Language Group, a notation will be made in the Street Where You Live spreadsheet (e.g. Pasqua is derived from Paskwāw, for "prairie").

4.8.5 Flora or fauna native to Saskatchewan:

4.8.5.1 Flora or fauna names may be derived from a living or an extinct species;

4.8.5.2 Flora or fauna names may be either in English or one of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups;

4.8.5.3 The same English root word may be translated into one or more of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups and reused within the City of Regina;

4.8.5.4 If a flora or fauna name in two or more of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups is not in compliance with 4.4, the flora or fauna name will be approved for use only once. A notation will be made in the Street Where You Live spreadsheet that the name is linguistically similar in multiple languages of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups (e.g. This word is nearly identical in Siouan languages.);

4.8.5.5 If a flora or fauna name in English for an existing park or street has been derived directly from a Treaty 4 Area Language Group, a notation of the name’s origin will be made in the Street Where You Live spreadsheet (e.g. moose);

4.8.5.6 Primary signage must utilize the modern English alphabet, regardless of language of origin.

4.9 Naming Quota Requirements:

4.9.1 Developers collaborate with the Civic Naming Committee to work toward achieving a target of 25% of street and 50% of park names within a concept plan bearing a name with an Indigenous connection.

4.9.2 Developers must select 25% of street or park names for new concept plans from the list of available street names as at January 1, 2018 until all street and park names are utilized from the list;
4.9.3 To allow for completion of existing neighbourhoods, street names that were approved for neighbourhoods and reserved for development companies as at November 1, 2017 may be counted within the 25% of street or park names required to be used from the list.

4.10 Street or Park Name Translations:

4.10.1 An applicant may apply to have an existing street or park name translated into one of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups;

4.10.2 The Civic Naming Committee will review all translation requests and present Administration with recommendations on the request;

4.10.3 Where appropriate, the Civic Naming Committee may consult with Knowledge Keepers/Elders on matters pertaining to the request and the translation;

4.10.4 For parks, the number of Treaty 4 Area Language Groups honoured will be left to the discretion of the Administration. There is no character limit to park signage, therefore park signage may honour multiple Treaty 4 Area Language Groups;

4.10.5 Each signpost will bear no more than two street name signs for a single street, one in English which is required for way finding and Canada Post, and one in the requested Treaty 4 Area Language Group;

4.10.6 Only one of the Treaty 4 Area Language Groups will be selected for signage for each road;

4.10.7 Signage requests for multiple languages within the Treaty 4 Area Language Group will be determined on a first come, first served basis, unless there is a logical reason that one language group would be preferred over another (e.g. if the name is derived from a specific Treaty 4 Area Language Group, if the commemorative name honours an individual with a connection to a particular Treaty 4 Area Language Group);

4.10.8 The Administration may place limits on translated street or park signs to control costs. The exact cost control mechanisms are left to the discretion of the Administration (e.g. limiting signage to a specific subdivision or neighbourhood, phasing in additional signage over multiple years);

4.10.9 Individuals, groups or organizations may offer to pay all or part of the cost for translated signs to facilitate timely placement of signage (e.g. crowdfunding, sponsorship, donations).
4.11 Street or Park Name Changes:

4.11.1 Street or park name changes will be considered for review if the change meets one of the following criteria:

4.11.1.1 The name poses a threat to health and safety and/or wayfinding;
4.11.1.2 The name honouring a person has been misspelled;
4.11.1.3 The historical legacy of the namesake of a street or park has been found to be unfitting of honour (see 4.11.5)

4.11.2 Street or park name changes submitted under 4.11.1.1 or 4.11.1.2 are housekeeping changes. The City Clerk, working through the Civic Naming Committee, has delegated authority to approve a street or park name change under 4.11.1.1 or 4.11.1.2. City Council will be informed of any name changes approved by the City Clerk via the Civic Naming Committee annual report;

4.11.3 The proposed new name for a street or park must be approved first by the Civic Naming Committee in accordance with these guidelines;

