Appendix A - OCP 5-Year Review: Proposed Policy Amendments – Part A Citywide Plan*

*Note: This review does not include any potential amendments to OCP Part B – Secondary Plans

Potential Policies to Amend as Part of the OCP 5-Year Review

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
Introduction to Design Regina (Pg. 3 and 4)	Live/work	The use of the term "live/work" in this section is not consistent with the definition of live/work. The instance in this section should not be a defined term (i.e. not italicised).	CHANGE: "…ensure that all parts of the city are well connected, that a strong ~~*live/work*~~ **live-work** relationship for residents is retained, and that the city is extended to serve all current and new generations."
Community Priority 2 description (p. 6)	"Embrace built heritage, and invest in arts, culture, sport and recreation"	The term 'built heritage' is not a defined term in the OCP and it should be broadened to included to include not just buildings but also other sites with heritage value such as the Regina Indian Industrial School Site Cemetery. The defined term 'historic places' is more fitting and inclusive in this context. The description for this Community Priority refers to "supporting heritage preservation" whereas the intent of policies throughout the Plan is to support heritage "conservation." The term 'preserve' is much more restrictive than intended. This language is consistent with recent work on the heritage program update.	CHANGE: Embrace ~~built heritage,~~ and invest in arts, culture, **historic places,** sport and recreation Enhance *quality of life*, community identity and pride by supporting heritage **conservation** ~~preservation,~~ arts, *culture* and four season sport and recreation activities which will foster community vibrancy and cohesiveness.
How to Read this Plan (p. 8)	Policy Interpretation	The Citywide OCP (Part A) is missing a section that provides clarity on what policies mean by "shall" versus "should" versus "may" versus "must" etc. Add the same section on policy interpretation that is found in the new secondary plans (OCP Part B).	ADD: **Policy Interpretation** **In the interpretation of the policies within this Plan, the word 'shall' means mandatory compliance. 'Should' policy statements demonstrate that compliance is encouraged and recommended. However, 'should' statements may not always be practical and flexibility is provided in such circumstances. 'May' statements indicate no obligation to undertake what is proposed, but implies that the approving authority shall give due consideration to the policy.**
D2, 4.1.3 (see also policies 11.5 & 11.6), Appendix C	Policy RE: preservation of 1:500 FLOODPLAIN	Reference in policy to preserving both the floodplain and "floodway fringe" is redundant as the floodplain includes both the floodway and floodway fringe. Note: The Province (Community Planning Branch) recommended alterations to Design Regina when it was being considered to include policies specifically protecting against 1:500 flood events (Statements of Provincial Interest)	CHANGE: 4.1.3 Preservation of **the** FLOODPLAIN **(i.e. *floodway* and *flood fringe*)** ~~and floodway fringe based on the 500-year flood event (provincial standard); and~~ 11.5 ITALICIZE "floodway" 11.6 ITALICIZE "flood fringe" CHANGE: "floodway fringe" to "flood fringe" (Appendix C – definitions)

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
			flood~~way~~ fringe: The outer zone of a flood plain ~~that is often inundated during floods, but generally does not experience flood currents~~ **where the waters in the 1:500 year flood are projected to be less than a depth of one metre or a velocity of one metre per second.** ADD: **floodway: The inner zone of a floodplain adjoining the channel where the waters in the 1:500 year flood are projected to meet or exceed a depth of one metre or a velocity of one metre per second.**
D2, 4.7	Urban Forest	The urban forest includes all trees within the city. The policy does not encourage the expansion of private trees in the urban forest. The OCP should provide policy support for programs to promote tree planting on private property, particularly on residential lots. Include a sub-policy to encourage (not require) private tree planting on residential lots.	ADD: **4.7.6 Encourage private tree planting on residential lots.**
D3, 5.8	Use of rights-of-way	Policy is not used to protect ROW that are needed to achieve improvements in the public realm, especially in the downtown according to the Regina Downtown Neighbourhood Plan. Should add language about protecting and acquiring lands that are near or adjacent to transportation rights-of-way necessary to develop lands according to the related policies on urban design and public realm improvements.	CHANGE: Protect and acquire lands that are near or adjacent to transportation rights-of-way necessary to ensure overall connectivity within the transportation network **and to develop lands according to the related policies on urban design and public realm improvements**.
D4, 6.7	Policy RE: stormwater management on MR and open space	The intent of this policy has been misinterpreted to mean that stormwater management should be accommodated on municipal reserve (MR)/open space. The intent of this policy is to continue to have parks function as parks (e.g. maintain programmable recreation space) as the primary use while allowing stormwater management as a secondary use of parks. There is a need to improve wording of the policy to clarify intent. There have also been issues with allowing it adjacent to schools which may be addressed by adding a sub-policy stating that stormwater ponds are not appropriate adjacent to schools.	CHANGE/ADD: 6.7 ~~Integrate~~ **Consider, in appropriate contexts as determined by the City, integrating** stormwater management into municipal reserves and open space in a manner that is compatible with the intended function of the open space. **6.7A Utilize municipal utility parcels for stormwater management where combining stormwater management and open space is not appropriate.** CHANGE/ADD: 11.4 Encourage school boards and developers to locate schools such that the safety and level of activity of children is optimized **including, but not limited to:** **11.4A Requiring safety measures when stormwater ponds are adjacent to school sites.**
D5, 7.1.8	Complete Neighbourhood policy	Missing italicized font of “sense of” before “place” (defined term) – housekeeping amendment	ADD italics to “*sense of*”
D5, 7.6	Live/Work	The policy requires the location of live/work units in residential areas to be specifically identified in a secondary or concept plan. This is unnecessarily restrictive. This is also inconsistent with policy 12.7.3 as well as the Guidelines for Complete Neighbourhoods policy 7.1.5	CHANGE: 7.5 Encourage appropriate *mixed-use* development **and *live/work* opportunities** within neighbourhoods**, URBAN CORRIDORS and URBAN CENTRES**~~, as well as the retention of existing local and neighbourhood commercial~~

