

Verbatim Public Comments on the Proposed Zoning Bylaw

received as of March 15, 2019

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Site Coverage

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
What is included in the maximum site coverage calculation? Is it strictly the house and garage for a typical property? I was under the impression that there is a maximum so rain/snow can melt away into the ground. Is this the reasoning being used?	Site coverage would include the percentage of the lot that is covered by buildings or structures. This includes anything that has a roof. For example, a covered deck, gazebo or shed would be included in the site coverage calculation. It would not include a temporary structure such as a screen tent.
What changes will there be to front and/ or side yard setbacks and % lot coverage and Which areas or zones?	There are not significant changes proposed to the setbacks and allowable site coverage standards in the residential zones from what is currently required.
Lot Coverage: By allowing 60% lot coverage will result in more massive buildings on small lots and lessen green space, flooded yards due to improper water drainage and the grade of the build ending up being much higher than the lot of the older house that has settled over the many years. We all know what happens to foundations due to excessive water not draining properly.	For some building forms such as a townhouse (Building, Row) there is a greater percentage of site coverage proposed as the lots are typically smaller. For a detached dwelling the site coverage will remain at 50%.

Lot Size

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<p>It appears the minimum lot size has decreased, unless I read incorrectly. I don't agree with this. Land developers are going to focus on only the minimum so they get more lots in the same area, and thus more money. If people don't want larger yards, there are alternative housing options available to them. It's a shame a person can't buy a new house with a large yard. I believe this is in the benefit of the developer instead of the citizens of Regina.</p> <p>PROPOSED: "Smaller lots will be permitted in more residential zones as the development standards for minimum lot area and minimum lot frontage have been reduced." Further minimization of lot widths will allow more of the lots in the current RI Zone. Districts to be split into 2 narrow lots of 9.45M (31 feet). Why is the City eliminating the RI Zone Districts to allow more than one dwelling unit? There is no apparent necessity or analysis to support this drastic change provided by the City. The Intensification summary on the City's Zoning Plan Map indicates that the majority of RI Zone Districts will not require any changes to provide more accommodation spaces for the anticipated 65,000 persons to reach 300, 000 population. Intensification is shown on the map as occurring along major transportation corridors and closer to the City centre plus Greenfield areas.</p>	<p>The minimum lot size has been reduced to allow additional opportunities for flexibility in building form and design, and to accommodate shifting market trends towards smaller lots. The development industry indicated that there is a growing demand for smaller homes on smaller lots. The proposed Zoning Bylaw is allowing that as an option.</p> <p>The proposed bylaw provides minimum requirements, this does not prevent the developer from creating larger frontages for larger buildings.</p>
It appears the minimum lot frontage has been reduced, and I completely agree with this.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I don't think that there should be any decrease in the minimum lot size. The current lot sizes already seem to be too small and don't allow for enough on street parking. Most households have more than one car and parking in a driveway as well as inside a garage doesn't allow for enough parking for visitors with the current lot sizes without overlapping a driveway. I also think that current lot sizes are too small because a developer typically will go with the smallest size possible which results in there being lot sizes that will not accommodate bungalow style housing (built a house 5 years ago and there was only a handful of lots in Harbour Landing that would be large enough to build a bungalow style). If anything I think there should be an increase on the minimum lot size for residential housing. 	<p>The proposed changes to the minimum lot size support the OCP policy for complete neighborhoods encouraging various housing forms for residents. The OCP is the master plan of the city for the next 25 years. Within this document is policy for flexibility in lot size to accommodate a variety of building forms. The Zoning Bylaw is the tool for implementing the direction of this policy.</p> <p>The Zoning Bylaw only provides the minimum requirement, this does not stop the developer from creating larger lots in the planning stages of the development. The developer will typically base their decisions on the market demand.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Setbacks

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
When a commercial or industrial building is being built it, depending on how close the building is to the residential house it should be no higher than the house. If its set back further it can be built higher.	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does have regulations in place for mixed use or industrial land uses when proposed next to residential areas.</p> <p>The proposed regulations in Industrial zones include required separation distances between industrial uses and residential uses, as well as specific requirements for development on sensitive lots.</p>
The Mixed Low Rise (ML) zoning designation is and will continue to be a place for conflict at any location where there is an abutting house. The new propose zoning document should reflect a more elegant transition between the existing residence and the commercial building. Although the draft zoning document does make some attempt to mitigate the likely conflicts between neighbors by limiting the types of businesses it does not address the other factors sufficiently such as front clearance, side lot clearance and building style.	Proposed mixed use development has the opportunity to provide dwelling units mixed with commercial, educational, employment and light industrial development. The development standards provide regulations for setbacks from abutting lots zoned residential. The proposed development standards have taken setbacks into consideration for heights in many of the proposed zones.
If the commercial building is built in the similar size and style as the abutting house this may be acceptable. Note that building placement and length would affect the acceptability as described in subsequent comments. In regards to front yard clearance, in all or almost all cases a residence cannot be build closer than 20ft from the front property line and this restriction should remain. In the particular case of the corner of 13th Avenue and Retallack street, the existing commercial buildings adhere to the 20 ft. requirement and it would seem to be out of place with the streetscape to allow as little as zero clearance to new construction at this corner. The current draft document allows for zero clearance if the building has an active front and is not more than 8.5 meters high. I believe this to be extremely unfair to the existing property owner as it's bound to affect the property value and would give the feeling of being boxed in or crowded.	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not dictate the style of the building. It can only regulate the permitted land uses and provide development standards for those uses.</p> <p>The OCP provides policy for walkable neighborhoods through the use of active walls and pedestrian friendly streetscapes. A nil front yard setback with the use of an active wall, is one approach to achieving this policy.</p> <p>The proposed ML zone required larger side and rear yard setback where the lot abuts a Residential to ensure separation between commercial and residential land uses. The frontage of the property would determine which are side and rear yards and how the regulations would apply. Furthermore, when the proposed structure on the ML lot is higher, it would require a greater setback, if it is a lower building then a lesser setback.</p>
What changes will there be to front and/ or side yard setbacks and % lot coverage and Which areas or zones?	Setbacks and lot coverage vary per lot and zone.
Setbacks: There is no fixed setback, I would like more clarification on that.	Setbacks vary per lot and zone.

Landscaping

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I want to finish some backyard lawn landscaping. Will the new zoning bylaw have any affect on this project? Also rocks with weeds instead of grass should not be allowed for entire front yard of the duplexes. What is the proposed Zoning Bylaw doing about front-yard landscaping? What is the proposed Zoning Bylaw doing to promote water conservation and minimize stormwater run-off into adjacent streams. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw will not impact the proposed rear yard landscaping.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw incorporates landscape regulations adopted by Council in 2018 that require all one and two-unit residential properties to provide landscaping to minimize erosion or nuisances. The landscaped area must provide permeable ground covering in all front or side yards bordering any public street or public pathway within two years of issuance of an occupancy permit.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Parking

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there such opposition to mixed use of parking near the Regina General Hospital? • An app developer came up with a great idea to improve allocative efficiency for parking around Regina General Hospital, while enabling people to get additional income. It was a win-win. It's a shame that this didn't get considered even on a pilot basis. • Harbour landing is a great example where streets are full of cars, schools and harbour landing village don't have any visitor parking so people end up taking on street spots preventing people from getting boats and trailers out of their driveways or people visiting parks and playgrounds. • What changes will there be to parking? I attended a zoning bylaw meeting and they indicated that parking on a lawn will be enforced to a greater degree. • As in respect residential homes were replaced (small lots) and redeveloped with duplexes or fourplexes, which has already occurred causing many parking problems. • The zoning division and the parking division must work much more closely with each other. • Regina zoning should require under-ground or other on-site parking for all multi-unit residential and commercial properties. For example, most condominium and commercial buildings in Toronto have underground levels for both parking and storage purposes. This approach provides for increased density while also limiting demand / competition for on-street parking by residents, business traffic and visitors. • While it was made clear on several occasions that by the presenters at the zoning meeting that this was a meeting about zoning, not about parking, clearly parking is a significant concern. • As long as there is parking on the property for their employees as for drop offs from personal experience there is a school zone across from us there are people parking and stopping in no parking zones on the street making it Difficult to get in or out our house your parking enforcement does not do much and we just live around that fact. • I think every attempt should be made to reduce on-street parking by providing enough space for adequate parking pads/garages at each home. Many homes have multiple vehicles to accommodate, whether it be from teenagers that are able to drive having a vehicle, suites that may have a couple or small family living in each suite, situations that have multiple families living in the same home, or people who enjoy toys and have snowmobiles, quads, or motorcycles in their garage. It seems the goal of the city has been to increase population density, but this is in-turn creating parking issues. There are some residential areas that have so much street parking you never know when a kid is going to run out into the street in front of you, and the ruts created in winter make it difficult to pass another vehicle. I don't think people should receive a parking ticket to park in front of their own house, but it would be nice if they had enough space on their lot to park as well as to make the streets safer. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw regulates on-site parking by establishing minimum parking requirements for every permitted land use.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate on-street parking. On-street parking and sightline requirements are regulated by the Traffic Bylaw.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw regulates the location of front-yard parking. The surface of the parking area must be an approved surface type, and vehicles cannot be parked on the front lawn.</p> <p>The builder/developer must show on the approved site plan that the minimum parking requirements can be met before a development permit is issued.</p> <p>The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate how many people can live in a dwelling unit. Because this number can vary significantly, it is not possible to establish a minimum parking space requirement that would account for variation in the amount of residents living in a dwelling unit, and thus the amount of vehicles for which parking would be needed. Parking on the street is for all residents.</p>

Parking (cont'd)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 1: 1F.2.5 Parking Relaxations As I understand it, the purpose of subsection 1F.2.5 is provide a mechanism for Council to reduce the minimum number of parking stalls required for a development. The considerations are listed in clause (10), and include: '(g) whether the proposed development(s) or land use(s) will be used predominantly by residents or populations who have specific needs and are less likely to require parking ' '(h) whether the proponent can demonstrate that access to the lot, the development and the land use(s) is prioritized for walking, bicycle and other non-motor vehicular transportation options and/or public transit services ' '(i) what pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities are provided beyond those required by this Bylaw ' This is great because it gives Council the ability to reduce minimum parking requirements for a range of developments, such as those near transit facilities, that are pedestrian friendly, or include affordable housing. What confuses me, then, is that Clause (7) lays out a requirement for the owner of the development to pay the city \$30,000 for every stall that is no longer required. If an affordable housing provider is trying to save \$12,000 to \$35,000 per stall in order to provide more affordable housing to people who are unable to drive or afford a vehicle, why would the City demand \$30,000 for every stall that is forgiven? I'm concerned that clause (7) makes this relaxation untenable. But I acknowledge that I might not understand it. If you could help me to understand the rationale of Clause (7) better, I'd be most thankful. • Now that the bylaw is being updated, the parking requirements have again been overlooked. • Bigger trucks and suv's result in big parking (unclear) • Others pay high taxes and cannot even park on their streets. Eat your own words City of Regina and follow your own bylaws as you say for the "safety of citizens". 7 years of lies, beating around the Bush and incorrect information give...time to finish your city wide 'parking project'for the safety of the citizens, eh? • Parking bylaws must be more diligently and vigorously enforced. Far too often, vehicles are parking beyond the 24-hour restriction. Reporting said vehicles usually does not result in the vehicle being moved. While some may believe that the streets are there for all, the streets are not there for small business people to park their construction vehicles, their work trailers, or flatbeds used to haul equipment. Nor are residential streets places for business people to park semi tractor trucks, which have appeared on more than one occasion on Houghton Road. • Given the limited on street parking in some neighborhoods, sometimes a person's only options is to park on their lawn. The winter also makes this much more important as if you don't plug in your vchicle it likely won't start in -40 degree weaterh. If you can't get close enough to your house to park your car on the street and reach it with a cord, parking your vehicle on your lawn might be your only option. This is also sometimes the place to park during snow route enforcement as well. IF you are planning on making the penalty for parking on a lawn more strict, I would highly suggest that you look into ways to both increase on street parking as well as maybe providing a provision for where it does not apply in the winter months. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw regulates on-site parking by establishing minimum parking requirements for every permitted land use.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate on-street parking. On street parking and sightline requirements are regulated by the Traffic Bylaw.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw regulates the location of Front-Yard Parking The surface of the parking area must be an approved surface type, and vehicles cannot be parked on the front lawn.</p> <p>The builder/developer must show on the approved site plan that the minimum parking requirements can be met before a development permit is issued.</p> <p>The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate how many people can live in a dwelling unit. Because this number can vary significantly, it is not possible to establish a minimum parking space requirement that would account for variation in the amount of residents living in a dwelling unit, and thus the amount of vehicles for which parking would be needed. Parking on the street is for all residents.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX A-7

Bicycle Parking

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the city feel it is necessary to mandate that future multi dwelling units MUST provide storage facilities for bikes? Why not simply let the market dictate if this is needed? If this is a real need and a facility were to offer it, people with bikes would rent from these facilities. A multi unit building may be targeting tenants who don't use bikes and the city is proposing to force them to build a storage facility for bikes which is of no value. These types of proposals tend to drive up building costs which results in higher rents. Unless it is a safety issue the city needs to let the market forces determine the need for bike storage units. To that end, I agree with the bylaws around bike racks. Multi unit building should have long-term bicycle parking that can be locked by the owner. Or even better mandatorily provide a storage unit for each renter/owner and they can use it to whatever purpose, not only storing bikes. Do the regulations for bicycle parking impact condominiums as well as apartments? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Official Community Plan (OCP) has provided direction for alternative forms of transportation for residents of the City. The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not speak to tenancy but must provide tools for the goals of the OCP to be achieved. The proposed regulations requiring bicycle storage facilities are intended to help achieve OCP policies related to active transportation. Residents want to have the option to determine their mode of transportation and have somewhere to park it when not in use. The proposed regulations are for new development only. Long term bicycle storage regulations will be applied to any multi-residential development with greater than 20 units. Regulations for short term bicycle parking is proposed for most land uses including mixed use and industrial. As the Zoning Bylaw does not regulate tenancy or ownership, the regulation for bicycle parking is based on only on land use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the proposed Zoning Bylaw support active transportation? 	<p>Where possible, the proposed Zoning Bylaw supports initiatives related to the Transportation Master Plan. These include requiring:</p> <p>One long-term, secure bicycle parking stall per 20 units in all Residential zones and the Downtown Direct Control District</p> <p>Two short-term bicycle parking stalls; 0.5 long-term bicycle parking stalls; or an equivalent combination for every 10 motor vehicle parking stalls in all Mixed-use zones;</p> <p>One short-term bicycle parking stall; 0.5 long-term bicycle parking stall; or an equivalent combination for every 10 motor vehicle parking stalls in all Industrial zones; and</p> <p>One short-term bicycle parking stall; 0.5 long-term bicycle parking stalls; or an equivalent combination for every 250 square meters of gross floor area along with two showers and ten lockers for every 1,500 square meters of Agriculture, Industry, Office or Industrial land uses in the Downtown Direct Control District</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Garages