4.11.4 In the case of a street or park name change submitted under 4.11.1.1, a new street or park name will be selected by the Administration, with preference given to names on the list of available street and park names;

4.11.5 Street or park name changes submitted under 4.11.1.3 will be adjudicated by City Council:

4.11.5.1 A report will be written by the Administration addressing the requested name change utilizing criteria approved by City Council;
4.11.5.2 Consultation with stakeholders and rights holders will be conducted before the report is written;
4.11.5.3 Criteria for the Administration to apply when writing a report addressing the historical legacy of the namesake of a commemorative name will be developed by the Administration in 2018 and submitted for consideration to City Council;
4.11.5.4 Until 4.11.5.3 is complete, requests for renaming under 4.11.1.3 will be tabled pending a report on 4.11.5.3 to City Council.
5.0 Specific Guidelines for Naming Streets:

5.1.1 When a street name honours a person or persons, surnames alone will be approved for use. Royal Family members may use a title and first name, or first name only (e.g. Prince George, Charlotte);

5.1.2 Total names for streets cannot exceed 18 characters, including spaces, to accommodate standard signage in use throughout the City of Regina;

5.1.3 While the City of Regina has no jurisdiction over the naming of private roads, the City of Regina will work with the developer/owner to create more meaningful address descriptions for structures located thereon and to align with all public roadway criteria to ensure public safety and way finding;

5.1.4 Whenever possible, the City of Regina will work with regional partners that have autonomous naming abilities (Provincial Capital Commission, Global Transportation Hub, Royal Canadian Mounted Police Depot Division, First Nations groups, rural municipalities or other agencies) to harmonize naming procedures in the Regina area in a manner that ensures public safety and way finding. This may include, but is not limited to: consultation, name vetting on behalf of the regional partner, reserving a name from the Master List of Street and Park Names for a regional partner, or performing the naming and addressing function on behalf of a regional partner on a fee-for-service basis.

5.1.5 Arterial and Collector Roads:

5.1.5.1 All arterial and collector roads will be named by the City of Regina;

5.1.5.2 All arterial and collector roads will be given a name with an Indigenous connection or tie;

5.1.5.3 The City of Regina will consult with Knowledge Keepers/Elders from the Treaty 4 area and other stakeholders when naming an arterial or collector road;

5.1.5.4 The consultation process will be a true consultation process, with selected names being reserved for use as an arterial or collector road;

5.1.5.5 The structure and procedure for consulting with Knowledge Keepers/Elders is left to the discretion of the City of Regina.
5.1.6 Developers will be allowed to name all local roads within a concept plan in accordance with these guidelines;

5.1.7 Roads on Annexed Land:

5.1.7.1 The City of Regina will name all roads on annexed land;

5.1.7.2 The City of Regina will grandfather in common names for roads on annexed land whenever possible;

5.1.7.3 If common names for roads on annexed land are not in compliance with these guidelines, the City of Regina will select a new name for the road;

5.1.7.4 Wherever possible, first preference for new names for roads on annexed land will be given to names with an Indigenous connection.

5.1.8 Streets Named for Neighbourhoods:

5.1.8.1 One street within a neighbourhood plan may bear the name of the neighbourhood;

5.1.8.2 Any street bearing a name of a neighbourhood may not continue into another neighbourhood. The street must terminate within the named neighbourhood.

6.0 Specific Guidelines for Naming Parks:

6.1.1 This policy does not apply to parks or features within a park where sponsorship has been provided by third-party organizations. In that case, the sponsorship policy will take precedence over these guidelines;

6.1.2 When a park name honours a person or persons, first and last names may be approved for use. Royal Family members may use a title and first name, or first name only (e.g. Prince George, Charlotte);

6.1.3 There is no character limit to park signage, therefore park names may include both first and last names;

6.1.4 The City of Regina shall consider park names that are in compliance with these guidelines, which are proposed by the following sources:

6.1.4.1 The local community association or zone board;
6.1.4.2 The developer of the park or subdivision;
6.1.4.3 User groups, organizations or residents of the area.