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		(bullet 2) and 7.1.10 (bullet 1) which encourage live/work developments. Revise the policy to remove the requirement for locations to be specified in secondary or concept plans. Include sub-clauses with the high-level factors that should be considered in determining whether live/work is appropriate in a residential area (e.g. street type, density of the area, etc.) Mixed-use is potentially more impactful than live/work but our policies are more permissive for mixed-use.	~~spaces~~. **7.6** ~~Permit *live/work* opportunities within URBAN CENTRES and URBAN CORRIDORS and within residential areas as identified within approved secondary plans or concept plans.~~ **Encourage the retention of existing local and neighbourhood commercial spaces.**
D5, 7.15.2	Plan 'New Employment Areas' to have certain land use and design elements	Employment Areas could be confused with "New Employment Areas" which are specific areas on Map 1 – Growth Plan (primarily our new industrial areas) whereas the policies cover New Employment Areas, commercial, industrial and major institutional areas. Apply 7.15 to all (commercial, industrial, major institutional) in addition to New Employment Areas. These policies are important to keep in this section because it is a particular issue with planning employment areas.	CHANGE Goal 4 – Employment ~~Areas~~ **Uses** 7.15 Plan and develop NEW EMPLOYMENT AREAS, as shown on Map 1 – Growth Plan, **commercial areas, *major institutional* areas and industrial areas** to include the following land-use and design elements:
D5, 7.17	Clarification of the terms 'Reinforce the streetscape' and 'Integrated' in the context of policy	Policy requires large format retail to be designed to reinforce the streetscape through orientation and site design, but it is unclear what that means. For example, if the existing streetscape is parking between the building and the fronting streets should new large format developments be required to continue with that orientation? The policy also requires large format retail to be designed to be integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods. It is unclear what should be assessed to determine whether a large format retail store has been "integrated" in the neighbourhood. Revise the policy to provide clarity on what is meant by "reinforce the streetscape" and "integrated".	CHANGE: 7.17.1 To reinforce the streetscape **(e.g. direct pedestrian access oriented to sidewalks and streets, buildings pushed up to the street)**, a high-quality *public realm*, and access to transit through the orientation of buildings and site design; 7.17.4 To be *accessible* and integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods **(i.e. walkable to the adjacent neighbourhood)**.
D5, 7.17, 7.18, 7.34 and Section E, 14.60, Appendix C	High-quality/enhanced public realm	These policies require buildings to provide a high-quality public realm but there is no indication of what elements are necessary for a high-quality public realm. Without further clarity, development proponents can argue that they already provide a high-quality public realm. Include additional policy or definition that provides a high-level indication of what elements are necessary for a high-quality public realm.	CHANGE (definition): Public realm: Places and spaces that are shared by the public. This includes all public places, open spaces, and streetscapes. **High-quality public realm may include opportunities for places to gather, places to walk to, beautiful spaces, pedestrian-oriented design etc.**
D5, 7.29.1	Office Development	It is unclear from the current wording if the policy supports only the	CHANGE:

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
	policies	conversion of heritage buildings within the Warehouse District or if they are supported everywhere within the Downtown/Central City Office Area in addition to the development or redevelopment of non-heritage buildings as medium scaled office buildings in the Warehouse District. The intent of the policy was to support any conversions of heritage buildings. Recommend creating separate policies speaking to heritage conversions and new development in the Warehouse District.	7.29.1 The conversion of designated heritage buildings ~~or the development of new *medium office* buildings in the Warehouse District, located within the DOWNTOWN/CENTRAL CITY OFFICE AREA, as identified on Map 6 – Office Areas~~; 7.29.3 **The development of *medium office* buildings in the Warehouse District, located within the DOWNTOWN/CENTRAL CITY OFFICE AREA, as identified on Map 6 – Office Areas;**
D5, 7.29.3 and 7.33B (NEW)	Office Development	Policy 7.29.3 is in relation to Airport Land which is outside the jurisdiction of the City. Recommend changing 7.29.3 based on feedback from Zone Forward, Legal and Regina Airport Authority.	REPEAL existing 7.29.3 and ADD a new 7.33B: **Collaborate with local authorities, municipalities and other lands under provincial and federal jurisdiction on the creation of complementary policies and agreements regarding office development**.
D5, 7.29.4	Office Development	Policy 7.29.4 says that medium and major office should be allowed outside the Downtown when associated with a "civic use". This gets into ownership issues which can change over time, are difficult to monitor, and are outside the purview of the Zoning Bylaw, which outlines the regulations for the Office policy. Medium and major office should be encouraged Downtown regardless of the ownership.	CHANGE: 7.29.4 The development of *medium office* and *major office* buildings associated with and located adjacent to a *major institutional area* (e.g. university, hospital) ~~or civic use~~;
D5, 7.29.7 (NEW)	Office Development	During the consultation on the office development policies several stakeholders expressed the desire to amend the policies to allow for industrial users that are not appropriate in a downtown location because they require warehousing space, compound space for fleet vehicles, storage of materials, etc. This OCP amendment will require a supporting amendment to the Zoning Bylaw (e.g. definition of 'Office, Industry' and development standards tables to include medium industrial offices as a discretionary use).	ADD: **7.29.7 The development of *medium office* for industrial users considered as a discretionary use.**
D5, 7.40	Compatibility of Built Form	It is unclear what aspect of the built form needs to be compatible or considered in development approvals – whether it this limited to building orientation and building massing or does it also include architectural elements. If it includes architectural elements, it is not possible to consider this in all aspects of development approvals without architectural controls for every area.	CHANGE: 7.40 Consider the built form and *urban design* policies in ~~all aspects of development and approvals~~ **the review of development applications**.
Section D6 - Housing (general), Appendix C	Housing policies	The only term that refers to housing that is not market rate is "attainable housing". This term does not mean much nor is it used in the City's housing policies or in housing policy generally. The terms affordable and below market housing have more usage and relevance to policy.	Add a definition of *affordable housing* and *below market housing* to the OCP and add to policies 8.1, 8.7, 8.14 and 8.19 as noted in the policies. The definitions can be taken from the Housing Incentives Policy: **Affordable Housing** – housing where the cost does not exceed 30 per cent of the household's gross income excluding costs for utilities, parking or other related expenses.

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		Definition proposed for affordable and below market varies slightly from the Comprehensive Housing Strategy. Future review of the CHS should align definition with the OCP and HIP.	**Below Market Housing** - housing for individuals and families who are at or below the Maximum Income Thresholds as defined by the City's Housing Incentives Policy. Below market rental developments are also defined as those that provide units that are at or below Maximum Rental Rates as defined by the City's Housing Incentives Policy.
D6, 8.1	Housing diversity	Policy should include affordable and below market housing**.** See above comments.	New wording: "Support *affordable, below market* and *attainable* housing…"
D6, 8.4	Italicize defined term	Italics of terms defined in OCP (housekeeping)	ITALICIZE: "accessory suite"
D6, 8.7	Incentives are used for affordable and below market housing, which are not mentioned in this policy	Policy should include affordable and below market housing. See above comments	New wording: "Use incentives… to increase the supply of *affordable, below market, attainable*, adequate…"
D6, 8.12	Flexibility and adaptability in the function of housing	It is unclear what function refers to in this context. The intent was physical design and function (e.g. multi-generational housing, transitional housing, supportive housing, etc.), but I don't know that it adds to the policy so perhaps general is better. Recommended to remove "design and function". Revise the policy to provide greater clarity on its intent.	CHANGE: 8.12 Allow for flexibility and adaptability ~~in the design and function~~ of housing and consider enabling regulation to increase innovation within the housing stock to accommodate the changing needs of households.
D6, 8.14	Development alternatives	Policy should include affordable and below market housing. See above comments	New wording: "Consider alternatives…. in support of *affordable*, *below market* and *specific needs* and innovative housing…"
D6, 8.19.1	Partnerships	Policy should include affordable and below market housing. See above comments	New wording: "Policy and regulatory changes…access to *affordable, below market, attainable housing*…"
D9, 11.1, Map 9, Definitions	Land Use Compatibility Transition Area	These areas have caused confusion as is unclear how the compatibility transition areas can be used for land use planning purposes. The areas are made up of miscellaneous industrial and nuisance areas; however, it is unclear what is included. City planners have not found this designation to be helpful in the review of development applications. Potential nuisances and hazards are identified at more detailed levels of planning at the neighbourhood and site plan level.	REPLACE policy 11.1 with the following: **Consider Map 9 – Health and Safety in the review of development applications.** REMOVE the Land Use Compatibility Transition Area from Map 9 and legend REMOVE the definition for Land Use Compatibility Transition Area
D9, 11.15, Map 9	Evraz Buffer	Policies from the City's former OCP (Part C NW Sector Plan of the Regina Development Plan – repealed in 2013 with new OCP adoption) should have carried forward to the new OCP that clearly stated that lands within the Evraz 1,000 metre buffer would only be permitted to develop non-residential uses. At present the City is protecting lands within the 1,000 m buffer by not allowing residential development but we could be challenged on it without clear policies. Sep. 26 Council Report (CR16-109) noted in the body of the report that	CHANGE: 11.15.1 That within the secondary plan or concept plan areas affected by the 1000m ~~IPSCO buffer~~ **EVRAZ BUFFER** (excluding the Lakeridge neighbourhood, which has had an approved concept plan in place since 1988), as shown on Map 9 – Health and Safety, future lot owners shall be made aware of potential noise and emissions associated with this operation; and ADD: **11.15A Require that land uses within the city, which are within the EVRAZ Buffer, as shown on Map 9 –**