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The city should not change current bylaws regarding garages. We already lack enough parking in this city and rather than bringing things up to similar cities in the rest of Canada, Regina seems to want to make it hard to people to own and use a car. Planning to build a new garage. If the resident wants a larger garage and can afford it as long as the property clearances are made this should not be a problem. It's becoming more of a necessity these days. Large toys, equipment for kids or grandchildren along with lawn mowers snow blowers or other large equipment. Although I'm not really crazy about putting sheds in the front yard nor have I ever seen one in the front yard. Why are front garage widths based on a percentage of the house width instead of the lot width? Why are detached garages not permitted in front yards? Some of those older houses have a very large front yard of wasted space, and may not always be able to put a driveway beside the house to a backyard garage. Putting garages in the front yard seems like a better use of space, provided it follows the lot frontage minimum. Why is there a garage maximum size of 807 sq ft? If a garage follows the property line offsets and is within the maximum site coverage, why does there need to be a maximum size? I like limiting the garage width. There are some streets in Harbour Landing that look awful because they are dominated by garages. let people have the size garage they want, if they are willing to pay for it. It's not hurting you in any way. 	<p>Regulations proposed for limiting garage width were removed from the proposed Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>Regulations for accessory structures such as a detached garage are not proposed to be changed from what is currently in place.</p>

Site Design

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
Will the new zoning bylaw address the 6.096m wide alley width in regards to the parking stall length. The requirement in the previous bylaws for the alleys to be 6.100m wide before a reduction of the stall length was allowed when in reality the alleys are 4mm short of that at 6.096. This 4mm difference impacts the parking stall lengths by 5'-0" which can be a lot of backyard space on a narrow lot. I'm curious if the 6.1m in the previous bylaw was simply rounded to one decimal place which maybe didn't seem like a big deal but losing 5'-0" because of 4mm seems a little unrealistic.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw will no longer regulate the size of the parking stalls. This will now be regulated through the Design Standards as part of the site review.
When planning to add to the front or back of your house. As long as property line distances are maintained and allowance is made for parking vehicles in front or back if there is access. They should be able to utilise the maximum area if they desire.	<p>OCP policy speaks to pedestrian-friendly streetscapes. Allowing an entire front yard to be utilized for vehicle parking does not meet this policy. This would create an unsafe environment.</p> <p>When renovating a home with an addition, the maximum site coverage regulation ensures there is permeable surfacing for moisture absorption on site.</p>
Should be allowed to build a maximum sized house as long as it maintains the required property line clearance is an easement clearances. In so far as maximum height of two or two and a half story would not be out of the question. Which was somewhat prominent in the early days. As long as it's a residential residence.	The proposed development standards permit different types of housing forms. The permissible building height may depend on whether the lot under development is within the Residential Infill Overlay Zone or not. In this overlay, the height of the homes on either side must be taken into consideration to ensure the development is sensitive to the surrounding context. When it is a new home in a new development the development standards do permit a taller home.
Decks or expanding deck. I'm not sure what you're proposing for distance but I would not go anymore than 3 feet from the property line.	The proposed regulation for decks will remain the same as in the existing bylaw. There is an opportunity for a proposed deck or porch to encroach a maximum 1.5 metres into the front yard setback, while maintaining a minimum 3.0 metre setback from the front lot line.

APPENDIX A-7

Site Design (con'td)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
Things change in a household as long as distances from property lines are maintained there should not be a problem. Both parents in the household work and children stay at home a lot longer in which case they drive cars so there may be a need for more driveway area it should not be up to the owners if there should be lane or driveway or backyard.	The OCP provides policy direction for the City for the next 25 years. We understand that households change, but the Zoning Bylaw does not regulate the users, only the uses, and provides minimum parking requirements based on the use. The proposed Zoning Bylaw is a tool for implementing OCP policies such as walkable, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes. Providing parking off the lane or minimizing the parking in the front yard assists in achieving this policy.
Front yards are kind of pointless, useless space, and I believe the minimum should be reduced as much as possible while still providing proper sight lines for traffic, and access to utilities etc.	The permeable surface in a front yard helps provide a surface area for drainage on the property. These are in the proposed Zoning Bylaw to allow reductions to the front yard setback dependent on the lot frontage.
small lot development is fine, but detached, not in row or duplex.	The OCP includes direction to provide more housing options and building forms in neighborhoods to accommodate our evolving population as well as intensification of existing neighborhoods. The demographics of the City are also changing. The proposed building forms allow for these policies to be achieved.
I like to keep the detached building types and not to extend it to row or stackedHow will this affect the present driveways and yards?	Existing driveways and yards will not be affected by the proposed Zoning Bylaw, unless the owner is proposing significant changes to their property. At the time of new development a property would be required to meet the new zoning requirements.
The size of commercial and industrial buildings be required to keep a certain percentage of green or landscaped space depending on the size of the lot.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw will require 10% site landscaping for commercial properties and 5% site landscaping for industrial properties.
Does the proposed Zoning Bylaw dictate site grading?	The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate site grading but this is regulated in other bylaws.
Street parking is inadequate for homeowners with multiple vehicles.	The Zoning Bylaw does not prescribe or regulate on-street parking.
Street snow removal. There is no place to put it now unless it is left behind the driveways.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate street maintenance or snow removal.
Is it likely to affect pipeline rights of way within the City Limits, i.e. properties along the pipeline right of way to the Co-op refinery?	There is no change to existing properties along the pipeline easement. Only new development will be required to meet the proposed regulations.

Sun/Shade Studies

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Infill turns] Back yards turn into dark corridors no one wants to live in or buy. • What provisions are being made with respect to rooftop solar installations? • In particular, are there any protections with respect to shading? • For instance, what protections are anticipated if a person built a single storey home with a south facing roof without shading issues but their neighbor to the south wants to build a two storey house that cast a shadow on it? • The Proposed Zoning Bylaw must align with Regina's commitment to be 100% renewable by 2050. • The bylaw must be easily amendable to accommodate renewable requirements. • With the increase in solar powered self generating homes, will we see any zoning bylaw requirements (or amendments) that will look at height restrictions on dwellings next to a mounted solar array? As a solar consultant, a re-occurring deterrent with residences in new build areas and infill allowance areas is that the lot next to their dwelling could potentially build to a height that will effect the efficiency of their solar renewable power source. Has this been taken into consideration? • Reading through the proposed bylaw, I notice there is nothing mentioned with solar panels on the exterior roof of residential units. Does any of the new proposed zoning bylaws take into consideration the use of self generating solar renewable energy systems in residential housing? Particularly for new builds and infill areas. IE: Should a bungalow residence next to an empty lot (or next to a proposed infill lot) install a solar panel system on their roof, are there any measures the resident can take to ensure that the new build in the empty lot (or an infill house) does not detract from the efficiency of the solar powered system? • Also, for all residential (and even commercial zoned neighborhoods) especially in more mature neighborhoods, what action can be taken to mitigate the shade reduction that city owned trees are having on the dwellings with solar renewable energy systems? I have personally seen shade reductions from city owned trees of 20%+ on some of these solar systems, ultimately making the consumer invest more to ensure their solar production is compensating for the inefficiency these trees are causing • Considerations for orienting new developments to take advantage of solar energy, and the prevention of infill development eliminating or preventing the use of solar panels (due to sun shadowing) is not addressed. Why not? 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not dictate the placement of solar panels.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw introduces regulations for Residential Infill Development with an intention to foster residential infill that contributes to revitalization of older neighbourhoods, while complementing existing buildings. For example, residential infill would be required to provide a maximum building height of the greater of 8.5 metres or the height of the principal building on a next-door lot. The cap on maximum building height recognizes that most houses within the infill boundary were not built to the maximum height of 11 metres permitted by the current Zoning Bylaw. Similarly, a new multi-unit residential infill development would require a larger minimum side yard setback where it is higher than 8.5 metres and adjoins an existing building that is less than 8.5 metres in height. Together, these regulations attempt to reduce the shadowing effect of a new multi-unit infill development on neighbouring properties.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Zero Lot

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am also definitely against the zero clearance proposal that will allow someone to build right on the property line. I experienced this exact scenario myself about 2 years ago on a residential property located directly across the street from the Pasqua Hospital. The house on one side had been purchased, was to be torn down and a physician's office with a residential suite was to be built in its place. The proposal they presented to me was a property that would be built right on the property line, with 27 foot walls, providing exactly 18 inches between the 2 buildings. I would no longer be able to use this sidewalk to access my front yard in any way. I tried to explain to the developer that the bedroom windows between the 2 buildings were exits in case of a fire and that the residents would not necessarily be able to now exit that window and escape between the 2 buildings with only 18 inches. I also expressed concern about the residents in my building having to deal with people from the physician's office occupying their parking spaces. Although there was no continuous sidewalk on the other side of my property, the developers response was that I could simply access my front yard using an area between myself and my other neighbors house and somehow it was not a safety issue that residents had only 18 inches between buildings to escape a fire. The developers response to my concern about parking was that they were providing the required 2 parking stalls in their plans and I would need to deal with physician's patients parking on my property as they occurred. NO to zero clearance buildings. • <Zero Lot> It was used to describe a house being built a long the property line. I would be very close to the house in next lot. They indicated it would require the approval of the house owner. It was indicated that the approval process would be between the two owners of the house (lots). There should be concerns. 1. Would the two owners know what their agreeing too. 2. Roof lines interfering between the two structures. Examples are ease draughts, snow removal from roof if necessary, potential cost fire insurance and the claim process implications. 3. Snow removal from the driveway. Not sufficient space on the homeowners lot. • Zero ?fill? zoning where you can build up to the property line on one side of a lot is not something that I can see working out well in the long term. With not having anywhere for the drainage to go and having to use a neighbour's property to access one outside wall of your house for any repairs, I think this is only going to create significant issues between neighbours. • <Zero Lot> Also in changing ownership of a property from one person to another, if a previously signed agreement was in place and worked well the new owners of the property might not have the same opinion for the neighbours using their property in the same way. This would likely result in some significant legal fights when ownership changes. You might be able to make Zero Fill work in a planned way for a neighbourhood (like an entire street all doing it) where between the houses would more constitute public space like in a townhouse type setting but that's the only possible way I could see it coming close to working. • I'm not in favor of Zero Lot Lines. I know there will be fire standards, but simply don't think that is enough. • Zero Lot is an issue because poor backfilling will result in settling and directing water toward neighbours foundation. The City should require a backfilling standard. • What are 'zero lots lines', and where in the city will they be allowed? • I do not feel that allowing building up to the property line is safe or compatible to building neighborhoods. • I lived in a home on zero lot lines for 10 years and for multitude of reasons it is a bad idea. • Zero Lot Development: I've seen this throughout my area as 'in-fill' development. They are usually 2 story plus in height and don't necessarily fit in with the neighbourhood. The idea that neighbours will work together to make repairs is depends on who the individuals are. There is a real possibility of disputes amongst property owners. The height of these buildings infringe on neighbourhood privacy - backyards, etc. For example, I've also noticed windows in place on the Zero lot line on the building up against the neighbour's back step. i.e. new buildings on the 5000 block, 7th Avenue. I'd recommend Zero Lot Development in newly designed and development neighbourhoods where there is a variety of housing options. 	<p>Residential Zero Lot regulations have been removed from the proposed Zoning Bylaw.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Zero Lot (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am totally against zero lot development. I see many potential problems. One being the piling up of snow against the house. Who is going to maintain the easement? Cooperation doesn't always happen. Selling the property will be difficult too. I don't think many would want a zero lot house. • Zero Lot Lines: I and many others in this neighbourhood are strongly opposed to this proposal. I am sorry to say, but, this is ignorance at it's best! To put houses that close together in an older neighbourhood is extremely detrimental to foundations of these older homes. I understand this is considered a civil matter if these type of issues occur. We as taxpayers should NOT be asked to pay the expensive lawyer fees to protect our homes!! When houses are this close it makes it nearly impossible to properly maintain a house i.e. Melt off from eaves in the winter causing terrible ice hazards on side sidewalks, shovelling snow and then where to put the snow. The difficulty to get in between the houses to do basement or sidewalk repair, trying to put up a ladder so as to get to eaves to clean them, must I go on and on so you will listen? • Zero lot residential houses too close, fire hazard hard for utilities provider to service once hose is build, can't get mechanical equipment between houses • I am not in favour of the zero lot line regulations for infill development in any residential zone. I think this type of development could be problematic if concerns regarding structural integrity, drainage etc. in the existing PUD areas of the city are true. This type of development could also have an effect of reducing selling prices of dwellings located next to this type of infill development. Even though there is an agreement between adjacent landowners and buyers are supposed to be aware of issues, these issues may not arise for years. Are we sure that the city would have no liability? • I am totally opposed to the use of any kind of "Zero Lot Lines" in residential zoning. Our city has tried this in the past and stopped the practise for good reasons. I believe that zero lot lines will expose the City to liability from property owners who enter into this kind of binding, permanent legal agreements without obtaining independent legal advice – du to age, infirmity, poverty or lack of language and legal skills. Newcomers and the elderly will be most vulnerable. Zero lot lines will disrupt the neighbourhood streetscape and devalue the adjacent properties. Development of the property granted easement on another's property will restrict the adjacent owners ability to develop their property forever. Addressing any claim of damage due to erosion of the easement area would not allow the property owner to access their own property without some kind of legal expense. This will apply, not just to current property owners, to every subsequent property owner. This is pandering to developers at the expense of other taxpayers. • Regarding the PUD proposal. I had the experience of living in a home in a PUD neighbourhood for 18 years. It was generally regarded as an unsuccessful neighbourhood experiment and abandoned. I would be happy to elaborate upon request. My concern for the return of this zoning is the very real possibility that a developer may attempt to use this zoning to overbuild on an infill lot. I know that the city would prefer to have 30% of new building to be done in already developed neighbourhoods — infill properties where the existing home is removed and another new one is built — and thus keep the city footprint small. Will the city not then be tempted to allow an infill builder to build a home with a larger footprint or perhaps a home with more than one residences in it? This would satisfy the building requirements but would also serve to devalue neighbouring homes • The zero lot line concept should be scrapped immediately. In its place there should be clear and enforced regulations regarding placement of decks, and how to prevent flooding of basements of one house without causing flooding of the neighbouring house or houses. There is an increasing culture of 'what's yours is mine and what's mine is mine alone'. I do speak from experience! • as I mentioned above, individual Zero lots should not be allowed. It does not fit into the style of surrounding lots and it is an infringement of somebody else's lot. • Zero should be allowed only for new developments if the whole block is designed that way. Individual zero lots should not be allowed. 	<p>Residential Zero Lot regulations have been removed from the proposed Zoning Bylaw.</p>

LAND USE

Permitted Use

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
When questioned about some of the permitted uses of the new zones, the comment was made that while, yes, that would be permitted, it will never happen. Then, why is it permitted? Because IF it can, eventually it WILL.	The proposed zones contemplate a range of complementary land uses that can coexist to support the implementation of the City's Official Community Plan to help create complete neighbourhoods. When designing the proposed zones, consideration was given to carry over the existing land uses to ensure that the existing developments remain legally conforming.