6.1.5 When a name is proposed for a specific park, the Community Services Department shall forward the proposed name for review by:

6.1.5.1 The affected community association in the case of a neighbourhood level park;
6.1.5.2 The affected zone board in the case of a zone level park;
6.1.5.3 The adjacent zone board and the adjacent community association in case of a new subdivision where a community association does not yet exist; and
6.1.5.4 The affected user groups in the case of a municipal park.

6.1.6 If the park is located on a joint use site involving the City of Regina and either the public or separate school board, or if the site is adjacent to a school, the Community Services Department shall consult with the school board prior to naming the park;

6.1.7 In the case of a proposed renaming, the Community Services Department shall arrange for a public consultation process in cooperation with the respective community association, zone board or user group to consult those affected by the name change;

6.1.8 Elements within zone and municipal parks that are distinct and separate such as athletic fields, pavilions, plazas and waterfalls may also be named in accordance with these guidelines at the discretion of the City of Regina.

7.0 Roles & Responsibilities

The City Clerk, working through the Civic Naming Committee, has delegated authority to approve a street or park name change under 4.11.1.1 or 4.11.1.2.

The Office of the City Clerk is responsible for providing committee support for the Civic Naming Committee, including maintaining the list of street and park names approved for use.

The Civic Naming Committee is responsible for adjudicating street and park name applications in accordance with this guideline.

City Council is responsible for adjudicating street or park name changes submitted under 4.11.1.3.

City departments are responsible for ensuring that street and park names suggested for use in new neighbourhoods are in compliance with these guidelines.
8.0 Related Forms

Civic Naming Committee Commemorative Name Application
Civic Naming Committee Treaty 4 Area Language Syllabics Application

9.0 Reference Material

None

10.0 Revision History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
<th>(Re)-Approval Required (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-Nov-2018</td>
<td>Initial Release.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A 2021 Approved Names

Approved For Street or Park

Achahkos
Achahkos means star or a little star in Cree.

Akiya
In Saulteaux, akiya means "which way" or "the way", which would translate as "directions" in English.

Amahpiya
Amahpiya means "it's cloudy" in Dakota.

Andek
Andek means "crow" in Saulteaux.

Bryce, Sharron
Sharron Bryce was a Regina City Councillor from 2003 to 2020, representing Ward 7. Bryce, a registered nurse, works as the Manager of Health Care for Athol Murray College of Notre Dame.

Cetan
Cetan means "hawk" in Dakota.

Esiwebak
In Saulteaux, esiwebak means "weather" or "weather conditions".
Favel, Philip

Philip Favel (1923-2021) was born in Prongua, SK, which is part of the Sweetgrass First Nation. He served in World War II as a driver and was involved in the Juno Beach invasion. He earned the French Legion of Honour Medal for helping an injured person and two children. He volunteered to serve in Japan, but hostilities ended before he could be transferred. He earned the 1939-45 Star, the France and Germany Star, the Defence Medal, the Canadian Volunteer Service Medal, and the War Medal 1939-1945. Upon his return to Canada, Favel advocated for the rights of Indigenous veterans. About 3000 Indigenous veterans served in World War II but returned to fewer benefits than their non-Indigenous counterparts. Favel’s efforts resulted in changes to compensation. In recognition of his efforts, Favel's portrait was hung in the Canadian War Museum. Favel was a recipient of the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal.

Flegel, Jerry

Jerry Flegel, a real estate agent, was a member of Regina City Council from 2003-2009 and from 2012-2020, when he resigned his position to make a bid for Mayor. His mayoral bid was unsuccessful. Flegel represented Ward 10. He works for Century 21 Dome Realty Inc.