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		these agreed upon changes would be made during the 5-year review. Amend policies as agreed with the RM of Sherwood (Sep.1, 2016). Policy should state that lands within the Evraz buffer shall include non-residential uses only. Revise Map 9 and wording in policy 11.15 to replace "Ipsco" to "Evraz"	**Health and Safety, be restricted to non-residential uses such as, but not limited to, commercial, light industrial, appropriate institutional uses and recreational uses or any other compatible uses determined through an approved secondary plan and/ or concept plan.** **11.15B Consider requiring, through an applicable secondary plan, concept plan, zoning amendment or discretionary use process for proposed development within areas affected by the EVRAZ BUFFER, the construction of a berm/ barrier that is:** **11.15B.1 Located within the EVRAZ Buffer as determined by the City; and** **11.15B.2 Designed to include landscaping, and other elements as determined by the City, sufficient to provide visual and audible relief from industrial operations.** CHANGE: Map 9 "IPSCO BUFFER" to 'EVRAZ BUFFER'
D11, Goal 5 – Social Inclusion	Ensure that Regina is socially inclusive and strives for social equality regardless of age, ethnicity, religion, income, sexual orientation, ability or family structure	Recommend adding 'gender identity' to more comprehensively cover social inclusivity and social equality	CHANGE: Ensure that Regina is socially inclusive and strives for social equality regardless of age, ethnicity, religion, income, sexual orientation**, gender identity**, ability or family structure.
Section E, 14.20B	Phasing and Financing Growth	14.20A and 14.20B could be interpreted as having conflicting direction with respect to the inclusion of residential development within Urban Centres and Urban Corridors. 14.20A indicates they will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Meanwhile 14.20B states that if they are located within an area subject to phasing that the residential portion shall conform to the phasing schedule. To clarify the intent of policy 14.20A that it is referring to employment uses (commercial, industrial and major institutional) within the corridors and centres. Further, architecture is outside of the City's authority unless an architectural control overlay is established.	CHANGE: 14.20A The phasing of development, and the provision of associated municipal services, within lands identified on Map 1 - Growth Plan and Map 1b – Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~ as URBAN CORRIDORS, URBAN CENTRES AND NEW EMPLOYMENT AREAS, shall be considered for approval, by the City, on a case-by case basis **for employment uses (i.e. commercial, industrial and major institutional)**. 14.20B Notwithstanding Policy 14.20A, where an URBAN CENTRE or URBAN CORRIDOR is located within an area subject to phasing, as shown on Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~ the timing of residential development shall conform with the phasing schedule; however, Council may waive this requirement where it can be demonstrated, to the City's satisfaction, that a mixed-use environment will be developed, which reflects a high quality urban design that is pedestrian-oriented~~, and includes high-quality architectural treatment~~.
Section E, 14.20D.3	Phasing and financing policies	Should read 'Special Study Areas' and not 'Special Policy Areas' (Housekeeping)	Replace 'Special Policy Areas' with 'Special Study Areas'
D9, Section E, 14.23-14.37, Appendix B	Alignment with provincial legislation - School siting policies	The Planning & Development Act (P&D Act) that governs the OCP was amended in 2017 to include new requirements for OCP's. The amended P&D Act sections 32(2)j(ii) & (iii) and 32(4) have new requirements regarding school sites locating on MR and consultation with the Ministry of Education.	CHANGE/ADD: 11.4 Encourage school boards and developers to locate schools such that the safety and level of activity of children is optimized **including but not limited to:** **11.4B Locating school sites away from potentially *hazardous facilities*.**

