

Hi my name is Devon Hill, and I am with Freedom Catalyst Regina.

Thank you for allowing me to speak. This afternoon I would like to address three main topics:

### **1. Grandfathering**

The report says that body rub parlours will be grandfathered in, in relation to being near another parlour, as long as they meet the other separation distance criteria.

This is my take – while it's ok to say that (since that is the legal requirement), I think it would be good to clarify if that actually is relevant to any existing parlour. In my assessment, this grandfathering does not apply to any parlour that I am aware of. There is only even one parlour that I know of that is currently in the industrial zone – and that is Come and Go near Winnipeg and 8<sup>th</sup>. However it also is less than 183 m from a residential zone, and therefore it doesn't meet the separation distance criteria of being near a sensitive lot either. All of the other parlours are in MAC or residential zones, and they wouldn't meet the requirements.

As I mentioned in a previous speech, even if there were any parlours that did meet the requirements, previous reports have said they would be grandfathered in as per Section 89 of the City Planning Act. However, this is what Section 89 says:

**“89(1)** A non-conforming use may be continued if:

- (a) the use, either permitted or discretionary, conformed to the bylaw that was in effect at the time of development;

In other words they would have had to be conforming to the old 9250 Bylaw. None of the parlours have applied or been approved through that bylaw, and they

therefore all do not conform.

## **2. Separation Distances – Options 1, 2 or 3**

In summary Option 1 is a 2 block separation distance, including for residential dwellings, places of worship and recreational facilities. Option 2 is the same, but using only 1 block. Option 3 is then 1 block, but removing the residential dwellings, places of worship, and recreational facilities.

In my opinion Option 2 is the closest to what was in the old 9250 Bylaw. In that old bylaw, there were 183 m restrictions from residential dwellings and places of worship. The only new thing being put in there are the recreational facilities.

If it is indeed correct that the general 2 block restriction creates a lack of available possible places for the parlours to operate, I personally think Option 2 is better than Option 3.

Option 2 is protecting residential dwellings – which I think is a critical, and wise thing to keep in the bylaw. Residents are, in my opinion at least, one of the most important groups to get this right for.

One other thing worth considering is the possibility of a two block separation distance from only residential zones (or even sensitive lots), and then keeping it set at 1 block for all of the other things such as schools, churches, etc. In my opinion residents are generally the ones most affected and concerned by this, and there are areas where industrial zones border directly on residential zones. As I've said in the past, during my door to door survey I did near Victoria, residents were still very much complaining to me about a parlour that was one block away. A one block distance is not that long, and it still within the clear sphere of use. After two blocks away, I found that there were still people that didn't like that the parlours were there, but they generally didn't have the direct stories of how the parlours were affecting them or their children in particular while at home. That is

why I think it would be wise to have a two block separation distance at least for residential zones, and then keep the 1 block separation for things like residential dwellings, schools, etc.

### **3. Bylaw 2019-62**

This is the bylaw in Appendix C, and in my understanding it appears to be the new bylaw that is going to be approved. Here are some of my questions or concerns about it.

- a. Unless I'm mistaken or missing it, it doesn't appear to provide clarification or any wording to the effect that the body rub parlours are restricted to the IL and IH industrial zones and are permitted. Why is that? Is this mentioned somewhere else in a different document?
- b. In Section 22 (see below) it mentions that Assembly, Adult (i.e. strip clubs) are only restricted from other parlours, strip clubs, and sensitive lots. Then it says parlours are restricted from the other places like "Institution, Education", "Institution, Daycare", etc. This is my question/concern: why are strip clubs (i.e. Assembly, Adult) not restricted from the same places (schools etc.) as body rub parlours? They were restricted before in the old 9250 bylaw. They also have the same effect on the surrounding community as parlours. Therefore in my opinion they should at the very least, still have the same separation distances as body rub parlours.
- c. One of the reasons why the strip club was voted down in 2015 was because it didn't have any licensing bylaw or assessment for things like human trafficking. Nothing has changed for strip clubs – they still have no licensing. However, since body rub parlours were voted as permitted use, my concern is that strip clubs will be lumped in as permitted use as well. I don't believe that should occur. Nothing has changed for strip clubs to remedy all of their concerns, and therefore I think they should be amended to be discretionary in the industrial zone.

Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

determined by the Development Officer.”

22 In Chapter 5B, section T2.8 in table 5B.T2 is amended by:

(a) repealing subsection (1) and substituting the following:

“(1) The “Assembly, Adult”, or “Retail Trade, Adult” land use may not be established or enlarged on a lot that is closer than 182.88 metres from:

(a) an “Assembly, Adult”, “Retail Trade, Adult” or “Service Trade, Body Rub Establishment” land use; or

(b) a “Sensitive Lot.””

(b) adding the following subsections after subsection (3):

“(4) The “Service Trade, Body Rub Establishment” land use may not be established or enlarged where it is closer than 182.88 metres from any of the following land uses:

(a) “Assembly, Community”;

(b) “Institution, Education”;

(c) “Institution, Day Care”;

(d) “Open Space, Active”;

(e) another lot containing a “Service Trade, Body Rub Establishment” land use; or

(f) a Sensitive Lot.