Fougere, Michael

Michael Fougere (1956 - ) is a former City Councillor and Mayor of Regina. Fougere, who was born in Farmington, Michigan, was elected to the first of his 5 terms as City Councillor in 1997, representing Ward 4. He was elected Mayor in 2012 and was defeated in 2020. Two notable events during Fougere’s tenure as Mayor were the wastewater treatment plant referendum and the construction of a new stadium for the Saskatchewan Roughriders. In news interviews after his mayoral loss, Fougere highlighted his proudest achievements as his work on infrastructure, homelessness, reconciliation and economic development.

Giyekiyapi

Giyekiyapi means “flying bus” in Nakoda, which would be translated as the English word “airplane”.
Ralph Edward Goodale (1949 - ) served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly and a Member of Parliament for multiple Regina ridings on multiple occasions between 1974 and 2019. Goodale, who was born in Wilcox, SK, attended the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan, ultimately receiving a law degree. In 1974, Goodale became the MP for Assiniboia, where he served as a backbencher until his 1979 defeat. He became the leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party in 1981, a time of calamitous misfortune for the party, which got only 4.51% of the vote in the 1982 election; although he won more votes than any other candidate, he still lost his riding. In 1986 he was the only Liberal in the Saskatchewan Legislature. He ran federally in 1988 but was narrowly defeated and spent multiple years in the private sector before joining the 1993 federal Red Wave. Goodale then took multiple cabinet positions in the governments of Chretien and Martin. After the Liberal defeat in 2006 he became Opposition House Leader under the leadership of Dion and Ignatieff. Goodale then became one of the cabinet ministers of Justin Trudeau, thus becoming the only MP to serve in government with both Pierre and Justin Trudeau. Goodale has served in multiple cabinet positions during his years in federal politics, including: Agriculture and Agri-Food; Natural Resources; Public Works and Government Services; Finance; Deputy Leader; Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness; and acting prime minister in the case of incapacitation of the prime minister. He was defeated in the 2019 election and has since gone on to serve as the Special Advisor to the Government of Canada’s response to the Ukraine International Airlines Flight 752 crash. He is the recipient of many awards, including multiple Queen’s Jubilee Medals, and is a member of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada.

Hanwi

Hanwi means “the moon” in Dakota.

Hawi Ozuna

Hawi Ozuna means “the moon” in Nakoda.

Hebert, Ben

Ben Hebert is an Olympic gold medalist for curling. Hebert was born in Regina and curled for Team Saskatchewan in two Briers and Team Canada on the World Junior Curling Championship in 2003, which Team Canada won. He moved to Alberta, where he won the Canada Cup and the 2008 and 2009 Briers. He was part of the winning 2008 World Men’s Curling Championship. After a controversial 2009 Canadian Olympic Trials match win over the Glenn Howard rink, Hebert and Team Martin beat Howard and went on to the 2010 Olympics in Vancouver, where they won the gold medal. Hebert is married with two children and lives in Alberta.
Approved For Street or Park (cont.)

Kekek
Kekek is the Saulteaux word for "hawk" and is pronounced in a way that is very close to the sound that the bird itself makes during its summer flights.

Kihiw
Kihiw means eagle in Cree.

Kimiwan
Kimiwan in Saulteaux means "it's raining".

Kiniw
Kiniw means "eagle" in Saulteaux.

Kisihs
Kisihs means "sun" in Saulteaux.

Kisik
Kisik means "the sky" in Cree.

Kisikohk
Kisikohk means "in the sky" or "in heaven" in Cree.

Kiswehap
In Saulteaux, kiswehap means "coloured sky" or "rainbow".

Kiwehaw
In Cree, kiwehaw means "she/he flies home by plane".

Kiwetin
Kiwetin means "north wind" or "the north" in Cree.

Magazu
Magazu means "raining" in Nakoda.

Mahpiya
Mahpiya means "the sky" in Dakota and Nakoda.

Mahpiyato
Mahpiyato means "blue sky" in Nakoda.
Maya
Maya means "goose" in Dakota.

Mazakiyon
Mazakiyon means "airplane" in Dakota.