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		The draft policies were circulated to the Ministry of Education and local school divisions and reflect their comments. Comments from City departments pointed to the fact that some of the proposed provisions should be guidelines and some considerations beyond what is required by the Act should be guidelines rather than policy. Note: There was also an amendment to the P&D act requiring that OCPs include policy with respect to safe setbacks to rail operations. Regina's OCP already includes such a policy (11.7) and it is also dealt with more specifically through secondary plans, which form part of the OCP.	**14.37A Require that the planning for new schools is done in accordance with the following policies:** **14.37A.1 Where a Secondary Plan or Concept Plan is being prepared:** **14.37A.1.1 The City shall consult with the Government of Saskatchewan and the affected school divisions to determine the need and, where applicable, size and location for new school(s);** **14.37A.1.2 The location for new school site(s), where applicable, shall be illustrated conceptually within Secondary Plans, specifically within Concept Plans, or otherwise as required by the City.** **14.37A.2 Where a new school is deemed to be required, the City:** **14.37A.2.1 Should require that land (e.g. municipal reserve dedication) or money (e.g. cash in lieu of municipal reserve dedication; levies) be provided through the affected subdivision process(s) for the purpose of accommodating the school site;** **14.37A.2.2 Shall seek a financial contribution, where the proposed school benefits an adjacent municipality, which may include proportionally equitable monetary contributions from any benefitting municipality.** CHANGE title to School **Siting** ~~Site~~ **and** Re-Use Guidelines (Appendix B). ADD section at end of Appendix B: **a) New school sites should:** • **Be located on a collector roadway;** • **Not front, flank or back an arterial or higher classification roadway;** • **Be located connected to pedestrian networks that provide safe connectivity to adjacent neighbourhoods; and** • **Accommodate a school and a contiguously located recreational open space**; **b) High school sites should be located adjacent, or in close proximity, to transit routes or future transit routes.** **c) New school sites shall be in substantial compliance with any applicable guidelines or standards pertaining to school site design adopted or endorsed by the City.**
Section E, 14.40.2	The need to protect all forms of land use from harmful encroachments by incompatible uses;	This policy should be expanded to cover discretionary uses. Also remove redundant text about requests for rezoning (type of application for amending the zoning bylaw).	CHANGE: 14.40 Ensure that applications to amend the zoning bylaw, ~~or requests for the rezoning of land~~ **and discretionary use applications** consider the following:
Section E, Goal 8 and 14.42.2.	Contract zone designation	The terms "unique" and "positive development" are too broad and creates the possibility for any proposed development to be designated a contract zone.	CHANGE: 14.42.1 Conforms with the general intent of this Plan or any applicable concept plan; **and**

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
			~~14.42.2 Represents a unique and/or positive development opportunity; and~~
Section E, Goal 9, 14.46.2 and 14.46.3	Direct Control District Designation.	The word "unique" is too broad and creates the possibility for any proposed development to be designated a Direct Control District. The word unique in unnecessary in the context of the remainder of the clauses. Mixed-use development is not consistent with Goal 9 and should not be specifically listed as a reason for a Direct Control District. Mixed-use developments are contemplated in all but one commercial zone in Zoning Bylaw 9250 and are specifically encouraged in the proposed Zoning Bylaw as such, they do not require a DCD designation. Direct control districts have been applied to test new development forms (e.g. laneway suites) before they potentially become conventional zones.	CHANGE: 14.46.3 Unique **existing areas (e.g. Downtown, Warehouse District, Former Diocese of Qu'Appelle District and Centre Square Neighbourhood)** ~~or mixed-use development proposals.~~; and ADD: **14.46.4 Pilot projects for testing new innovative development forms.**
Section E, 14.52	Exceptions to development standards	Zone Forward Steering Committee flagged a need to make this policy more general to not refer solely to the Zoning Bylaw. There are other tools beyond the Zoning Bylaw where we secure these contributions.	CHANGE: 14.52 Consider expanding the Zoning Bylaw **or other tools** to secure contributions from development to improve the *public realm*.
Section E, 14.53	Small lot zoning	The policy lists all the zones where detached dwellings on a small lot are permitted and restricts the use of these zones to older residential neighbourhoods. Goal 11 and Policy 14.54 indicate that small lots should be encouraged in new neighbourhoods. There are policies that refer to specific zones from Zoning Bylaw 9250, many of which will not exist when the proposed Zoning Bylaw is approved.	CHANGE: 14.53 Apply **narrow lot zoning** ~~the R1A (Residential Older Neighbourhood Detached), R3 (Residential Older Neighbourhood), R4 (Residential Older Neighbourhood), R4A (Residential Infill Housing), IIT (Innismore Industrial Transitional Overlay), and TAR (Transitional Area Residential) zones only~~ in older residential neighbourhoods (determined by the City) with special site and parking regulations.
Section E, policies 14.55-14.58	Mixed Residential Business Zone	There are policies that refer to specific zones from Zoning Bylaw 9250, many of which will not exist when the proposed Zoning Bylaw is approved by the Province. The MX zone is not being carried forward to the new Zoning Bylaw This amendment also requires renumbering of Goal 13 to 12	REPEAL Goal 12 and policies 14.55-14.58: ~~Goal 12 – Mixed Residential Business Zone~~ ~~Provide a compatible land-use transition between commercial development and residential neighbourhoods.~~ ~~14.55 Use the MX – Mixed Residential Business Zone as a transition or buffer between high-traffic-generating commercial zones and residential neighbourhoods.~~ ~~14.56 Limit the MX – Mixed Residential Business zone to *low density*, low-traffic-generating commercial and multiple unit residential development.~~ ~~14.57 Apply the MX – Mixed Residential Business Zone in a manner which supports the stability and viability of adjacent residential areas.~~ ~~14.58 Restrict the MX – Mixed Residential Business Zone to locations on *minor arterials* and *collector* streets~~