Incompatible Uses

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
How about refusing builder to set up dangerous objects near residential houses or playgrounds such as Gas stations?	The proposed Zoning Bylaw classifies gas stations as a discretionary use if they are proposed to be developed within a certain distance of a residential zone. This will allow the City to evaluate whether additional conditions are required for the proposed development.
That a commercial or industrial building of certain sizes is required to do a traffic study and when the traffic exceeds a certain amount depending on the size of the street that, the building should not be allowed to be built.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw permits the Development Officer to request a traffic impact assessment to determine the impacts on neighboring properties.
That when a commercial or industrial building Is built and it offers 24-hour services to the public that it should not be built within a certain distance to residential homes.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate the operating hours of businesses. There are other bylaws the City has that can address nuisance-related concerns.
That when an entire city block of a residential homes is squeezed between commercial spaces and then an industrial building is being build on the other size that special consideration is given to the homes so that they may be rezoned as commercial buildings.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw permits land uses that are complimentary to one another or support the proposed development. The proposed Zoning Bylaw carries forward provisions that allow for a zoning amendment.

Group Care Homes

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certain group homes should not be allowed to move into the neighborhood. If the bylaw cannot differentiate between the group homes according to what group it serves, then the bylaw should not allow group homes at all. Certain Group Car should be ok. There's no clear understanding what group care means. If it is a small private retirement home or group home for disabled people, it is ok. If it is a halfway house for rehabilitating criminals or a home for people recovering from addiction it is NOT OK. I am on the edge on group home for youth or shelter for women. They can attract predators to the neighborhood and it might not be the outcome that was intended. Do not change current bylaw restrictions re: care/group/nursing homes. Keep limits on locations in same neighbourhood 	<p>The OCP contains policies encouraging housing diversity for various stages of life and special needs. The Dwelling, Group Care land use is defined as a supervised dwelling unit, licensed or approved under provincial statute for the accommodation of persons referred by hospitals, courts, government agencies or recognized social service agencies or health professionals.</p> <p>The Zoning Bylaw cannot regulate the occupants of the proposed dwelling unit. The Zoning Bylaw is proposing building form options that will allow residents to remain in their neighborhood despite changing housing needs.</p>

Laneway Suites

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
Went to open house bylaw session, inquiring regarding laneway homes in our area. Disappointed to find out we would have to wait to explore this opportunity further.	Noted.

Community Gardens

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the proposed Zoning Bylaw support urban agriculture? 	The proposed Zoning Bylaw supports urban agriculture by allowing Open Space, Active in all zones, which allows for community gardens.

Residential Homestays

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<p>PROPOSED: "Residential Business - Service Trade, Accommodation (Unit)". Defined as meaning a unit used for sleeping quarters that may include in-unit bathroom facilities but that does not include in-unit cooking or clothes-washing facilities." Source: Table 3A.T2: Residential Neighbourhood Zone Land Uses. This new terminology is being used to cover off all types of room rental activities in residential dwelling units. It seems to include short term and longer term room rentals by separate, unrelated persons. For example, Bed and Breakfasts, Residential Home-Stays (less than 30 day room rental), Internet Room Rentals (AirBnB), Boarding, Lodging or Rooming Houses, Hostels, etc. This has essentially been an underground, unlicensed activity that exists in residential neighbourhoods that the City of Regina has not developed an enforceable policy and procedures that will deal with the zoning and regulation of this type of land use. Difficult to understand why this has not adequately occurred in the current Zoning Bylaw proposals. This topic has been raised many times over the years by Community Associations and taxpayers in the south area of the City near the University and Poly-Tech institutions. The City of Regina Administration and Council decided to eliminate the Rooming House sections from the Zoning Bylaw pertaining to this type of land use in 2013 that was causing many problems associated with them; ie. crime, drug trade, excessive numbers of vehicles on lots and streets that prevented access by emergency vehicles, no adherence to building, health and safety codes, etc. Provincial government spokesperson has stated that this practice of rooming house and similar rentals is regarded as a change of occupancy from its original permit that requires the owner to adhere to Canadian and Provincial codes that protect the health and safety of the tenants. The City has the responsibility to ensure this is done and now is the time. Solution would be to review what other Cities have done to deal with this underground activity instead of allowing it to manifest itself. Look at the Zoning Bylaws for Saskatoon and Winnipeg. They both recognize Rooming/Boarding Houses and only allow them to be operated in specific zoned areas of their cities. Appendix B - Saskatoon Zoning Bylaw - Permitted Uses and Glossary definitions. Regulation, licensing, and enforcement of "Air B&B" type rentals (single room occupancy). Include same specifics as in current group or care home bylaw requirements and restrictions.</p>	<p>City Council approved the removal of "rooming house" as a land use from the Zoning Bylaw in 2013. The proposed Zoning Bylaw includes no changes to the existing residential homestay regulations and regulates a Group Care the same way as a dwelling unit.</p> <p>The Planning and Development Act, 2007 prescribes a Zoning Bylaw to control the use of land for providing for the amenity of the area and for the health, safety and general welfare of the residents. Zoning cannot control for people because they are not tied to land use. Therefore, issues such as where people choose to live, their familial status, and how long they could stay were removed are not related to land use issues that can be regulated through a Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>The proposed changes support various Official Community Plan policies encouraging housing diversity for various stages of life and special needs.</p>
<p>As for Airbnb, it would be nice to see homeowners have the option of registering their location with the city without having to go through a rezoning application. It's sad to see what happened to the homeowner who went ahead with the legal operation of this model. The city needs to modernize to keep up with a world that is already in the midst of the fourth industrial revolution. Change should be embraced, not met with opposition. The same can be said for ridesharing like Uber and Lyft.</p>	<p>Short-term rentals as a land use remain discretionary under the proposed Zoning Bylaw, in order to assess each application on its own merit and to ensure that the development meets the National Building Code and other applicable City regulations. Converting an existing house into a short-term rental may require upgrades to the existing development and may require an inspection of the space to confirm compliance.</p>
<p>Is the bylaw address the increase in rooming houses, air b&bs, non-regulation suites in residential areas which are not monitored and which change the neighborhood because of transience, stresses on city services, such as, garbage collection, recycling, and parking. If yes, how?</p>	<p>The Zoning Bylaw contains rules and regulations for development of land in Regina. The Planning and Development Act, 2007 authorizes the City to take enforcement action against any person that contravenes the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw. Residents should report any illegal land use activity to the City so that it can initiate enforcement.</p>
<p>Will there be a different taxation who have rooming houses or air b&b as they put more stresses on city services and businesses</p>	<p>The assessment value of a property is influenced by the potential uses of the property and the actual use of the property. Accordingly, the zoning applied to a property does impact its assessment value. However, the process for assessing taxation rates is separate from the development of the Zoning Bylaw.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Daycares

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My major concern is with the last note about the daycares. I got an email today from CCPA with a document about how Saskatchewan is already failing with regards to childcare: https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/saskatchewan-failing-report-card-child-care Saskatchewan already has so many barriers and so much red tape about daycares. I blogged about my experience trying to set up a daycare: https://windingrants.wordpress.com/write-31-days-starting-a-new-daycare/ Please, please, please, do NOT add more restrictions onto daycares. It's hard enough setting one up. I finally gave up and donated the money we had fund-raised to the YWCA. This would just be one more hoop we have to jump through to get these much needed facilities opened up. • I don't support private daycare in the neighborhood. They create clutter during rush hours when others try to move in and out of the neighborhood. The playground is usually at the front which looks ugly and poses health risk for the kids anyway. It is even dangerous, predators might linger around these small daycares. Pick up and dropping off kids creates dangerous situations for everyone on the road because small kids are unpredictable. We should push for daycare centres located in existing schools not in random residential streets. • Under the current and proposed bylaws, it would be a discretionary permit to put a day care at the end of a cul de sac zoned for residential use. A 12 child day care centre would have little impact to the surrounding properties, but a 90 child centre would be devastating. Comparing the traffic needs of a 90 child day care centre is more akin to a Religious Assembly, which is required to be "located only on sites adjoining and accessed by a collector or arterial street." (TABLE 3A.T2: RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE LAND USES). But that requirement is not necessary for someone running a day care for 12 children out of their home. Perhaps further categorizing day care centres into groups of "12 children or fewer" "13-45 Children" "45+ children" and addressing the concerns at each level would be better. • Parking issues aside, more thought needs to go into where Day Care Centres are permitted in terms of their size. Because a Day Care Centre can vary wildly in the numbers of children that are there, I do not feel that the proposed bylaw adequately addresses all concerns. I think equating all Day Care Centres doesn't do justice to the potential impact that it could have on the neighborhood. • The current rules that govern Elementary School parking as stated in TABLE 14.5: OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND RECREATIONAL USES of the current bylaw should be the basis of the parking requirements for Day Care Centres. Namely "1 space per each teacher, employee or administrator, except in the case of a previously developed school site, any building addition shall be exempt from these parking requirements". I have also noticed that the parking requirements for Schools in the proposed bylaw have been changed to 1 stall per 100 square metres. I feel that the proposed change should be discarded and that the current rule of 1 stall per employee should remain in force. Perhaps it could be amended to say 1 stall per employee or per 100 square meters, whichever is greater • Tables 3A.T6: RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE PARKING REQUIREMENTS and 7B.T5: INSTITUTIONAL ZONE PARKING REQUIREMENTS in the proposed bylaw state the parking requirements for parking in Institution, Day Care. The stated parking requirements for a 90 child daycare centre are: 1 stall is required for land use and that 9 stalls are required for Passenger Drop off. This is woefully inadequate. Depending on the clientele of a 90 child Day Care centre, the staffing requirements could easily reach 18 staff members, yet only 1 parking space is required for all those staff? • Large Day Care centres are especially concerning because I feel that the city risks overlooking beneficial changes that should be made to the parking requirements of such facilities. In March of 2017 there was a discretionary use filed for a property at the end of our block to be converted to a 90 space Day Care. At the time I voiced my concerns, primarily about the increased traffic and pointed out how the current bylaw was not properly updated when the bylaw limiting residential day care centers to 12 children was repealed. • As a resident of Dieppe Place, I am surrounded by the Public Space of A.E. Wilson Park and the site of the former Dieppe School. When I purchased the home the green space played a big part in my satisfaction with the location. I did not expect that a Restaurant would be an acceptable use of this space, nor that a monstrous 90 child Day Care could be built. 	<p>An Institution, Daycare can be applied to as a residential business when the proposed day care meets the requirements of a family childcare home or group family child care home, as defined by the <i>The Child Care Act</i>.</p> <p>The regulations within this act limit the number of children allowed in a dwelling unit.</p> <p>A Daycare Centre, which is a discretionary use in the proposed Bylaw, must meet the requirements of <i>The Child Care Act</i>.</p> <p>Through the discretionary use application, the concerns for parking can be addressed. The Development Officer has the discretion to request a Traffic Impact Study Assessment.</p> <p>The City does not own the school sites, they are typically owned by one of the school divisions who have the ability to sell their lands. Through a rezoning process, it is possible that as school site be rezoned to allow for non-institution land uses. The Zoning Bylaw cannot deny development if all regulations and standards are met.</p>

Residential Businesses

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to offer our feedback on how home based businesses have affected our area street. There are obviously other home businesses in the area which do not infringe on the neighbourhood and we do not consider those businesses to be an eyesore to the area We are long time residents of Varsity Park. In the past few years, home based businesses have been springing up in our area at an alarming rate. In a short walk about of the neighbourhood, we have identified at least 10 home based businesses near our home. These were easily identified by trailers and/or equipment being parked on their driveway or on the street. There are obviously home based businesses in the area which do not infringe on the neighbourhood and we do not consider those businesses to be an eyesore to the area. There is one home based contractor about 1 block from us that sometimes has as many as 6 vehicles parked on the streets around the home. Those vehicles usually (but not always) depart in the mornings and return later in the day and for the most part appear to be within the letter of the law in terms of street parking. But surely such use of a residence in this area was not the intent of the City when the area was zoned as residential. Our personal experience from having a home based business (contractor) next door has not been positive. When the (contractor's) trailer is not on the street, it is stored on the driveway right along our property line. When we drive out of our garage and on to our driveway, our visibility is sometimes limited and dangerous. The risk of hitting a pedestrian on the sidewalk is high. There is an increase in traffic flow as a result of employees coming and going as well. The City of Regina has bylaws that prohibit the storage of recreational vehicles on driveways during winter months at least, but apparently The City allows similar sized vehicles if they are industrial vehicles. Industrial trailers are just as intrusive as recreational ones from our perspective and should receive equal treatment in the City of Regina's bylaws. We do not believe contractor trailers and other vehicles should be allowed to park in this area in the summer either, but as a minimum these industrial trailers should be treated the same as recreational vehicles and prohibited from driveway parking during winter months. When we bought our home, we never anticipated that a new owner of the property next door would be allowed to remodel the existing home to accommodate a home based business. The City never notified the residents in the area that a new business was coming to the area and as such, the residents living in the area had no opportunity to voice their concerns. I believe there is a rule in place already concerning a residential business. As long as they have adequate living space and the business doesn't pose a danger to the people or residences there should not be a problem in conjunction as long as there is some curb parking and doesn't cause congestion there shouldn't be a problem. 	<p>Residential businesses are only permitted when the use of the building will continue to be used primarily as a dwelling.</p> <p>The proposed bylaw will not regulate non-land use related items such as number of employee's, advertisements, business vehicles, zero impact, mechanical equipment and client visits.</p> <p>A residential business is required to provide minimum one parking stall in addition to the parking required for the dwelling unit on the same lot.</p> <p>When a land use is permitted, there is no requirement for notification of neighbouring properties or surrounding area. Only when the land use is discretionary is there a requirement for public notification.</p> <p>A residential business is permitted to occupy up to 25% of the gross floor area of the building used for the dwelling unit. The residential business would become discretionary if proposed to occupy 25-40% of the gross floor area of the building used for the dwelling unit.</p>