Mino Wapan
In Saulteaux, mino wapan means "It is a beautiful morning".

O’Donnell, Mike
Mike O’Donnell had a 30-year career in teaching and administration in Regina’s school divisions before his retirement and a second career as a City Councillor representing Ward 8. O’Donnell, who first ran for City Council in 2006, retired from City Council in 2020, stating that it was time for someone new to represent his ward. O’Donnell said he was proud of his work on two National Infrastructure Summits, his chairing of the Olympic Torch Relay, and his championing of environmental initiatives such as a paperless council, solar and alternative power sources.

Ocew
Ocew means "fly", as in a housefly, in Cree.

Pimihakan
In Cree, pimihakan means "airplane".
Pinay, Noel Joseph (Penna)

Noel Joseph (Penna) Pinay, born July 8, 1919, served in the United Kingdom and in Continental Europe during World War II.

Noel enlisted on June 15, 1942 in Regina, SK and his service and training included:

- Trained paratrooper and artillery soldier (Rank # L 100812)
- Served in the 1st Canadian Parachute Battalion
- Qualified parachutist
- Employed on training and duties for 15 months, as an artillery gunner for 7 months, as a paratroop instructor for 2 months and as a paratrooper on operational duties for 21 months
- He was wounded near Minden, Germany on April 4, 1945
- Total service: 45 months with 19 months in the United Kingdom and North West Europe
- Noel was awarded the 1939-1945 Star, the France & Germany Star, the War Medal 1939-45 and the Canadian Volunteer Service Medal & Clasp

After Noel’s discharge on April 1, 1946, he married Emma L. Crowe from Piapot First Nation and they moved to Peepeekisis to farm and raise their family.

Noel served as Chief of Peepeekisis Cree Nation for one term in the 1950s and eventually left farming to start a career as a field officer with the Department of Indian Affairs. Noel, Emma and their family lived throughout Saskatchewan (Meadow Lake, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Shellbrook, Percival/Broadview and Yorkton) from 1959 to 1984, with Noel eventually retiring and returning to Peepeekisis. Noel enjoyed camping, traveling, hockey, curling and spending time with his family, grandchildren and great grandchildren. He was an active member of the Saskatchewan Indian Veterans’ Association as well as the Royal Canadian Legion. Noel passed away in December of 1998 at the age of 79. He left a rich legacy of proud military service, dignity and advocacy for First Nations veterans (who had restricted rights under the Indian Act and could not vote until 1960) and he instilled pride and a strong work ethic in all of his children.

Pinehsi

Pinehsi is the Saulteaux word for a small bird, like a swallow.

Pipon

Pipon means “winter” or “it is winter” in Saulteaux.

Piyesis

Piyesis means “small bird” in Cree.
Approved For Street or Park (cont.)

Po
Po means "fog" in Dakota.

Saskan
In Cree, saskan means "it is a chinook" or "it thaws".

Songipohn
In Saulteaux, songipohn means "it is snowing".

Sowahkeyiw
In Cree, sowahkeyiw means "she or he is soaring", as in soaring like a bird.

Stadnick, Theodore “Ted”
Theodore “Ted” Stadnick (?-1913) was born and raised in Beaubier, SK. He joined the Navy in World War II, where he was a shipwright on a frigate. After discharging from the Navy, Stadnick returned to Regina, where he was employed as a finishing carpenter with Hilsden & Co until founding a company, Telmed Construction Co. with Mel Douglas. He married Joyce and had two sons, Blair and Brian. Stadnick was a longtime member of the Royal Canadian Legion, serving in multiple board positions including President and Secretary Manager. He joined the Masonic Order Assiniboia Lodge in 1959. Stadnick was the founder of the Sherwood Lodge in 1961. He served in multiple board positions within the Masonic Order and WaWa Shrine Temple, including Worthy Patron, the General Grand Chapter Membership Committee, and was Captain of the Drill Core with Wawa Shrine Temple. Stadnick’s Precision Drill Core came in first in many competitions during his tenure. He was also a volleyball player, winning three Provincial titles in three years at the YMCA. He worked with the Cubs and Scouts for many years and was a longtime member of the Lakeview United Church.