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
			~~adjacent to residential areas and to locations between existing MAC Zones and residential areas.~~ CHANGE (Re-number): Goal **12** ~~13~~ – Architectural Control Districts
Section E, 14.64	Architectural Control Districts	Policy indicates that fees for development permits in Architectural Control Districts should be included in the Zoning Bylaw. All development application fees are set out in the Development Application Fee Bylaw and not the Zoning Bylaw.	CHANGE: 14.64 Set out the application process, and review mechanisms and any applicable fees related to development permits in ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL DISTRICTS through ~~the Zoning Bylaw~~ **applicable bylaws**.
Section F - Maps	All Maps	Proposed amendments to maps described below	REPLACE: All OCP maps with revised maps included as Appendix B in the report to committee and City Council. Note: All maps include amendments as described in this table with the exception of Map 1a RM of Sherwood-City of Regina Growth Intentions.
Section F – Maps	All Maps (except Map 1a)	There was a minor boundary alteration approved in 2018 that is not shown on the OCP maps (Housekeeping)	Update city limits on maps
Map 1 – Growth Plan	City Centre and central urban corridors	The Albert Street and Victoria Avenue urban corridors underlay the City Centre however this is difficult to tell on the map. This has caused some confusion on a few different occasions. Make the City Centre layer more transparent to see the underlying urban corridors (Housekeeping). All of the urban corridors were looked at through the neighbourhood and corridor plan sequencing project. Wascana Parkway found to contain no vacant lots within the Urban Corridor. Wascana Parkway is primarily flanked with lands outside of municipal jurisdiction (Wascana Authority and University of Regina) to the east while residential and some commercial development to the west. The developments on the western portion of the corridor are generally backing the corridor, with limited building frontages to support street activity immediately on Wascana Parkway. Due to the current configuration of the corridor, there is limited opportunity for additional development or growth. The Albert St. Corridor should also be redrawn to extend south from its current stopping point at Victoria Avenue to College Ave instead, reflecting the redevelopment potential of this section of the roadway, especially the potential of the vacant lots. Make adjustments to the urban corridors and centres based on analysis from the neighbourhood and sequencing plan work.	CHANGE: City Centre to transparent to ensure the underlying urban corridors and other features are visible Extend the urban corridor on Albert Street to College Avenue REMOVE: Urban Corridor and Intensification Area (300k) along Wascana Parkway
Map 1 – Growth	Urban Centres	Map 1 only shows future Urban Centre and not existing Urban Centres	ADD existing urban centres at:

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
Plan, Map 6, - Office Areas		which will also serve as areas for future intensification (policy 2.7 speaks to urban centres and corridors at future and existing locations). Map changes to incorporate existing urban centres is a recommended change and supported by the existing policies and consistent with proposed changes to Zone Forward. The new urban centres are major redevelopment sites with significant potential to transform from single use commercial districts into mixed-use environments. In accordance with the definition of urban centres in the OCP they are to be located at a major intersection along an urban corridor and/or at a major transit node. All three locations are transit nodes as identified on OCP Map 5 and the TMP Transit Map; the Northgate Mall site is also on an urban corridor.	- Southland Mall - Northgate Mall - Grasslands in Harbour Landing
Map 1 – Growth Plan	Population #s and land areas	With the inclusion of the SE lands to the Growth Plan the population threshold would go beyond 300K. Need to review status of 235K as well and Special Study Areas. CR16-109 (Sep. 26, 2016) noted in the body of the report that this would be looked at during 5-year review Note: The population capacity within this area within the bypass is expected to be between 1,500 – 2,000 which is negligible to the overall growth plan (i.e. doesn't warrant changing all of the numbers to say the 302k growth plan).	REMOVE: *The above figures do not include the amendment area in the southeast within the highway bypass (Approx.: 4,000 persons). REMOVE and CHANGE: "New Neighbourhood (300k) 2016 Amendment*" from the legend and depict the area in the southeast where it is currently shown as "New Neighbourhood (300k)"
Map 1 – Growth Plan and associated policies (numerous)	New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods	There is little difference between the lands labelled as "New Mixed-Use Neighbourhood (300k)" and the "New Neighbourhood (300k)" – particularly Westerra south of Dewdney. When this area was in the preliminary stages of planning before the Growth Plan was finalized in the OCP it was anticipated that the area would have more of a mix of residential and employment lands whereas it shifted to more of a residential neighbourhood after the OCP was completed. Further, mixed-use is encouraged in all neighbourhoods. Would also need to remove any references in policy (Note: there are no stand-alone policies for New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods; they are always lumped in with New Neighbourhoods)	REMOVE: New Mixed-Use Neighbourhood from legend, change on map to New Neighbourhood (300k), remove references in the Table of Contents and List of Maps in Section F. REMOVE: "New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods" references in policies (numerous): 1.4 Develop infrastructure in accordance with the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~. 1.7.1 Coordinate capital plans with phasing of growth and development in accordance with the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~; 1.7.3 Identify and evaluate each capital project in terms of the following, including but not limited to: - Costs; - Timing and phasing in accordance with the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~;