Secondary Suites (Multi-Family)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> disagrees that secondary suites should be allowed in townhouses and semi-detached building forms. These building forms are not big enough to accommodate two families. Therefore, permitting secondary suites in them would invite more short-term boarders to the area, which would be detrimental to the property values of the neighbouring properties. Why should residents have to pay for more taxes when this is happening? This is outrageous. Secondary suite is fine or extensions for accommodation, if it agrees with the overall style of the particular street. Some streets have larger houses and walkouts that can easily accommodate that, but I don't want over garage suits that tower over on smaller houses. 	<p>The proposed RN – Residential Neighbourhood and RU – Residential Urban zones permit a secondary suite in Building, Detached only.</p> <p>The proposed multiunit zones - RL – Residential Low-rise and RH – Residential High-rise - permit a secondary suite in Building, Detached, semi-detached and townhouse buildings. .</p>

Rental Use

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too often I see multiple resident rental dwellings being built in communities that were once dedicated to families. • This creates congestion when multiple people live in a location that was designed to house a single family. • This does not address the problems encountered when two story homes surround single story heritage homes. • Property values drop and people lose the neighbourhoods they thought they were part of when buying their home. All to companies looking to make money off of poorly managed rental properties. • Unacceptable. • I have nothing against rental property to a degree, however, multiple units (sometimes 3) in a single 25 foot lot creates conflict and tension. • This has no place in a community that is going to grow and flourish. • I hope you take these comments into consideration as there are already too many of these popping up around my home. • Thankfully I have nothing next door to me currently, however, I can see the trend and do not want it to become my reality. • I would like to know what the city has planned for older communities that are becoming rental communities? • I hope you stop letting builders build houses with three suites. • I have four of them on our block. • They get permits for two suites and then build an illegal suite. • Then there isn't enough parking on or garbage cans for the residents. • There are not enough internet channels for all these extra people causing everyone to have slow internet. • The people who suffer are the ones who are living in single family homes. • Stop Zarkor from building cash towers. • Or at least don't let them have three apartments per lot. • The zoning bylaw says you can only have two suites on one lot so why do these builders get to have three. • Start holding them accountable • Pay very high property taxes and don't want to be living where there are transient people that cause parking issues on the street, extra noise, etc. • I will like to see a bylaw that allows a basement secondary suite for a duplex house (townhouse) with a separate entrance. • Having a bylaw that make it possible to develop a secondary suite in a duplex (townhouse) with separate entrance • There are already building codes concerning building codes for residences containing a suite. • We have neighbours who have left their house and rented out rooms to multiple individuals. There are some cases where there are 7 individuals living in one home with seven vehicles. It creates issues with the property not being maintained and garbage overflows. Can you we please address this with the bylaw changes. <p>Rental Property Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it include a more effective method in controlling the unauthorized rental of residential buildings for short term stays? The 2013 Zoning Bylaw amendment to include the term and definition of Residential Home-Stays was poorly conceived and ineffective to control the commercial use of residential property in our City. We now have hundreds of illegal, unregistered businesses renting in single family detached dwellings because it is very lucrative. Will there be higher financial penalties for those that cheat the system? Will they be more aggressively enforced? • Rental houses should be licences businesses. This would allow for safety. Don't say this is too onerous. The honour system isn't working. Not everyone stops at red lights. It doesn't mean we don't have the law. • would like to see boarding rooms/short-term rentals permitted in certain areas of the city only. They increase the demand for on-street parking and change the nature of a stable neighbourhood to a transient neighbourhood. • Multiple renters housed in one residence. There are single family residences that rent out rooms for months at a time to individuals who are working in Regina for less than a year. In some cases 4 to 6 individuals. Each of these individuals drives a vehicle (usually a truck). They take a lot of parking space on the street. In Winter it can be hazardous depending on the location of the home the amount of snow fall and the condition of the roads. Maintenance of the road is difficult for snow removal. This type of residence is providing a 'boarding house' service. Rather than using motels and hotels, individuals find the 'boarding house' more economical and accessible to their work site. The 'boarding house' is here. It appears to be needed. The 'boarding house' is a business. Money is collected and not filed with Revenue Canada. Business is taxed and pays those taxes to the City of Regina. The 'boarding house' has an affect on neighbourhoods. It can limit parking in a neighbourhood. It can also cause neighbourhood disputes and may affect neighbourhood property values. I encourage the addition of a category to include 'boarding houses'. I also encourage door to door published information on 'boarding house' implementation. 	<p>The Zoning Bylaw does not and cannot regulate rental use, tenancy, household composition, property standards or rental licensing.</p> <p>Residential rental tenancy is regulated under provincial legislation.</p> <p>Property maintenance within the city is regulated through the Community Standards Bylaw of the City of Regina.</p> <p>Building safety and building alterations are addressed under the National Building Code and the City's Building Bylaw.</p> <p>The draft Zoning Bylaw is proposing to permit secondary suites within townhouse developments to support greater housing choice.</p>

ZONES

Proposed Residential Zones

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Will there be major changes in existing residential neighborhoods?What is the difference between 'R1' and 'RU' zoning?Why did you feel the need to remove the R1 designation? Crucial to keep that in place.After going through the new proposed zoning bylaw on regina.ca/zoningbylaw and subsequently looking at the map, my understanding is that my property falls in Ward 1, Zone code: RN & that it 'Allows for development of one and two-unit dwellings while promoting flexibility in lot size for residential development'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing neighbourhoods may experience gradual change over time. Established areas may already be considered complete neighbourhoods. The existing R1 land zone currently allows for two dwelling units, the principle residence and a secondary suite. The proposed RN zone allows for a maximum of two dwelling units in different building forms than are currently permitted. Below is a summary of notable changes in key residential zones.	
	RN	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Two-unit detached/ semi-detached dwellings are now permitted building types.Varying standards for minimum lot frontage depending on presence of rear lane access.Restrictions on front yard motor vehicle access and front-facing garages on lots with rear lanes.Restrictions on the width of front-facing attached garages.Group care dwellings (including Supportive Living Homes, Individual and Family Social Service Homes and Special Care Home)
	RU	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Two-unit detached/ semi-detached dwellings are now permitted building types.Varying standards for minimum lot frontage depending on presence of rear lane access.Restrictions on front yard motor vehicle access and front-facing garages on lots with rear lanes.Restrictions on the width of front-facing attached garages.Group Care Dwellings (including Supportive Living Homes, Individual and Family Social Service Homes, and Special Care Homes) are now regulated the same as dwellings.
	RL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">New one-unit and two-unit detached dwellings are prohibited.Low-rise multi-unit stacked buildings are now a permitted building type.Secondary suites are now permitted in multi-unit row house buildings.Minimum parking requirements for dwellings in multi-unit stacked buildings changed to be consistent with minimum parking requirements for dwellings in other building types.Group care dwellings (including Supportive Living Homes, Individual and Family Social Service Homes and Special Care Homes) are now regulated the same as dwellings.
	RH	<ul style="list-style-type: none">New one-unit and two-unit detached dwellings are prohibited in the zone.High-rise multi-unit stacked buildings are now a permitted use.Secondary suites are now permitted in multi-unit row house buildings.Minimum parking requirements for dwellings in multiunit stacked buildings changed to be consistent with minimum parking requirements for dwellings in other building types.Group care dwellings (including Supportive Living Homes, Individual and Family Social Service Homes and Special Care Homes) are now regulated the same as dwellings.

Mixed Use

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no mixed use development that contained both non residential and residential as depicted in your pamphlet I would also like an exact definition of an I designation and be provided examples of developments that are allowed in that mixed use zone. Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to comment on the proposed zoning bylaw changes. I am sharing my input through the lens of a developer, owner, operator, family community member and caregiver. I applaud the zone forward group for striving to remove obstacles currently in place related to mixed use developments. Families and providers will be free to live in developments that allow and encourage diversity and inclusion. I am energized and inspired to see what future developments within the city of regina can look like under the new changes. 	<p>Mixed Use development is proposed to be permissible in the proposed Zoning Bylaw. The general intent of mixed-use zones are to promote complete communities that support a variety</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Flood Zone

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure that the Flood Zone is protected regardless how it is called 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does propose a Floodway Overlay Zone. Beyond the Zoning Bylaw, there are provincial and federal regulations that further outline development regulations for floodway areas.</p>

PS to I

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I totally disagree with incorporating PS into the Institutional zoning designation. Yes I was looking for clarity in regards to the change from a PS designation to an I. I just want to make sure I understand it correctly. Currently with a PS designation if something were to get built on the PS area by a public institution say a concession stand at a ball diamond, the City would have to jump through several hoops to get it re-zoned and consult with the community and surrounding properties to get that approved. On an I designation, if the same were to hold true, the City would not have to directly consult with the surrounding area or residents, further to that point, if there were residents that had an issue with this they would not have a lot of options to push back against developments of that type. Am I correct in my understanding of this? What is the justification for getting rid of the Public Spaces zone and replacing it with the Institution zone? I feel that the changing of Public Space zones to Institutional is not in the best interest of the residents of the City of Regina. Green spaces such as parks and schools can be huge draws for people when choosing a home to buy, and there is the expectation that the park will stay as such. The trope is wanting a house that backs a green space, not backs an Institutional space. At the ward 8 meeting at Martin Collegiate one of the reasons given for this change was that this would allow something like a concession to set up at a ball diamond without as much foresight and paperwork. I think that it's foolish to apply this logic to every green space in the entire city. And if the City disagrees, then they should consider rewriting the bylaws that govern concessions, rather than opening up Public Spaces to broader uses. As a resident of Dieppe Place, I am surrounded by the Public Space of A.E. Wilson Park and the site of the former Dieppe School. When I purchased the home the green space played a big part in my satisfaction with the location. I did not expect that a Restaurant would be an acceptable use of this space, nor that a monstrous 90 child Day Care could be built. Large Day Care centres are especially concerning because I feel that the city risks overlooking beneficial changes that should be made to the parking requirements of such facilities. In March of 2017 there was a discretionary use filed for a property at the end of our block to be converted to a 90 space Day Care. At the time I voiced my concerns, primarily about the increased traffic and pointed out how the current bylaw was not properly updated when the bylaw limiting residential day care centers to 12 children was repealed. (part 1 of 3) As a resident of Dieppe Place, I am surrounded by the Public Space of A.E. Wilson Park and the site of the former Dieppe School. When I purchased the home the green space played a big part in my satisfaction with the location. I did not expect that a Restaurant would be an acceptable use of this space, nor that a monstrous 90 child Day Care could be built. At the ward 8 meeting at Martin Collegiate one of the reasons given for this change was that this would allow something like a concession to set up at a ball diamond without as much foresight and paperwork. I think that it's foolish to apply this logic to every green space in the entire city. And if the City disagrees, then they should consider rewriting the bylaws that govern concessions, rather than opening up Public Spaces to broader uses. I feel that the changing of Public Space zones to Institutional is not in the best interest of the residents of the City of Regina. Green spaces such as parks and schools can be huge draws for people when choosing a home to buy, and there is the expectation that the park will stay as such. The trope is wanting a house that backs a green space, not backs an Institutional space. I'm concerned that the proposed Zoning Bylaw will not protect park spaces. 	<p>The PS zone and I zone will be carried forward into the new Zoning Bylaw unchanged.</p>

INFILL

Density

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
I do not like the fact that a duplex can reside in a single dwelling neighborhood, especially in a cul-de-sac.	<p>The Official Community Plan gives the City direction to provide more housing choices and options for residents. The existing Zoning Bylaw permits a secondary suite in a single detached dwelling, which is considered another dwelling unit. This means that an existing single detached building could already be accommodating two dwelling units.</p> <p>The proposed regulation allows for different types of building forms in a residential neighborhood with a maximum of two dwelling units. The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate the architectural design or occupancy of the dwelling units. It does regulate other matters, including building height, setback from the street and property lines, lot coverage, required parking spaces and location of required parking.</p>
As a resident of S. Lakeview, I am NOT in favor of changes to the zone code from RN to MH. We have seen all the issues which results from higher density living in Harbour Landing. No place to park, no place to move snow out of the way, little to no area for growing your own food in a garden.	<p>The proposed zoning for the RN zone is similar to that of the existing R1 zone. In the R1 zone, you can build a single-detached dwelling with the opportunity for a secondary suite which is also considered a dwelling unit. This currently allows for two dwelling units to be built on a lot. The proposed RN zone allows for a maximum of two dwelling units, but allows them to be constructed in alternative building forms.</p> <p>The MH - Mixed High Rise Zone is comparable to the current MAC – Major Arterial Commercial zone, which allows for commercial development. The difference is that the MH zone allows for more uses to be brought together, including residential. In doing so, the proposed Zoning Bylaw achieves OCP policies regarding greater variety in housing options for residents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit the amount of duplexes on a block. We have 5 already. The back alley can never be paved as we have no parking as it is..especially since zarkor didnt pave thier so called parking areas. The notion that the zoning could change to allow for two-suite dwellings is distressing. The density of the neighbourhood is fine as it stands. PROPOSED: "2 unit detached/semi-detached will be permitted in previous single dwelling neighbourhoods". "RN - Residential Neighbourhood Zone - This zone is intended to accommodate one or two unit dwellings,... Building Types Building, Detached (1 unit), Building, Row (3 units), and Building, Stacked (3 units)". Handout shows 3 units instead of 2 Units as claimed in other text. What is the justification for this? Who gains from this? Subdividing lots for the purpose of replacing existing single housing with two houses would significantly & unacceptably change the neighborhood. This process has no merit and cannot be supported by the City's Official Community Plan for a 300, 000 population planning process. What is occurring in Saskatoon that is planning for a 500, 000 population? The answer is provided in Appendix A - Saskatoon Zoning Bylaw No. 9538, Revised November 19, 2018, it shows that the RI - Large Lot One Unit Residential District, RIA - One Unit Residential District, and RIB - Small Lot One Unit Residential District exist in the Bylaw. They have recognized the functionality and residential character of these neighbourhoods and have chosen not to allow unethical money-driven developers to destroy them as is proposed by the City of Regina Planning Department. You can also find that RI Zone Districts exist in Winnipeg, Manitoba, a city much, much larger than Regina and Saskatoon. The clear solution is to eliminate this proposal and continue with a Zone district that maintains the characteristics of the RI that exist in the current Zoning Bylaw 9250. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw allows for different types of building forms when the existing lot meets the development standards required for the building form.</p> <p>A single detached home has the opportunity to construct a secondary suite, which would also require a parking stall in addition to the one required for the principal dwelling unit. The minimum parking requirement is one parking stall per dwelling unit.</p> <p>The surfacing type of the parking space is regulated as well within the current and proposed Zoning Bylaw. When the City receives complaints through a service request there are tools and other bylaws to enforce compliance.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Density

