

Members of the Regina City Planning Commission:

I support the recommendation of the Administration in the above matter for the following reasons:

1. **Non Compliance with the Standards and Guidelines adopted by Regina** - The Cook House (3160 Albert) is a designated Municipal Heritage Property. No alterations or additions to this building can be permitted which do not comply with the Standards and Guidelines for Historic Properties in Canada, which have been adopted by the City of Regina. These guidelines provide that any addition must be “compatible with” and “subordinate to” the designated property. This proposal is in obvious violation of that standard. No other aspect of this proposed development can be considered until that preliminary issue is resolved. A great deal of everyone’s time (and especially the time of City staff) has been wasted by running a full application process on a development proposal which does not meet the first test.

The Administration’s Report (at Page 8) speaks to the Heritage Analysis. I agree with their conclusion that the proposed work is well outside what is acceptable under the Standards and Guidelines. In my opinion it is blatantly outside the Standards and Guidelines. If there is any doubt about that a properly qualified Architect could have been engaged to conduct that evaluation.

Furthermore, the complete demolition and reconstruction of certain elements is impossible for the City to police. There are a great many circumstances which could arise which would cause the project to not be completed. The proponent claims “that is what insurance is for”. Not so. This would require a bond of probably several million dollars. The proponent has in no way provided assurance that he is capable of guaranteeing that the work proposed can and will actually be carried out.

2. **Streetscape and Cultural Landscape** - The following objective is included in Regina’s Cultural Plan (at page 52): *Conserve and enhance the heritage values of areas, streetscapes, and cultural landscapes.* It goes on to say: “Use the zoning bylaw to ensure key elements of existing local heritage character are protected by development standards. The form, scale, and massing of new development in a predominantly early 20th century streetscape could be regulated by lower height limits among other standards for example.” This proposal is exactly what Regina’s Cultural Plan does NOT want.
3. **Unacceptable Location** - There are literally dozens of vacant sites in inner city Regina which would be perfect for the development the proponent wants to build. The City Administration should do everything they can to assist this developer in building his project on one of those infill sites. No developer is entitled to an upzone as a right. An upzone should only be allowed by the City if the project is of obvious benefit to the community affected. The affected community clearly does not consider that the proposal is an obvious benefit.
4. **Municipally Designated Heritage Property** – This is a Municipally Designated Heritage Property. The City just recently went through a long and thorough process to make that determination. This proponent knew the property was on the Heritage Holding List when he purchased the property. He was offered \$50,000 more than he paid for the property after it was formally designated and should have accepted that offer and moved on. He continues to suggest that his property rights have not been respected. The proponent not the City is the one who has the misunderstanding with respect to property rights. It is time for the City to make it clear to the proponent that the City has

designated this property and will use the full authority which it possesses to ensure that the building is protected.

This proposal should have been dismissed immediately as not meeting of the Standards and Guidelines referred to above. We should learn from this exercise and in the future should not consume the time of City staff and interested parties considering development proposals on Heritage sites until the "Heritage Analysis" (page 8) has been conducted.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my thoughts concerning this issue.

Ross Keith