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
			- Funding sources 2.6 Phase and stage development in accordance with the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b – Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~. 2.10.7 Guidelines for future *intensification* of NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS ~~and NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBOURHOODS~~; and 2.12 NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS~~, NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBOURHOODS~~ and NEW EMPLOYMENT AREAS shall: 2.12.1 Be developed in accordance with the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed - Use Neighbourhoods~~; and 5.14 Ensure street patterns in NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS~~, NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBOURHOODS~~ and NEW EMPLOYMENT AREAS provide both internal and external connectivity, pedestrian-scaled block sizes, and transportation choices. 6.13 Sequence infrastructure based on the phasing and financing policies adopted in Section E, Goal 5 of this Bylaw and Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~. 7.2 Encourage, through any applicable planning and development initiative or approval as determined by the City, that NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS~~, NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBOURHOODS~~, INTENSIFICATION AREAS and BUILT OR APPROVED NEIGHBOURHOODS conform to the guidelines outlined in Appendix A – Guidelines for Complete Neighbourhoods. 14.20 The phasing of development, and the provision of associated municipal services, within lands identified on Map 1- Growth Plan as NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS ~~and NEW MIXED-USED NEIGHBOURHOODS~~ shall be in conformity with Map 1b – Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~. 14.20A The phasing of development, and the provision of associated municipal services, within lands identified on Map 1 - Growth Plan and Map 1b – Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~ as URBAN CORRIDORS, URBAN CENTRES AND NEW EMPLOYMENT AREAS, shall be considered for approval, by the City, on a case-by case basis. 14.20D As identified on Map 1b - Phasing of New Neighbourhoods ~~and New Mixed-Use Neighbourhoods~~, Phase 1 (i.e. the combination of Phase 1a, Phase 1b, and Phase 1c) shall be developed first, followed by Phase 2, which is followed by Phase 3. REPEAL definition: ~~NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBOURHOOD:~~ ~~A new neighbourhood that is to be developed to accommodate multiple residential, commercial, and industrial uses, in stand-alone and mixed development, offering a range of services and amenities to residents and workers.~~
Map 1b	Phasing of New Neighbourhoods	A minor boundary alteration that included small parcels in Harbour Landing and West Harbour Landing requires an adjustment to this map	Show Harbour Landing parcel as Phase 1a and the parcel to the west as Special Study Area

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		(Housekeeping)	
Map 2	Regina Census Metropolitan Area	Regina CMA boundary changed with 2016 census (Housekeeping)	Update map to reflect current CMA boundary
Map 6 – Office Areas	Boundary of Downtown	Southern boundary of downtown shown on this map does not reflect actual downtown boundary as defined in Part A of the OCP and as per the Regina Downtown Neighbourhood Plan (Housekeeping).	CHANGE south boundary of downtown to follow 13th Avenue consistent with the RDNP
Map 9 & 10	Airport Vicinity	Minor changes to airport vicinity features (e.g. NEF boundaries and height restrictions) as per updated Regina International Airport Master Plan	CHANGE map features to align with the updated Regina International Airport Master Plan
Appendix B	School Site Re-Use Guidelines 1) b) iii) Commercial Uses	Reference that neighbourhood commercial would be considered on "collector or higher-level roadways at the periphery of neighbourhoods". This conflicts with the guidelines in Appendix A (Policy 7.1.3 and Figure 2) to centrally locate neighbourhood hubs that include neighbourhood commercial. Locating commercial on the periphery is based on the former policy of the now repealed Northwest Sector Plan. Consider deleting "at the periphery of neighbourhoods". Possibly replace with "within neighbourhood hubs".	CHANGE: iii) Commercial Uses – Neighbourhood commercial uses may be considered for sites located on collector or higher-level roadways ~~at the periphery of neighbourhoods~~, especially where higher density residential or commercial uses are located nearby.
Appendix B School Site Re-Use Guidelines	Heritage building retention	Façade-only retention is sometimes considered as a last option but may not be encouraged.	CHANGE: Where retention has been examined and found to be not viable, the building elements of greatest heritage value~~, such as the façade,~~ should be preserved and incorporated into the new development.
Appendix C	Definition of COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AREA	Definition references "new policy 3.17" (Housekeeping) The reference to "new" is unnecessary – this policy and definition was part of the OCP when it was adopted in 2013 (when all the policies were new)	CHANGE: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AREA: See ~~new~~ Policy 3.17
Appendix C	Definition of density	Inconsistent definitions and application of how density is measured between OCP, Zoning Bylaw and in practice. In new neighbourhoods, large format retail and industrial areas are netted out as a matter of practice. Definition should be amended to reflect working definition of density. This amendment should consider the minimum lot area requirement in the zoning bylaw. Some of the zones being applied to low density areas would not meet the requirement for low density in the OCP based on minimum lot area. For example, narrow lot single detached dwellings often yield a greater density than 25 units/hectare. Propose to change the definition to match the new zoning bylaw for low, medium and high	CHANGE: New neighbourhoods are to achieve a minimum overall gross population density of 50 persons per hectare (pph). This excludes any environmentally sensitive or other natural areas that will remain undeveloped (e.g. environmental reserve open space), **large-format retail and industrial**. ~~For the purposes of reviewing concept plans:~~ ~~• Low density means the net density is less than 25 units/hectare;~~ ~~• Medium density means the net density is 25-50 units/hectare; and~~ ~~• High density means the net density is greater than 50 units/hectare.~~ ADD:

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		density defining by building form rather than people per unit.	**density (low): Low density refers to an area consisting primarily of lots with up to two units (e.g. single detached, single detached with secondary suites, single detached with accessory suites, semi-detached, and duplex).** **density (medium): Medium density refers to an area consisting primarily of lots with multi-unit buildings with more than two units (e.g. triplex, fourplex, townhouse, and low-rise apartment). Medium density development is often incorporated into development plans to transition low to high density development in neighbourhoods.** **density (high): High density refers to an area consisting primarily of lots with a mix of apartments buildings (e.g. low to high-rise apartments).**
Appendix C	Definition of OFFICE AREA is missing	Need a definition for OFFICE AREA since it relates to policies 7.28-7.33 (D5, Goal 5); map feature on Map 6 – Office Areas (Housekeeping) Note: policy 7.30 already references that we need to consider in accordance with the Office Area zone in the Zoning Bylaw.	ADD: **Office Areas: Conceptually depicted on Map 6 – Office Areas**
Appendix C	Medium and Major Office	The policies apply to new builds, conversions and redevelopments. The intent of the policy was to specify that it applies to buildings where office is the principle use. In other words where office is accessory the policies do not apply. Need to adjust the definitions to match the intent of the policies.	CHANGE: Major office: A **principal use** purpose-built office building that is over 4,000 m2 in size (gross floor area, including secondary uses, but excluding indoor parking areas). Medium office: A **principal use** purpose-built office building that is between 1,000m2 and 4,000 m2 in size (gross floor area, including secondary uses, but excluding indoor parking areas).
Appendix C – Definitions	Hazardous facilities	Draft policy changes related to school site present the need to define the types of facilities that should be avoided in school site planning. Proposed definition is aligned with proposed Zoning Bylaw	ADD: **Hazardous Facilities: Any building, structure or land use, including but not limited to gas pipelines, dangerous goods routes and chemical plants, which involves the storage, transportation, processing or manufacturing of hazardous materials as defined in the Zoning Bylaw, or which, in the City's opinion, due to the presence of such hazardous materials poses an acute risk of harm or adverse effect in the event of an accident.**
Appendix C – Definitions	Neighbourhood Hub	Appendix A identifies that they must be considered in new neighbourhoods, but they could also be allowed in existing neighbourhoods. Remove "new" from the definition.	CHANGE: neighbourhood hub: One of the focal points of ~~new~~ neighbourhoods that complement and act as smaller urban centres…
Appendix C, Map 1, Map 1 c (New)	Greenfield and intensification	Missing definitions for greenfield and infill development – they are referenced in the plan without definitions. The term 'Greenfield' only shows up once in Part A on Map 1 – Growth Plan and it is referring to New Neighbourhoods. This could be confused with what we consider to be greenfield for the sake of calculating the intensification rate. There is also a disconnect between what Map 1 considers built or approved neighbourhoods and what the City considers intensification.	CHANGE: "Greenfield" to "New Neighbourhoods (300k)" on Map 1 table ADD (definition – also italicise any references): **Infill development – The replacement, alteration or redevelopment of an existing building or the construction of a new building on a vacant lot in an established neighbourhood.** ADD (New map):

Reference (policy, map, section)	Description of Policy	Rationale and Background for Potential Policy Amendment	Proposed change (new policies or text shown in bold; removed text or policies struck out)
		The City monitors intensification based on an established boundary that should be included as a map in the OCP.	Map 1c Intensification boundary ADD: **2.3.2 Monitor *intensification* based on Map 1c – Intensification Boundary**
Appendix C	Definition of "Major institutional areas"	Erroneous reference to accessory uses that could be removed without consequence.	CHANGE: An area used for public, quasi-public and private institutional establishments of a citywide or regional significance, such **as** universities, colleges**,** hospitals **and** large religious institutions~~. and accessory uses that generate significant traffic, have a large footprint, and serve as employment hubs.~~
Appendix C – Definitions (Heritage Holding Bylaw and heritage properties listed), D8 10.6	Heritage Holding Bylaw	New bylaw and name change recently approved by City Council. We can merge the definitions for Heritage Inventory and heritage properties – listed.	CHANGE: Heritage ~~Holding Bylaw~~ **Inventory** – The **list** which identifies properties that have been formally recognized as having heritage value, but that are not designated under The Heritage Property Act. Heritage properties – listed: Properties listed on the Heritage **Inventory** ~~Holding Bylaw~~ that are formally recognized by City Council to have heritage value. 10.6 Develop a set of *cultural heritage* themes that reflect Regina's identity and the diverse values of residents and ensure that the list of HISTORIC PLACES recognized within the *Heritage Property Register* and *Heritage* ***Inventory*** ~~*Holding Bylaw*~~ adequately represent these themes.