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
In conclusion, let me say this: We are a small city working towards being a medium sized city. We will never be a huge metropolis like Vancouver or Toronto. Why, then, are we designing neighbourhoods that put as many people into them as possible? That is not what the people living here want. I constantly hear complaints about congestion and traffic woes. I never have heard in my 32 years selling real estate anyone wanting to age within their neighbourhood. Lots of older folks want to remain in their current home for sure but that is totally different than suggesting that someone might want to be born, grow up, go to school, move out and get a job, start a family, retire and stay all in the same neighbourhood. It does not happen and no one wants it to except for the planning committee. Do you know what people have told me that move here from Toronto? They tell me that they are delighted with the feeling of spaciousness. They do not have to drive for an hour and a half just to get home at night. They have yards big enough here to play in and have some privacy. They are pleased with the "small town" feel and the big city amenities. So, please, let's not lose that. We have broadened our developments to accommodate other cultures which is great, but we do need to make it permissible to go forward with new neighbourhoods that just have single family homes. We have lost a big tax base to the RM of Edenwold and to White City. Those folks wanted bigger yards and are willing to commute 10 or 15 minutes to get that. They still work in Regina and take advantage of our facilities but their tax dollars are going elsewhere. It would be nice if going forward, there was something to accommodate these folks in the city so they don't have to move out.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw supports neighbourhood transformation by allowing for gentle intensification in existing neighbourhoods.
How will the proposed Zoning Bylaw support increased density, which helps make active, exciting places?	The City is undertaking an additional step to work with communities to identify where they feel density should be encouraged within their neighbourhoods through the development and review of neighbourhood plans.
How does the proposed Zoning Bylaw support density and decrease urban sprawl?	The OCP identifies green-field development areas and includes a target of 70% greenfield development and 30% infill development. The OCP also identifies design requirements of 50 people per hectare in greenfield development to limit urban sprawl.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be empty lots and building all over this city. • There is no reason to keep expanding this city. • There is lots of land to be used. 	The OCP encourages regional cooperation in planning, encouraging compatible, supportive planning. The OCP provides policy for the use of vacant lands through revitalization and reuse of existing lands within the City. The proposed Zoning Bylaw provides regulations for infill development to help achieve this objective.

Infill Overlay

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
What areas or zones will the new infill height restrictions affect?	The Residential Infill Development Overlay applies to all lots within the area of the infill boundary, which is based on the existing areas with houses primarily built before and up to the 1960s.

Infill

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill housing needs to match the character and building heights of the neighbourhood. • Plopping a 36 foot tall skinny house next to 50s bungalows is inappropriate. • I've watched zarcor split double lots and then throw up giant blank walls next to existing homes. • There is nothing wrong with people wanting to live in a neighbourhood that has only single family homes in it. • Creating shadows over back yards because the homes fill up huge portions of the lots. • Winnipeg recently brought in new bylaws because of this and I'm curious how the proposed bylaw differs for the city's report that discussed infill for Regina. • I would like to see the city maintain the character and standards of neighbourhoods. • My neighbourhood is something I considered when purchasing my home. It is a family centred area that has a strong sense of community. • I have lived in the Crescent area of Regina for 38 years. • I love living here because of the real character & beauty of the homes in this historical area of Regina. • But over the years I have seen the crescents & streets change with homes that DONOT fit in with the character homes they are built beside. • On Crescents they are sometimes built protruding further out than the other homes. • They should be built on the property to specifically align with the other homes on the Crescent (Connaught). • These cookie cutter Harbour Landing type homes should not be allowed in this area. • There are developers/builders (Zarcor) that have built dozens of the very same style of quick builds/in fills in these classic areas of downtown Regina. • The intended design plans should be reviewed before they are allowed to build. • These companies end up building 2 homes on 1 lot, that are a reflection of each other. • Other areas of the city have specific restrictions on allowed builds. • Very modern Contemporary style homes built in close proximity of Heritage homes should not be allowed either. • Specifically Cameron & 18th Ave. • The view the owners of Henderson Terrace have, out their windows is appalling, & the heritage of the area has been ruined!!! • On Cameron street south of 18th a home has been built on 2 lots that is so modern & huge it smothers the other character homes. • I hope in these new bylaw changes the Crescent/ Cathedral area is protected or considered for protection of its character & historical homes. • What standards are in place in my neighborhood to protect the integrity of aesthetic of these old homes with character and colour. • And styles. • Houses built beside other old houses should have to compliment. • These dark black houses in a character neighborhood are hideous. I think. • Allowing developers to buy up say 2 small house and build a condo or apartment s wrong. • Not specifically but I just want to provide some background information to help you understand what I'm talking about. I live at <redacted> and have been a Resident of Cathedral for 27 years. When we purchased this house there was parking lots and commercial buildings and now the parkade is expanding 2 more stories. We decided that we could live with it because there was a school and green space/park in the front. So now the Ywca has the property and we have seen the preliminary drawings we are concerned with the over all size. We are also concerned that no one had to notify us. Now our block specifically is stuck in a dead zone. We'd like to have the option to rent it to a couple of psychologists who are interested in starting a practice and are worried that we won't be able to get rezoned which then we will be forced to try to rent it out or sell it at a loss. • When larger parcels of land (maybe bigger than 3 regular house lots) are being sold or donated by the city or a developer for redevelopment the surrounding houses must be notified via mail. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw includes a Residential Infill Overlay zone that is intended to facilitate infill development that complements existing buildings. The Residential Infill Overlay zone applies to all lots within the area of the infill boundary, which is based on the existing areas with houses primarily built before and up to the 1960s. New residential developments within the infill boundary would be required to meet the following development standards:</p> <p><u>Front Yard Setback</u> Requires a minimum front yard setback equal to the average of the established setbacks of the buildings on the next-door lots and a maximum front yard setback of the farthest established setback on a next-door lot. This ensures that the infill development respects the established street pattern.</p> <p><u>Side Yard Setback</u> Requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.2 metres on one side. This ensures that the infill side yards are consistent with the typical setbacks of the existing houses.</p> <p><u>Maximum Building Height</u> Requires a maximum building height of the greater of 8.5 metres or the height of the principal building on a next-door lot. The cap on maximum building height recognizes that most houses within the infill boundary were not built to the maximum height of 11 metres permitted by the current Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p><u>Maximum First Floor Height</u> Requires a maximum first floor height of 1.37 metres from grade level. This ensures enough clearance for the inclusion of egress windows in the basement, which is important for fire safety, while still being sensitive to the first-floor height of neighbouring properties.</p> <p><u>Height Transition</u> a larger minimum side yard setback where a new multi-unit residential infill development is higher than 8.5 metres and adjoins an existing building that is less than 8.5 metres in height. This regulation attempts to reduce the shadowing effect of a new multi-unit infill development on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Under the process to develop new neighbourhood plans, additional regulations regarding the architectural features of new buildings in a particular area could be implemented.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Infill (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our concern is the new homes being built in older, character communities. • The communities I am referring to are Old Lakeview, The Crescents and the Cathedral Area. • We believe that building permits should only be granted if the exterior is in keeping with the existing architecture character of the area. • Most people buy in those areas because of location, lot maturity and “character homes”. • If property can be subdivided (eventually) through the appeal process, what are the possibilities for a neighbourhood to not allow the appeal to succeed? We do NOT want infill where 3 builds occur where there was previously 1. We don't want the infill overload. • The new “modern” designs take away from, disrupt and ruin the integrity of the street and community. • I ask council, city planners or whom ever is charge of granting a building permit to insist that the exterior remain in character to age of the area. • This is a by law in many other cities across the country. • They only allow homes to be built if it maintains the neighbourhoods character and integrity. • Stop the building of ugly big houses in older areas? • Can you please stop the practice of tearing down small bungalows in older neighbourhoods and building two unsightly two story skinny houses, this completely ruins the older area's and takes away the privacy that everyone had in their back yards when builders adhered to building bungalows. • You devalue the existing home next door to these two story eye sores that do not fit in with the existing structures at all. • Please allow buildiners only to build design homes similar to ones arelad build in area. • Oppose the infill or newly built two story houses that are appearing in areas where bungalows predominantly are. We lose our privacy, sunlight and view of trees. In these areas, I would prefer to see other bungalows or split levels built. • Keep Heritage designated houses/buildings maintained and not torn down if at all possible • Small, old dilapidated houses sometimes need to be torn down, but they still go up for sale and or rent. There is a house like this on 24 block Lindsay, east side near 17th Ave. • How will the Bylaw deal with new housing in the Cathedral area? There has been a lot of infill housing which doesn't match the character of the existing housing on the street. For example, there's a 3 story house on the 2300 block of McTavish or Queen Street that towers over its neighbours - it looks like a black grain storage facility. Will the new bylaw establish architectural standards for height and design of new construction to conform to the existing streetscape? There are other examples - new structures on Cameron Street one block north of Wascana Street - tall flat roofed houses that appear to share one lot on the east side of Cameron with very little side yard clearance. How will the bylaw deal with this kind of construction? • I hope the Bylaw preserves and enhances the character of the Cathedral area. I've lived in this area for more than 60 years, 40 years of which was by design. Every day as I walk around the neighborhood I see more and more infill housing which detracts from the streetscape - either because the new houses tower over their neighbours or the new dwellings look out of place because the building are crowded together with no setbacks. I've visited other cities which have architectural controls over infill housing to preserve the character of the neighborhood. I hope the new bylaw will do the same. • I agree that infill developments should blend into the street view. • In fill housing should be the similar to existing homes. No subdividing of lots. • Infill development should be reviewed. Too many complaints that new homes do not match others on same street • I live in Ward 1, Broder's Annex, Arnheim area. Allowing these new changes will be detrimental to older neighbourhoods. 	

APPENDIX A-7

Infill (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am totally opposed to the idea of zero zoning and the size of what is being allowed for infill housing in this neighborhood! Before you subject us tax paying residents to your new bylaws, give it some serious thought as to whether YOU would like to be subjected to an oversized build that close you!! That type of development in an old neighborhood is an absolute ignorance at it's best! Research has proven to me that this is not good. I have been in this neighborhood for 55yrs, I grew up here. This neighborhood has character, urban forests, nice yards for us gardeners and a sense of liking to see out of our windows! My husband and I have fallen 'victim' to this awful 'cash-flow' tower! Not being able to see out of our north windows and the lack of natural light, invasion of privacy, the disregard for sustainable development, the list goes on and on how awful this type of build is. This type of infill needs to stop! We as a neighborhood have spoken up and we surely hope that you are listening. • Our neighbourhood has already been permanently damaged by unscrupulous developers building cheap and ugly homes in an area with heritage character. This has been a known issue for years the late and languid response from the city reflects, at best, a lack of leadership and responsibility. The proposed response, especially with respect to architectural standards, is a cop-out that will pass the buck to neighbourhoods to organize, effectively cementing the status quo. • The zoning division is planning on changing the face and character of neighbourhoods after the fact. Residents select their lots carefully, looking at existing zoning regulations. It is not fair for the city to decide, after lots have been purchased and homes have been erected, that the neighbourhood should be changed to one that is more walkable, more affordable, more inclusive than what the current residents in the neighbourhood had understood their community to be. The zoning division's goal of diverse housing may not be the desire at all of the people who may be living in a particular area. It was clear from its inception what neighbourhoods like The Creeks, Wascana View, The Towns, The Greens, and Harbour Landing would look like. People make housing decisions based on those initial plans. • I am concerned about that what happened to a home nearby could happen to me. I have no doubt it reduced the value and sale-potential of the other house and want to document my concerns and prevent it from happening to me. Specifically, house #3391 Kings Road is so large that it completely over-powers the house next door on Allen Ave. The fact that that was allowed to happen is ridiculous to me and since my house is one house in from Kings Road (east) just south of that one (the shadow house), but on Whitmore Ave, I am in a similar vulnerable position. I want to log the issue and have it acknowledged to prevent this situation from occurring to me and my property. Please have someone contact me to discuss or advise what steps I need to take to protect the value of my property. • I am also against 2 storey in fill housing. We have a lot on our street that was subdivided into 2 lots. A 2 storey house with basement walls extending above the ground is on one lot and the other a 1 storey house the height of a 2 storey house. The main level of the 2 storey house towers over the bungalow next door. These houses do not fit within the neighbourhood. • In closing, before any of these new proposals are put into place, I strongly suggest that you seriously think about how you would react having these invasive, massive towers built right beside you! • Permitted height has been changed to 8.5 meters. Is this height from ground up to peak of roof? The height of the walls? There has been no clarification given on this height. If that is only the wall then the peak is added that makes a considerable difference and creates incompatibility in this neighbourhood. We will be subjected to more inappropriate housing like the monstrosity right beside me on 2505 Atkinson St., and on 2701 Wallace St., with many others like this throughout the neighbourhood! • In regards to the new zoning bylaws that are being changed for infill housing in an older neighbourhood, I wish to express that I am strongly opposed. Through the appeal process myself and this neighbourhood have made clear how opposed we are to this type of infill development. From what I have seen at the meetings on this zone forward, it is still going to be in the favour of the developers with no regards on how the older neighbourhoods will be negatively affected. 	