Tade
Tade means "the wind" in Nakoda.

Takwakotew
In Cree, takwakotew means "it arrives across/in the sky", as in clouds.

Tibikan
In Saulteaux, tibikan means "it is night time".

Upahu
Upahu means "wings of a bird" in Dakota.
Approved For Street or Park (cont.)

Wakinyan

Wakinyan means "it's lightning" in Dakota.

Wall, Bradley John

Bradley John Wall (1965 - ) was Saskatchewan's 14th premier from 2007-2018. Wall was the MLA for Swift Current from 1999-2018. He became the first Saskatchewan premier since 1935 to leave office for a reason other than losing an election when he announced his retirement from politics. Wall was a very popular politician, overseeing multiple landslide victories and routinely polling nationally as the most popular premier in Canada. He oversaw a robust Saskatchewan economy and helped to make Saskatchewan a popular destination for new immigration for the first time since the 1920s. His government successfully reduced surgical wait times by increasing surgeries at private clinics, a controversial but ultimately successful program. He works for Osler, Hoskin and Harcourt LLP law firm as an advisor.

Wambdi

Wambdi means "eagle" in Dakota.

Wi

Wi means "sun" in Dakota and Nakoda.

Wicahpi

Wicahpi means "the stars" in Nakoda.

Wicanhpi

Wicanhpi means "the stars" in Dakota.

Woohanko

Woohanko means "speeding, go fast" in Dakota. This would also be the translation for "Mach number" for true air speed in aeronautical terms, although this term technically refers to the ratio of flow velocity past a boundary to the local speed of sound.

Yiwaskwan

Yiwaskwan means clouds or it is cloudy in Cree.

Yotin

Yotin means "It is windy" or "windy" in Cree.

Zitkanna

Zitkanna means "bird" in Dakota.
Horizon Station Park

The horizon is the point where the earth meets the sky, and has special significance to Indigenous people. Stations are a regular stopping point on a public transportation route, especially one on a railroad line with a platform and one or more buildings. Both elements are topographic features located in or near the neighbourhood where the park currently resides. Regina’s location was intrinsically connected to its status as a railroad station.

“Horizon” also honours the former hamlet of Horizon, SK, located in the Bengough municipality roughly an hour and a half southwest of Regina. The Towns subdivision commemorates ghost towns and dying communities in small-town Saskatchewan. The hamlet of Horizon was a point at which the Grand Trunk Railway surveyors met the Canadian Pacific Railroad surveyors. Town legend has it that one of the crews made the remark that “It looks as if we have come to the horizon,” giving rise to the name of the community.

The name “Horizon Station” was selected through an engagement process with St. Gabriel’s 6th grade class.

Jim Sinclair Park

Jim Sinclair (1933-2012) was a founding member of both the Native Council of Canada and the Métis National Council and past President of the Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan (AMNSIS). Born in the Punnichy area, Sinclair grew up in a “road allowance” area in the Qu’Appelle Valley. Sinclair’s accomplishments included playing key roles in the creation of many institutions, including: the Gabriel Dumont Institute, the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation, the Saskatchewan Native Addictions Centre, and the Urban Native Housing Corporations and Provincial Métis Housing Corporation. Sinclair was personally invited by the Prime Minister of Australia to speak on Indigenous rights and held a private audience with Pope John Paul II on four occasions to discuss Indigenous rights and issues. He also spoke at the European parliament on Indigenous rights. Through the efforts of Sinclair and other Indigenous leaders, the Métis people were included in the 1982 repatriation of the Canadian constitution.
Kathleen Robinson Park