APPENDIX A-7

Infill (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live in Parliament Place, located between Lakeview and Albert Park. Houses were built in the 1960's on large lots. Many have front drives in addition to rear alleys. Garages are located off of the alleys. Most yards are fenced. The majority of dwellings are bungalows. For example, on my block face there are eight houses, two of which are 2 storey. On the other side of the street there are nine houses, two of which are 2 storey. • I have some concerns related to infill development in my neighbourhood and the preservation of the existing built form character of the neighbourhood. I do not disagree with infill development and increasing density in existing neighbourhoods. I do understand there are many issues with regard to the development and implementation of architectural controls for existing neighbourhoods and am very happy to hear that there are plans to start creating these neighbourhood plans in the near future. However, I know how long it can sometimes take for the preparation and approval of plans and am concerned that the character of my neighbourhood could change significantly through infill development during the preparation and approval process if there are not some controls on building form. • The zoning for my neighbourhood in Bylaw No. 9250 is R1. The proposed zoning is RN. I appreciate that the maximum building height has been reduced in the RN zoning to 11 metres. However, this height can easily accommodate the construction of a 3 storey dwelling, which is out of character with the current building forms where the maximum height is 2 storeys. • I have attached pictures of a recent infill development on the 4100 block of Argyle Street. A bungalow was replaced by these two dwellings, which dwarf the bungalow to the south and even tower over the 2 storey dwelling to the north. The high main entrance to the dwellings is also out of character with the entrances to the remainder of the dwellings on the street. In addition, Bylaw No. 9250 allowed one reduced side yard to 0.45 m on a narrow lot. As you can see from the pictures, this enabled the two dwellings to be 0.9m apart. I'm not sure how the owners can maintain these respective side yards without encroaching onto the adjacent property. I did not see this side yard reduction when I reviewed the proposed RN zone but if it still proposed in the new bylaw I would like to see it removed as it does not support the current built character of the neighbourhood. • It seems to me that some of the issues I have raised were flagged as concerns for other neighbourhoods in the proposed new zoning bylaw. At one of the Open Houses I attended I noticed information on a Residential Infill Development Overlay Zone. Some of this issues addressed in the overlay zone are ensuring that heights of infill development are appropriate to the adjacent existing development and that entrances are in keeping with those of adjacent existing development. These are the types of regulations I would like to see in my neighbourhood. However, Figure 8K.F.1 Residential Infill Development Overlay Boundary excludes my neighbourhood but does include the Hillsdale neighbourhood which is of a similar age and has similar development form to Parliament Place. I would like to know why and what information you require to re-examine this exclusion. • In summary, in the RN Zone, I suggest the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the maximum height further to accommodate a 2 storey dwelling • Apply the Residential Infill Development Overlay Boundary to the Parliament Place neighbourhood. • Delete any regulations that reduce the side yard to 0.45m for a narrow lot. • How will infill complement existing neighbourhoods? • How has the proposed Zoning Bylaw responded to protecting the design and make-up of existing neighbourhoods? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential infill development chapter & overlay boundary, figure 8K.F.1 This chapter permits the infilling of existing lots in the core area of the city. If we encourage more development within this area, we put a strain on the existing public/park space system, which is already lacking in open space, according to the Open Space Management Strategy (OSMS). Basically, more residents will require access to open space that is already insufficient and in some cases in poor condition. What strategy will the City develop to procure funding to update existing park spaces or to purchase additional lands for more public green space throughout the boundary area? • If the building is being built on green space that there must be a study in the percentage of children in the surrounding area and an appropriate amount of green spaces is kept for the neighbourhood children. They either have to cross a street to get to one or walk over peoples front yards to get to the neighbours or his buddies. 	<p>Infill development and its impacts on open space in established neighbourhoods is being reviewed by the City as part of the Servicing Agreement Fees.</p>

ADDITIONAL PLANS OR POLICIES

Design Standards Manual (Development Standards Manual)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
We just received the COR mail-out re: proposed changes to the COR zoning bylaw. In Chapter 3 Residential Neighbourhood (4)b(ii) p.3.20 ...with the proper surface type in compliance with Design Standards Manual. Yet when I try to search this title, it cannot be found. Is it under another name? Can you send me a copy?	The Design Standards Manual (Development Standards Manual) can be found online at https://www.regina.ca/business/building-demolition/download-manuals/manual-development-standards/index.htm . The Development Standards Manual is currently under review.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

Architectural Controls

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the difference between site design and architectural controls? Why, in some ne neighbourhoods, do developers have guidelines that the City doesn't administer? When It comes to commercial and industrial buildings I hope that they have to follow the architectural concept of each area. The prosed zoning document doesn't seem to contain sufficient restrictions in regards to length of abutting new construction. Typically a house is not as large as a commercial building. The length of the new building to the abutted property could be the full length of the side lot property line with only 1.2 meters side lot and rear lot clearance and a height of 8.5 meters. The new building would give undesirable feelings to people living in the abutting residence of being boxed in. Also any second story windows could make the people backyard feel uncomfortable, intruded or watched. The side lot clearance regardless of height should be 3.25 meters as a minimum. 	<p>Architectural Controls outline the specific design elements that must be applied to a proposed development (e.g. architectural style or features, building materials, colour, etc.).</p> <p>Site Design standards dictate building placement, number and location of parking stalls, landscaping requirements, etc.</p> <p>Developers are free to implement architectural or site-specific requirements on their developments that are above and beyond the minimum requirements of the City.</p> <p>The City does not enforce developer-imposed guidelines, as they are a matter between the land developer and home builders.</p>

Sustainability & Water Conservation

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regina zoning should require water storage (on-site under-ground cisterns) for all new developments. This would provide water for many potential purposes, alleviate water supply challenges, and reduce surges contributing to storm drainage challenges Also, absolutely no mention or intention of SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT! This City needs to start looking through a new lense. This type of development is the way and should be the way when it comes to development in this City! How is the proposed Zoning Bylaw responding to the City's commitment to Regina being 100% renewable by 2050? 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not regulate on-site water storage. Once greater direction is provided from City Council regarding the implementation of certain sustainability measures, amendments to the Zoning Bylaw to support those measures could be introduced at that time.</p>

SUBDIVISION

Utilities

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excerpts from: City of Regina Zoning by-law review- Feb, 2019 POLICY 7.1.9 Buildings which are designed and located to enhance the public realm, and which contribute to a better neighbourhood experience. Guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide appropriate setbacks between homes and streets to support an enhanced street environment. <p>.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention: The 2019 Zoning By-Law review - City of Regina review Team Concerns and proposals: Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Existing by-law: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Regina By-Law; Residential Zone Regulations, 6B7, Permitted Yard Encroachments, states: Clause 7.1.2. (iii) "no projection is located closer than 450 mm from the side lot line." This concern centres around the interference problems created because the City of Regina By-laws (example: The City of Regina By-Law; Residential Zone Regulations, 6B7, Permitted Yard Encroachments), fail to have jurisdiction or even co-ordination with any placement of other service utilities including; SaskEnergy, SaskPower, SaskTel, cable and data, other. Accordingly; City of Regina By-Laws cannot be brought into force to prevent other service utilities from improper placement of lines and equipment (such as gas regulators, gas meters, electrical metering,) that are not, "appropriate to the setbacks between homes and streets". What the Zoning Bylaw Does and Doesn't Do What the Zoning Bylaw Does <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulate where land uses can occur Supports the implementation of OCP policies Regulates the form and placement of buildings on a lot <p>Proposal: The City of Regina Zoning By-laws shall be empowered to have jurisdiction and co-ordination with any placement of other service utilities including; SaskEnergy, SaskPower, SaskTel, cable and data, other. This jurisdiction shall commence from initial development planning by the Developer for new developments. This jurisdiction shall be in force for all existing buildings and for all renovations and additions to buildings and properties.</p> <p>City of Regina By-laws (example: The City of Regina By-Law; Residential Zone Regulations, 6B7, Permitted Yard Encroachments), shall have jurisdiction and co-ordination with any placement of their service utilities including; SaskEnergy, SaskPower, SaskTel, cable and data, other.</p> <p>Reluctance by The 2019 Zoning By-Law review - City of Regina review Team to include this proposal may happen, but service utilities are an important aspect of development, and for the ongoing administration of properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Regina Planning and Administration require jurisdiction authority over the placement of all utilities. City of Regina Zoning bylaws shall be empowered to have jurisdiction and coordination with any placement of other service utilities, including SaskEnergy, SaskPower, SaskTel, cable, etc. This shall commence from initial development planning by Developer. This jurisdiction shall be in force for all existing buildings, and for renovations and additions. Existing and new property by-laws shall be enforced in placement such as natural gas meters. 	<p>The City does not regulate placement of utilities on private property. The City does work with utility providers regarding the placement of utilities on public property.</p>

CONCEPT PLANS

New Neighbourhoods

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum street width also should be considered in zoning and increased. • Regina has a history of acting like an American city -- build whatever you want, wherever you want, however your want -- I hope the new bylaw when it is enacted balances growth with common sense, and we don't have apartments on top of single family homes, businesses up against the airport (what is this, a slum in Asia??), and poorly designed commercial centres (like Harbour Landing) that take 45 minutes to get out of because they were so ineptly constructed • People work hard to be able to move up to a larger home with a larger lot and they need to be accommodated as well as first time buyers and those with less money. • alley ways should not be allowed. Seriously, do yo want to go backward? Alley ways are dangerous and hard to maintain especially in a neighborhood that becomes increasingly elderly. • Who regulates placement of alleys in new developments? • Do subdivision plans submitted to the City by developers align with the Zoning Bylaw? • The new developments have no room for any trees to grow along side the streets, no room for parking, no room for snow, it is truly disappointing how you handle your affairs. • The density is of concern. • There is a fear that I'm not too long down the line it could potentially become an area of issue. • The question is... Why are contrators and developers given the go ahead to build with such density especially so many multi family units?? • People realize money is the largest reason... but what about over population in one area. This, as one knows, from other cities what this can potentially lead to. • My last concern is that developers are granted permits to build neighbourhood without sidewalks on both sides of the street. • Area are often promoted as "family oriented" Ask yourself... where will you child be able to start his walking or biking journey if there are no safe sidewalks for him to access. • I believe the new way of building communities is extremely disappointing. • The Harbour Landings, Greens, etc... what happened to the Windsor Park, Lakeridge, etc. Those are beautiful communities. • A small dogs only dog park would be awesome • Is there any requirement in zoning or other bylaws that dictates what the minimum street width must be? • Residential areas in Harbour Landing had streets that were not wide enough. A parked car made driving area only 1 car wide 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw helps achieve the policies and goals of the Official Community Plan by providing housing and built form options for all residents of the city.</p> <p>There have been zoning bylaws in effect within the city since the late 1920s. The bylaws are amended over time to adapt to the changing needs of the community.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw supports changing housing needs by permitting different options with regard to building form as well as flexibility in lot size and area. The OCP guidelines for complete neighborhoods encourage all types of house forms and opportunities for residents. The City works with developers at the initial stages of neighbourhood design to create infrastructure that supports a diversity of housing types. Subdivision plans that are submitted and approved by the City must align with the development standards regarding lot area and lot frontage within the Zoning Bylaw that is in effect at the time.</p>
Not impressed with your zoning and planning for new developments.	Noted.
What does this mean for the Railyard Renewal Project and the development of that land?	The Railyard Renewal Project is in phase 2 of the Regina Revitalization initiative. A draft neighborhood plan for this area was submitted this winter for regulatory review. It is proposed to be rezoned to MLM - Mixed Large Market zone, which would accommodate a combination of mixed-use development. This will create a vibrant and unique place that connects neighborhoods and supports the ongoing revitalization of Regina's City Centre.
Also, the communities such as Greens on Gardiner are one of contention among many.	Noted.

APPENDIX A-7

Alleys & Infrastructure

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why encourage more alley usage. More streets equal more maintenance. More maintenance equals more revenue needed. Alleyways for new construction should be banned. And where possible, if possible, eliminate existing alleyways and encourage front garages and parking spots. 	<p>The encouragement of rear lane access to homes comes from OCP policy to provide enjoyable and safe street space. OCP policy for small lots requires the use of lane access which eliminates the need for multiple driveway accesses from the street and allows for more on-street parking and supports a safer, accessible pedestrian pathway.</p>

Rear Lanes

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why does the lot frontage minimum depend on the presence of a rear lane? It appears there is an effort being made to encourage back lane parking instead, but why is one dependent on the other? 	<p>The OCP goal for small lot zoning suggests that small lot development should require a lane or back alley.</p> <p>There has been a shift in the market trends towards smaller lots. In today's housing market, the lot frontage of a two-unit townhouse would be comparable in width to a lot for a single detached home. When there is a lane, the parking for that property is required to be provided at the rear of the property either in a garage or a parking pad.</p>

Neighbourhood Composition

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I realize that the zoning committee has endeavored to follow the city master plan for future development. Our city has grown in the past few years with both interprovincial and international migration. We welcome all to our lovely city and are pleased with the added growth. I understand that the city is eager to respond to new housing requirements. Many immigrants are accustomed to high density and unfamiliar with yards requiring maintenance and so prefer either row housing or apartments. However, I cannot express enough the need for the city to also take into account the needs and desires of the residents currently living and working in Regina. These are the people that built the city to this point and so deserve the respect of a city that does not overlook them in favour of upcoming residents. In favour of people that do not even live here yet. How does the proposed Zoning Bylaw support complete communities? 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw supports the development of complete neighbourhoods by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> supporting mixed-use developments of varying densities to allow for residents to acquire and access all their needs within a reasonable distance. encouraging building to be designed and placed to enhance the streetscape. allowing for a diversity of housing forms for households of different income, types, stages of life and abilities. supporting densities sufficient for the provision of transit, commercial and recreational amenities. encouraging rear lane access to home to provide a more enjoyable and safe streetscape. and allowing for a variety of building designs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe residential housing should stay all residential, no small or large apartments or condo's stuck in between residential houses. Design an area in the city for only condo's and multi apartments away from any single housing development like in east Regina off Prince of Wales. 	<p>Many areas of the City that are currently zoned residential, such as R1, R2, R3 and R4, prohibit apartment buildings. In the proposed Zoning Bylaw this does not change. The proposed RN and RU zones still only allow a maximum of two dwelling units.</p> <p>In the proposed Zoning Bylaw, both low and high-rise apartments are only permitted in the medium and high-density residential areas, which is similar to the existing Zoning Bylaw.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I also agree with the idea of a neighborhood consisting of all sorts of different housing, retail and commercial endeavours The presenters put forth the idea that neighbourhoods should be self contained and cater to all generations. That being said the Rosemont, Mount Royal, Dieppe and McNab are in need of a recreation centre and library that are wheel chair accessible. We have no where to hold day time activities. Most areas in the city have one or both. Are we not entitled to the same amenities. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Keep in mind how much of our area we have no back lanes. We have easements.</p>	<p>Some of the City's older neighborhoods do not have lane or alley access which has been taken into consideration in the proposed Zoning Bylaw with regard to the regulations for front yard parking.</p>
<p>More apartments okay but parking needs to be addressed</p>	<p>The minimum parking requirement for apartment buildings is one parking stall per dwelling unit. To accommodate other forms of transportation there is a proposal for required bicycle parking to be accommodated for all land uses to further implement this policy.</p>

COMMUNITY STANDARDS BYLAW

Storage Containers

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I received the mail out pamphlets this morning regarding proposed zoning bylaw changes. I do not know all the zone bylaw regulations BUT want to focus on a particular bylaw. I understand that camper trailers and motorhomes cannot be parked by the owners on their driveway for an extended period. This section is fine considering the abuses that some owners may create with their specific unit. HOWEVER I was informed by the information desk at City Hall that the Large storage containers were allowed??? my specific complaint is regarding a large storage container; nine feet high, six feet wide and 30 feet long; parked on the driveway at 29 Hanley Crescent. The unit has been parked on the property for at least three or more months. It seems unbelievable that this storage unit would meet bylaw requirement rather than say a smaller motor home or trailer; none of which I own. Beside the complaint I would suggest that a future bylaw either severely limit or not allow storage units to be parked in residential areas. The said units are an eye sore and decrease property values. 	<p>The current zoning bylaw prohibits cargo containers in all residential and commercial zones as well as some industrial zones with some exceptions.</p> <p>A cargo container may be temporarily placed on a site in any zone when related to a valid building permit that has been issued for construction on the site and must be removed once construction is complete. It may also be temporarily placed for the purpose of loading or unloading items associated with the principle use for a period of not more than 10 days.</p> <p>When a complaint is received, it is investigated to determine if there is a violation of any of the applicable City bylaws.</p>

Recreational Vehicles

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to see the bylaw for parking RV's revisited. I believe when this bylaw was introduced we did not have 40ft. RV's. Parking a 40' RV cross ways on your drive way, onto your front yard for 5 months of the year should not be allowed. Our neighbourhoods are not RV parks, this effects home values, blocks a clear view of vehicles coming down the street and is a hindered view of people on the sidewalks. Also once people see one person doing this others realize they can get away with it and half our neighbourhood looks like a RV park. This effects home values, makes garages unusable, effects the way people look after there yards/neighbourhoods and also puts more vehicles parked on the street as there garages are unusable. If you have a 2 car garage you should only be allowed to park 2 vehicles there not a large RV that spills over to your yard. I also believe this would be a hazard to fire fighting and ambulance personnel if they had to get to the house. If we would have had any idea that this was allowed and was happening next door we would never have purchased our home here 2 years ago. Allowing RV's to park at homes a couple days prior to going out camping or after coming home is not an issue. Residents should have to have a designated RV spot along the side or in the back of there home in order to park RV's at residents for more than a few days at a time. 	<p>Recreational Vehicle regulations are being removed from the proposed Zoning Bylaw and being incorporated into the Community Standards Bylaw. This is to support more efficient enforcement of the standards and enable to City to issue tickets for violations.</p>

RADIO TOWERS & CELL PHONE TOWERS

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
In the proposed zoning bylaw, I am interested to know the changes pertaining to Radio Communications Antenna Support Structures. In the current bylaw this is under Chapter 4 General Development Regulations - 4C.5 Radio Communication Antenna Support Structures. What chapter does this belong in the proposed bylaw? I see only up to 10 chapters compared to the current 21 chapters.	Regulations for communications towers have been removed from the proposed Zoning Bylaw as they are regulated federally under the <i>Radiocommunication Act</i> . The City's role in the approval of communication towers is limited to issuing a letter in support of the proposal or against it. The City does have the authority to establish a consultation process to be followed by applicants, and can also establish guidelines regarding the placement of towers and any desired screening that help inform applicants as to what is acceptable from the City's viewpoint. Accordingly, the City is in the process of developing a consultation process and guidelines for communication towers that are outside of the Zoning Bylaw.

ZONING MATERIALS & PRESENTATIONS

Zoning 101 Sessions

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, you have the Ward 1 Zoning Bylaw session hosted at the Conexus Arts Centre which is not accessible by transit. You need to hire more diverse event planning staff. #MakeReginaAccessible Thank you to all the City of Regina staff that took the time to come to the Ward 4 Zoning 101 meeting yesterday. Your efforts are appreciated. And again. Thank you for taking the time to help the citizens of the city better understand these very important changes. Attended the meeting Wednesday March 6. I thought the presenter and presentation was well done. It was obvious no expense was spared but it did give me a better understanding on the ZoneForward initiative. However the fact there were more city employees present than residents was troubling. The city had approx. 10 staff at a presentation that took 2 people to give. I'm pretty sure the city staff wasn't volunteering their time. Unfortunately this excess and waste of resources seems to be a growing trend within almost every city department. Although I support the Zone Forward initiative, when the first thing your exposed to is this extreme waste and excess of Human Resources (that will undoubtedly be reflected in the 2020 property tax increase) its a real distraction. Attended the ward 7 presentation – Feb 27, 2019. Would like to compliment the city and staff that organized their zoning sessions. Staff did wonderful jobs on presenting the information to a live audience. Lots of staff on hand to answer questions. Excellent P.A system so all could hear okay and allowed questions. Great job. Thanks. This is supposed to be an open, public process. I did not receive my notice of meetings until the day after the session in my area. This was the first session. Twice, I was refused a paper copy of the material available at the public meetings. I was referred to the City website. Not everyone can afford a computer and internet. This is not providing "open" or "public access." Maps were given out that displayed the current zoning on one side and the proposed zoning on the other side. There was no legend on either side to let people know what the current zoning actually meant. There should have been something on there that explained what R1 or R3 or Mac I meant otherwise how can anyone determine what the change actually was? I attended in Harbour Landing February 7. The handout information and Speakers provided sufficient clarification. 	<p>If you were unable to attend the session, all of the Zoning 101 sessions were recorded and are posted on the City of Regina Website.</p> <p>All property owners were sent a letter from the City of Regina informing them of the proposed zoning change to their property. The letter provide the specific dates that the bylaw will be addressed at Council and when delegates can appear before Council.</p> <p>Information regarding the current and proposed zoning of a particular site is also available at https://www.regina.ca/residents/city-planning/zoning-bylaw-information/proposed-new-zoning-bylaw/your-property/.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Proposed Zoning Bylaw Materials User Friendliness

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city should provide an overview of the changes in an easy to read document rather than over 50 individual PDFs. • Does the city think people are going to read each of these line by line and know whats changing? • How will the bylaw impact my neighborhood? • Will there be a more detailed explanation of what some of the land uses would entail. • For example I don't see brewery/distillary listed? • And could someone explain Industry and Service Trade under land uses? • The brochure distributed was nice to look at but difficult to use. For example in the 10 Common Times the Zoning Bylaw Applies to You - listed were three things that I wanted more information on. • So I went to the proposed Zoning Bylaw to find the proposed bylaw and was confronted with lots of PDFs and I downloaded and searched several which seemed to apply to my area of Regina (Whitmore Park) - couldn't find anything on the topics. • It would have been more helpful to actually include in the 10 Common Times the specific section of the bylaw. For example, when planning to build or expand your driveway go to But you didn't and I waster close to an hour trying to find the information. • BTW I have a graduate degree and spent 30 years of my life writing instructional programs/manuals - so I'm not a dolt who doesn't know how to find information!!!! • What are the specific changes to existing bylaws that will affect me? • Sorry if I'm missing anything, however I got a pamphlet on the mail asking my opinion on new law changes. However nothing directed me or told me anything about what will be changed. • I was only directed to the city of reginas website, where it has PDFs for the entirety of all of the bylaw information. • However as tax paying residents I feel we would like to know what is actually going to be different. Or else we can't give this feedback on the "new" zoning laws this pamphlet is asking about • Then I read your pamphlet...what a joke! • The Zoning Bylaw provides regulations that make it possible for each type of development to build and thrive within the city without interfering or conflicting with different land uses nearby' I got a good laugh at that one! • Again classic City of Regina communications: I received the letter about Zone Forward meeting in my area the same day of the meeting. If i would have opened it i would have had 1 hour to get there. • I'd love to have these broken down into lay man's terms. • Since I don't know what the new bylaw is supposed to be, it might be nice if I could find info either online (on the city facebook page) or maybe in the leaderpost (which I read daily) • Thanks for providing the info, but I received the envelope in my mailbox the day after the first meeting was held in my zone. I could not attend the second one unfortunately. • A little more advance notice would have been appreciated. • Also, in the Zoning 101 brochure, 10 Common Times section, very poor grammar is used for no. 8 "When Planning To Put An(?) Storage Shed In Your Yard! • Thank you for consolidating the zones down to less than 50. The idea of being able to read 3 sections rather than 12 when reviewing, for example, residential requirements is wonderful • How does one actually have the opportunity to review the contents of it besides the short summaries of what it contains? It would be useful to have a link attached to the site to allow taxpayers the opportunity to look up areas within the Zoning Bylaw similar to the current one. • I like the amalgamated design polices, use of best practices, integrated zones and by-law references. <p>Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Creeks was not an option below, so i chose Wascana View. 	<p>The City of Regina website provides FAQ's, an overview of all zones along with each chapter of the proposed zoning bylaw.</p> <p>For complete detailed information on each land zone, residents are encouraged to read the zone that applies to their specific property.</p> <p>The Bylaw will impact your existing property if you are planning on making substantial changes, alterations or additions to the building on the property in the near future.</p> <p>Many of the existing land uses were modernized in the proposed bylaw. The land uses are defined in Chapter 2 of the proposed bylaw.</p> <p>In order to determine which chapter of the proposed bylaw applies to a property, a person may contact the City to provide the information or use the online map available to identify their proposed zoning See the following link: https://www.regina.ca/residents/city-planning/zoning-bylaw-information/proposed-new-zoning-bylaw/your-property/ The proposed zoning of the property will determine the relevant section of the proposed bylaw.</p>

GENERAL

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<p>You are letting the developers have too much power and control.</p> <p>There is so much you are missing and no attempts to fix it....not happy.</p> <p>Curious as to why we can't build what we want on a piece of land that we supposedly "own" and pay ridiculous taxes and services for.</p> <p>I question the point period.</p> <p>I question the bylaw because what's the point, it's a joke.</p> <p>I am very much on board and in favor of the Zoning Bylaws being guided by the Official Community Plan.</p> <p>It's just more control on private properties the zone bylaw is fine the way is !</p> <p>As for the rest of the rezoning, I have concerns that this just adds more red tape and restrictions on what home owners are able to do with land they, allegedly, own.</p> <p>Everyone deserves equal property enjoyment</p> <p>The City of Regina claims in its "Zoning 101" brochure that was handed out at its public meetings that it "Recognizes Contemporary Practices". We don't believe this is actually being accomplished in their proposed update of the Zoning Bylaw.</p>	<p>A new Zoning Bylaw was developed to align with the OCP passed in 2013. The last comprehensive review of the Zoning Bylaw was done in 1992. The City has included provisions in the proposed bylaw that reflect contemporary development practices.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors and developers should not be allowed to build as they have been More townhouses in residential areas ok but homes must be by design, fit in more with other homes on the same street 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not dictate architectural controls for specific residential neighborhoods, however the developer of a specific area may require homebuilders to meet certain design standards.</p> <p>Within the proposed Residential Infill Overlay, there are proposed regulations to help mitigate some of the perceived negative impacts associated with infill development. The regulations proposed would require the development to be contextual to surrounding properties. (see Q&A's on infill)</p>
<p>Absolutely no mention of urban transit in this plan.</p>	<p>The Zoning Bylaw is a document that regulates land uses. The Transportation Master Plan is the document that addresses urban transit.</p>
<p>Site says, '... review included extensive consultation with developers, architects, home builders, non-profit housing providers, realtors and community associations.' Now the citizens are invited to offer their suggestions. This gives the impression that this is a done deal. Really fed up with the influence of moneyed interests in this city</p>	<p>The first review of the draft bylaw was a technical review that engaged the high-impact external stakeholders, as well as internal departments to determine if the proposed regulations were technically feasible. This preliminary review ensured the proposed regulations presented to the public were realistic given the changing social, economic and development needs of the city.</p> <p>The residents of the City do have a voice and can make a difference in proposals that are made to Council regarding the proposed Zoning Bylaw. Resident input is very important as this document affects every property owner.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. Community involvement, as far as it went. I appreciate the effort being made by the city to answer questions and hear people's concerns. As long as it does not put special interest needs for industrial corporations or is politically motivated. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>I don't understand what the proposed zoning bylaw is?</p>	<p>A zoning bylaw provides regulations for land uses and developments within the city. These regulations determine what can be built on a parcel of land, taking into consideration the other land uses surrounding that property or within a neighbourhood. These regulations allow for orderly development related to building use, height and placement on the property.</p>
<p>Why is the city doing Zone Bylaw now?</p>	<p>To facilitate the goals and priorities of the City's Official Community Plan: Design Regina which provides a 25-year, long-term plan for Regina's growth. To update regulations to facilitate contemporary development practices and land use within Regina. To remove regulations not pertaining to land use that are more appropriately enforced in other City bylaws.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

General (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
My husband and I at the Ward 4 zoning meeting on February 13th and appreciate the work that has gone into these presentations. Full disclosure — my husband has been a residential Realtor for 40 years and an appraiser for many of those years. I have been a Realtor for 32 years. So, we understand zoning and some of the implications of said zoning that perhaps the general public does not.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some simplification and standardization of bylaws Brining together prior changes which may have been scattered into one area. A housekeeping item Land use zones reduced to 43 ok 3 local commercial zones okay 5 residential zones okay Complete neighbourhood (unclear) good 	<p>The proposed new Zoning Bylaw has been structured to facilitate a more streamlined and user-friendly experience.</p> <p>Regulatory language has been simplified where possible and regulations not pertaining to land use have been removed.</p> <p>Chapters are organized by zone and provide all relevant requirements in one place with land uses more clearly defined.</p>
Mixing different types of property classes is not appealing to me or the appearance of a city.	The Official Community Plan (OCP) includes policies around complete communities, which encourages opportunities for convenience and diversity within the neighborhood. Complete neighborhoods are to help provide residents with the amenities for their everyday needs close to home.

Existing Zoning Bylaw No. 9250

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
How long have we had a Zoning Bylaw?	The City of Regina has had a Zoning Bylaw since the late 1920s.
When I purchased my house in 1997, the then, three adjoining properties were zoned R4A. However the developer requested approval of a building that required these properties to be rezoned. This was approved by City Consul but to my understanding for only that building. The building was never built and therefore these properties in my opinion should have returned to R4A. Why this was not done I don't know but it would seem to provide an unfair avenue for developers to change the zoning on empty lots. Therefore at the very least the property abutting mine should be returned to R4a and should not be zoned to ML and remain residential only. The houses that existed there burned down which is not a suitable excuse to change the zoning to satisfy land speculators.	When there is a proposed rezoning amendment for a property(s) separate from a development permit, the rezoning stays with the property it is tied to. Only when the proposed development application includes the rezoning as part of the development application would it revert back to the underlying zone, two years after the expiration of the development permit.
<p>I do have future development plans for my house and need more understanding if these are allowed. The developments that I'm planning are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open Front Yard Parking. 2. Mud Room attached to the front entrance. 3. Three Season Room. 4. Modular Bedroom attached to the existing house, no basement. <p>Please find attached a small image for easy understanding.</p> <p>I'm not sure if this is the right place to ask this question, if not kindly let me know whom to contact.</p>	Resident's request forwarded onto Current Planning to assist them in navigating current regulations.

Bylaw Enactment

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
The proposed Zoning Bylaw will not take effect until 30 days after Ministerial approval. Any fully completed applications or proposals submitted prior to approval of the proposed Zoning Approval will be reviewed utilizing Zoning Bylaw No. 9250.	The proposed Zoning Bylaw will not take effect until 30 days after Ministerial approval. Any fully completed applications or proposals submitted prior to approval of the proposed Zoning Approval will be reviewed utilizing Zoning Bylaw No. 9250.