Park name only. Staff Sergeant Kathleen Robinson, a First Nations Veteran of the United States Air Force, served as an Aircraft Electrical Systems Specialist overseas in Korea, South Korea, Philippines, Taiwan and California from 1978-87. Kathleen has the distinction of being the first woman in the US Air Force to have an Electrical Systems crew of her own. She was the recipient of the AF Achievement Medal, AF Good Conduct Medal, AF Longevity Service Medal, AF Overseas Short Tour Ribbon and the AF Commendation Medal. After completing an English Degree from Minot State University, Kathleen returned to Canada, and began a career working with the students of the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College in Regina, Sask. She would later pursue a career with YTC Child & Family Services, working with First Nations children. Kathleen was a long time member of the Native American Church, and a practising Sun Dancer, as her culture & spirituality were at the centre of her life.

Sally Elliott Park

Sally Elliott was “Regina’s Grandmother” for over 30 years. Elliott, a nurse specializing in maternal care, made a career specializing in prenatal care. In addition to operating the YMCA’s perinatal program, Elliott founded the Y’s Moms support group for postpartum depression and anxiety. She was a 2020 recipient of the Saskatchewan Order of Merit. Elliott passed away in 2021.
Dr. Barbara Young was born in the San Francisco Bay area. She immigrated to Canada with her second husband after getting her PhD in Education in 1981. Young worked for the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, where she championed administrative roles for women in education and worked to create more female leaders. Young served on the Regina Public School Board in the 2000s before running for her first term representing Ward 1 on City Council. While her 2012 campaign was a squeaker with only about 250 votes separating her from the nearest competitor, Young won her 2016 campaign easily. She was defeated in the 2020 election.

**Young, Major Sidney, M.D.**

Major Sidney Young, M.D., enlisted in the Canadian Army in 1941 and joined the No. 8 General Hospital Unit in Dundurn, SK. No. 8 followed the D-Day invasions to Normandy, setting up a canvas hospital outside Bayeux and then moving closer to the front at Rouen and then behind the troops into Holland, a first for a medical unit. Upon his return in 1945, Dr. Young set up a medical practice in Regina, becoming Chief of Surgery, DVA, Chief of Surgery, Regina General Hospital, Chief of Surgery, Pasqua Hospital, President of Medical Staff, Regina, SK, a founding member and president of Saskatchewan Surgical Society, Board President of Medical Arts Clinic in Regina, and a member of the Western Canadian Surgical Society. He was also a member of the church vestry and the Rector's Warden at St. Paul's Anglican Cathedral.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Applications</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Names Approved for Future Street/Park Use</th>
<th>Names Approved for Addition to an Existing Definition Only</th>
<th>Denied Names</th>
<th>Names Approved for Park Only</th>
<th># of Streets on Registered Plans</th>
<th># of Parks Approved by Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition Key**

- **Application**: Application from a member of the public, developer or organization to nominate an honouree to have a street or park named in their honour. One application may nominate multiple honourees.
- **Type**: Indicates whether the honouree is Indigenous or non-Indigenous.
- **Names Approved for Future Street/Park Use**: Number of honouree names approved in a given calendar year for use as a street or park name.
- **Names Approved for Addition to an Existing Definition Only**: Number of honouree names approved for addition to The Street Where You Live List as an addition to an existing street or park definition only due to health and safety reasons.
- **Denied Names**: Number of honouree names that were denied by the Civic Naming Committee because the name did not comply with the Civic Naming Committee Guideline.
- **Names Approved for Park Only**: Number of honouree names that were approved for use as a park name only. This may occur for a number of reasons, including but not limited to: health & safety, Indigenous consultation, community consultation, or a strong connection to sport, nature or community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Streets on Registered Plans</td>
<td>Number of street names on a registered plan approved by City Council in a given calendar year, broken down by whether the name was Indigenous or non-Indigenous. This metric demonstrates how close the City is getting to having 25% of new street names having an Indigenous connection. There may be a lag between a registered plan being approved and a street being constructed, meaning the name may not be on a street sign immediately after approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Parks Approved by Council</td>
<td>Number of park names approved by City Council in a given calendar year, broken down by whether the park name was Indigenous or non-Indigenous. This metric demonstrates how close the City is getting to having 50% of new park names having an Indigenous connection. An approved park will have signage placed within the park, meaning the name is in active use immediately upon approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COVID-19 Update

Date | March 16, 2022
---|---
To | City Council
From | City Clerk's Office
Service Area | Office of the City Clerk- Council Reports
Item No. | CM22-6

**RECOMMENDATION**

That City Council receive and file this report.