APPENDIX A-7

Light Pollution

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the city preparing property lighting standards in the new zoning Bylaw. I live a half block south of ecology Harbour Landing School. The light from the parking lot lights light up my back yard so much that it is difficult to enjoy outside activities in the evening. It seems to me that there is no real reason to light up this parking lot all night when it has a gate which is locked after hours. Also, the globe style street lights shine light into my home which is not desirable. I am not sure why the City is trying to light the inside of my home. From an environmental perspective, if it was darker, nocturnal animals such as owls may be able to hunt better in the area and naturally control the rabbits that have overrun the neighbourhood. Light pollution has become a major problem in many communities and failing to address it at this time will leave the city continuing to exacerbate the problem for many years to come. There are cities that are developing new neighbourhoods with no street lights at all. As our great city grows, so does the halo of light covering it at nighttime. I understand that you are looking at a bylaw that does not address Light Pollution. I have a concern about that. Can this concern, and its many implications be thoroughly discussed? I know there are many ways to reduce light pollution, and energy consumption, etc., from using LED streetlamps, to putting timers on huge storefront lights and many other situations too numerous to mention here. Did you know that you must travel at least 50Km away from our city to minimize the effect of the city lights? Finding total darkness is a hard thing to do for things such as Astrophotography. Thanks for listening. Does the proposed zoning bylaw include considerations for light pollution? I would ask that the city consider light pollution as part of the zoning bylaw. Any light other than directed light is just wasted energy. Light pollution is very disruptive to the ecosystem. I live about 100 km from the city of Regina, and I can see a glow in the sky from the Regina city lights. There are many great alternatives for lighting, everyone should be aware of the problem and they will make a better choice. Does this zoning bylaw cover light trespass or light pollution? If this bylaw covers light trespass, I would like to see some, if not all, light standards in neighbourhoods with a cover which directs the light downward towards the street and not open to the sky. Also, there is a light that shines directly into my front window every night. Even with blinds it is very intrusive to our activities in the front room. Some evenings I enjoy watching the night sky but am blinded by this light outside my house. It is quite offensive. Just something to think about. Thank you. Why is there nothing in the new proposed Zoning Bylaw that addresses light pollution or light trespass issues? I believe the current Zoning Bylaws need to be updated to address recent changes in technology in the areas of lighting. More specifically, the new Zoning Bylaw has nothing on light pollution or light trespass. The current proposal to address billboards is a good start but is only a small fraction of the lighting issues technology is introducing. Now it's easy to dismiss lighting issues as building code related but the truth is that lighting is an environmental and landscaping issue and other jurisdictions include light pollution in their Zoning Bylaw. Lighting at night affects humans and alters their circadian rhythm causing sleep disorders which are commonly found in Alzheimer's and Dementia patients. Birds will never sleep in a tree illuminated by a street light. Criminals are not going to paint graffiti with a flashlight because it's going to attract attention to them. These are all simple light pollution examples that are true. SaskPower has recently adopted the International Dark Sky Association standards for LED street lighting. Why should SaskPower put in good lighting only to have it ruined by some over lit business next door that doesn't follow the same lighting standards? This very question is a good example of the environmental effects of light trespass and illustrates why light pollution needs to be addressed by the community as a whole. I believe it is time for the City of Regina to start planning ahead for the next 25 years by adopting light pollution and light trespass issues within the Zoning Bylaw like other communities already have. Doing so will allow the citizens of Regina to work together to make a better community that does not promote crime at night, is more conscious of the environment and saves money by reducing electricity (and non-renewable resources) used to power wasteful lights. The proposed Zoning Bylaws needs to be updated to address light pollution and light trespass. As the price of LED lighting declines the number of lights being installed increases. Many of these lights have a very high colour temperature which impacts our circadian rhythm and has been linked to several human diseases. They are also harmful to both plant and animal life impacting their normal reproductive, feeding, and sleep cycles. Impacts on the food chain can yield significant costs for cities as they deal with unwanted pests due to excess lighting. There are also studies demonstrating increased lighting increases crime and reduced lighting decreases crime. The causation is you need to be able to see stuff to steal it and you need lighting to paint graffiti. In the absence of light a flashlight draws attention to the criminal and no one can see your artwork. The lack of light becomes a crime deterrent. Other cities have adopted the International Dark Sky Association standards as part of their Zoning Bylaws so there is well established precedent for this. It is important to address light trespass because otherwise the good work of the city on street lights and the good lighting of the others can be impacted by the resident or business next door. The light dome over Regina can already be seen well over 50 - 75 km away so the impact is not just local. If we don't address this in our Zoning Bylaws it will only grow over the next 25 years. 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw does not propose regulations for on-site lighting. The Regina Community Standards Amendment Bylaw, Bylaw No. 2016-2 includes regulations for outdoor lighting.</p>

APPENDIX A-7

Property Assessment & Valuation

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The highlights will be the need to take how zoning affects property values into account and also to stress how important it is to look after the needs and wants of current Regina residents. Property Values — Little thought appears to have been given to property values. A house across the street from an apartment building has less value than a house across the street from another single family house. A house next door to a duplex is also worth less. I felt that the zoning committee did not take this into account at all. They were pretty cavalier about removing the old RI zoning and replacing it with RN. With RI, you can only build single family homes. Under RN, you now have all sorts of options open to you which can negatively affect the neighbourhood as well as individual home owners. This needs to be addressed and corrected. Bring back the RI zoning. 	<p>The assessment value of a property is influenced by the potential uses of the property and the actual use of the property. As such, the zoning applied to a property does impact its assessment value. Two properties in the same zone may have different assessment values if their actual land uses are different.</p> <p>In some cases, the proposed Zoning Bylaw allows a greater variety of uses than what is possible in the equivalent zone under the current Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>Since property tax is a function of a property's assessment value, it may also be impacted if the proposed Zoning Bylaw is approved. Undeveloped land is likely to be more impacted by a change in zoning than a developed property. This is because the assessment value of the developed property is largely based on the actual use of the property, which will not necessarily change. However for an undeveloped property, the assessment value is based on the potential uses of the land which may change if the proposed Zoning Bylaw is approved.</p>

Business Development

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can this new proposed zoning bylaw allow more businesses to open that are both engaging to the community it is in, as well as the whole city? More and more businesses are starting to close due to the inconvenient places they are in. (commercial areas in the industrial section, etc.) How will this new zoning bylaw help both small and large businesses thrive and seem fit in the area they are in? 	<p>The proposed Zoning Bylaw is helping implement the goals of the OCP regarding complete neighborhoods.</p> <p>The proposed shift from commercial zones to mixed use zones, allows for more flexibility in design and the ability to bring conveniences to residents within their neighborhood, providing more flexibility in permitted land uses to achieve this.</p> <p>The proposed zoning bylaw is encouraging uses that complement one another to be located close to each other but cannot ensure that the location of a particular business is going to thrive based on the proximity to others.</p>

Enforcement

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would love to provide feedback but it pointless because the city is not enforcing the current bylaws now. Enforce the current ones before making new ones. And I don't know if I want a response - when I have contacted city staff to get an answer to a question such as how big a storage shed is allowed in Whitmore Park it seems to trigger a whole investigation rather than just giving me the information. I strongly suspect that the 'revised' bylaws will NOT improve the situation. Maybe that is why nobody follows bylaws - you don't make it easy to actually get to them!!!! My main concern is that the city does not enforce bylaw legislation that they now have in place. I would like to know if this will change in the future ? 	<p>The City encourages residents to call 306.777.7000 and file a service request regarding their concern.</p> <p>The City does investigate land use concerns and works with property owners to achieve compliance.</p> <p>Many items that were not related to land use in the current Zoning Bylaw are proposed to be removed and placed in other City bylaws where they can be more effectively enforced.</p>

MISCELLANEOUS

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
Would be nice if you actually did the correct thing? You let some do what they want and screw other people over? A developer that does stuff wrong knows it is wrong should never get a second chance to screw us over? Then you guys screw over capital point fighting when you could just help them get the place built.	Noted.
No Brandt Industries and businesses in Wascana Park PLEASE! Good location for the new Floral Conservatory when it is built, in the best location possible to maintain the spirit of Wascana.	Wascana Park is outside the land use jurisdiction of the City of Regina.
Streets are too narrow, no proper sight lines at intersections, Woodland Park Drive is terrible, you have to pull halfway out into the street to get a proper view of any oncoming traffic to see if it safe to enter this street. And it is only single lane, as you pack another subdivision north of Greens on Gardiner, you will not leave room to expand the street.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate traffic. The Zoning Bylaw regulates land use.
Arcola ave is terrible too, too much traffic- two lanes and dinky turning or merging lanes. Can you guys actually build streets that have more than two lanes?? It is frustrating and a pain when there are no alternative roadways, Arcola Ave is jammed up, you are so scared to build Prince of Wales south of Arcola to hook up with Wascana Parkway and the new bypass.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate traffic. The Zoning Bylaw regulates land use.
I get the big picture, you need to have high population housing (apartment buildings) and single dwelling homes in these areas, but you never allow enough room for proper traffic. The Ring road is a joke, two lanes again and too much traffic, the bypass will not take all of the traffic off it, as the Ring Road is not linked to the bypass. The exit from northbound ring road onto Arcola, you have a stop sign, that right, a stop sign cause there is a pedestration crossing there. Wascana parkway to Assibone Drive needs to have a third lane on ring road to take in the merging traffic and to provide exit. Grow up, this is a freeway and you stick a stop sign there to jam all the traffic up. Put a lighted ped crossing sign there just like the one on Assibone Drive and add a proper third lane to merge into Arcola Ave. There is so much you are missing and no attempts to fix it....not happy.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate traffic. The Zoning Bylaw regulates land use.
I live to the East of the freeway the city put in - the Argyle street extension. I say freeway because that is how it is used. Yes there are posted speeds but people simply do not give a <expletive> around school zones etc, especially since this section has never been monitored. I have raised the issue of excessive speeds and noise several times. The city tells me to call police and the police blames the city - obvious nobody gives a damn. It will take a tradegy for anyone to get off their <expletive>. As it is our quality of life is in the toilet. The freeway is right at our back yard. The speeds along here with no protective barrier has created a safety hazard, any moment a vehicle could come flying through our back yard so enjoyment and relaxation is no longer possible. We tell our children to not play next to a freeway yet the city put one right through our back yard. The noise level has made it so we can no longer use our master bedroom, we cannot open windows in summer as traffic noise fills our house. There are bylaws against vehicle noise which is obviously not enforced with the high school children and adults in diesel trucks with noise making mufflers.Tests of speed, trucks gunning their engines has ruined our quality. Your freeway has most definitely interfered and conflicted with use of my property due to the safety hazard of the excessive speed, zero monitoring of speed and noise bylaw enforcement. I am not responding in hopes that something will be done...I know nothing will be done, I know this city well and it really does not give a damn...we are already here and you are already collecting taxes from us, period end.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate traffic. The Zoning Bylaw regulates land use.
Turn signal on Dewdney and pasqua street	Forwarded to Roadways.
And when you going live out what you preach of your own city bylaws. It's about the facts that the city says one statement of the streets width must be 8.7 meters wide to have one sided parking and to stand strongly with "safety of our citizens"yet they are not following their own standards and facts. Your city bylaws are for the "safety of all citizens"to ensure emergency vehicles like fire trucks and amublaces can get down the streets with parking. Yet all over the city you have parking on 1 side and 2 sides and they do not meet your own bylaws and the some streets cvannont have parking.	The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate street width.

APPENDIX A-7

Miscellaneous (cont'd)

Stakeholder Comments	Administration Response
<p>Are medical marijuana grow ops considered in any of the proposed bylaws (I did not see any reference) in so far as fire hazards (i.e. electrical system overhauled), or that 60-70% of residence used as grow op, or the noise, or the smell, or the entire system exhausting within meters of neighboring intake vents (besides smell, chemical considerations, etc) all the areas that a normal residence, or residential business would need to abide by that this grow op does not? Health Canada advises that medical marijuana grow ops still need to abide by local bylaws therefore I am hoping that the bylaw will specifically mention this aspect so as the city can act more quickly on this matter (i.e. 8 years of complaints to date).</p>	<p>Marijuana grow-ops require a license from provincial/federal authority. The building code and fire code requirements will apply, so this may not be possible as a residential business even the Zoning Bylaw does not specifically prohibit it. The regulations of the Community Standards Bylaw regarding nuisances may also apply. There is also the Noise Abatement Bylaw that regulates noise.</p> <p>As a residential business, it cannot legally occupy 60% - 70% of the residence as suggested in the question. The Zoning Bylaw regulations only allow for a maximum of 25% of the of the gross floor area of the Dwelling Unit to be used for a residential business.</p> <p>If it is not being done as a residential business then it would have to be either "Agriculture, Indoor" or "Agriculture, Outdoor". Both uses are prohibited in residential zones</p>
<p>Is it possible to get more patrolling police cars in north central and more of a police presence in Wascana park.</p>	<p>Policing is outside the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curious as to why we cant build what we want on piece of land that we supposedly "own" and pay ridiculous taxes and services for. • And not looking for a generic run of the mill answer. • Also, why are fines so ridiculously priced? • Most people dont intend to go passed bylaws and the economy sucks so bad, so how is it ethical to wallet <expletive> someone and then expect them to be able to change what they did wrong? • The prices for everything city related are ridiculous and it makes no sense. • The more people have money in their pockets, the more they can spend on other things city related and tax income can be generated that way. • Not forcing people to break their wallet to live. • Reduce the taxes its gone up every year since our new mayor has being in power ! • Stop spending The tax payers money carelessly ! • It doesn't matter what the residents of Regina want, city council will do want they want and increase taxes. • City council is getting WAY too big-brotherish. • The city is losing a lot of tax money to people that have moved out to the RM of Edenwold and White City (who then use city services). 	<p>Comments are outside of the scope of the Zoning Bylaw.</p>
<p>How is it possible that the City can build over a contaminated site with no remediation. (City Transit Centre) City has many conaminated sites which should be identified by zone. Zoning should identify conaminated lots/areas so people can determine developing anything in that area.</p>	<p>The Zoning Bylaw does not track contaminated sites. Contaminated sites are required to comply with provincial regulations.</p>
<p>What if anything has been considered re homelessness and tiny house type shelters. I would seriously be willing to doneate my time and cash to help accomplish this.</p>	<p>The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate housing costs. The development of tiny homes is not prohibited by the Zoning Bylaw or the Building Bylaw. However, there are a number of National Building Code and Uniform Building Accessibility Standards Act requirements that must be met that may make such development cost-prohibitive.</p>