**DISCUSSION**

The Interim City Manager will provide a verbal status update respecting COVID-19.

Respectfully yours,

Amber Ackerman, Interim City Clerk

3/4/22
MOTION

March 16, 2022

To: Mayor Masters and City Councillors

Re: Whistleblower Policy

WHEREAS the City of Regina established a Whistleblower Policy in January 2020 that provides protections and procedures for employees to confidentially or anonymously report allegations of wrongdoing by the City of Regina;

WHEREAS the current Whistleblower Policy states that the City Manager will review reports of wrongdoing to determine if the allegation of wrongdoing will be investigated by an independent investigator, or by appropriate City staff;

WHEREAS the City Manager’s Office acts as the point of contact for any independent investigators appointed or City staff assigned to an investigation of wrongdoing under this Policy;

WHEREAS the policy should provide adequate safeguards to ensure that no employee experiences any form of retaliation when bringing forward information in good faith;

WHEREAS the City of Regina can have a Whistleblower Policy that offers protection similar to other jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS this policy would support City Council in providing good governance to the citizens of Regina;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Administration be directed to prepare a report for Executive Committee by Q2 of 2022 that:

1. Amends the current Whistleblower Policy for City of Regina employees as follows:
   a) The City Manager’s authority to manage the policy be revoked and an internal tribunal be created to manage the policy that includes the following internal representatives:
      i. Internal Auditor
      ii. Director of People & Organizational Culture or designate
      iii. City Solicitor or designate
   b) Section 4.5 of the policy requires the Tribunal to provide a non-identifying summary of reports made under this policy and outcomes of subsequent investigations to Executive Committee for information at least annually.
2. Outline any associated costs and implications related to the implementation of these amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Bresciani
Councillor – Ward 4
NOTICE OF MOTION

March 16, 2022

City Clerk
City Hall
Regina, Saskatchewan

Please be advised that I will submit the following NOTICE of MOTION at the March 16, 2022 meeting of City Council:

Re: Ending Homelessness

WHEREAS no person should suffer homelessness;

WHEREAS the Plan highlighted a priority investment of $5.5M/year for housing first and supportive housing in order to support 270 “complex clients experiencing chronic and episodic homelessness”;

WHEREAS housing and supporting homeless individuals is not only humane, but saves taxes on aggregate;

WHEREAS since 2018, the City has been unsuccessful in its attempts to have the Saskatchewan Government directly participate in funding the Plan in whole or in part;

WHEREAS the City has recommitted to issues of social and environmental justice since 2018, including through adopting the Community Safety and Wellbeing Plan; and

WHEREAS the commitments underlying the Plan remain unfulfilled, and this work remains urgent;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Administration be directed to include the following in the 2023 proposed budget:
1. Full operational funding to solve homelessness throughout the City using a housing first, supportive housing model. This draft funding to be clearly demarcated in a line item of its own.

2. Any supplemental report required to explain the costing of point 1, above.

   a. This report will provide the estimated number of chronically homeless persons in Regina, the anticipated cost per individual to provide supportive housing to these individuals, the anticipated timeline to house these individuals if the draft funding were approved, and the means by which the City would deploy the funding if approved (including through working with service partners).

   b. This report will also describe the financial cost of continued inaction on this issue. This analysis will outline the current, ongoing costs of unaddressed homelessness throughout the City.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan LeBlanc  
Councillor – Ward 6

Andrew Stevens  
Councillor – Ward 3