Councillor Fougere moved that the recommendation of the Regina Planning Commission contained in the report be concurred in.

(Councillor Hincks temporarily left the meeting)

The motion was put and declared CARRIED.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(d) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, the brief presented by Owen Sarauer was received and filed.

DE07-46 Mr. Al MacLean: Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Al McLean addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

The matters we wish to raise for the consideration of City Council are as follows:

1. The problem of the planning process to date.

The recent history is this. The developer came before the Planning Commission (hereinafter the abbreviation PC is used for Planning Commission) at the June 13, 2007, meeting. She was asked by members of the PC to address the concerns of members of the PC as well as some of the issues raised by the area residents. She steadfastly refused to make any concessions whatsoever. As a consequence, a motion was unanimously passed by the PC (which appears in the July 11, 2007 report) requesting the City administration to prepare a report on the feasibility of the matters set forth in the motion. The continued refusal by the developer to address these concerns is disappointing in the extreme.

At the June meeting of the PC, we gave the example of an infill planning matter that occurred when the Wascana Winter Club burned down some 25 years ago. The original proposal of the developer at that site (on the southwest corner of the intersection of Albert Street and 19th Avenue) did not meet with the approval of the area residents. Through a series of meetings with the developer, the area residents and the City Planner, an ultimate proposal reducing the number of lots, in large part brokered by Mr. Ron Clark, the then City Planner, was agreed to.

With respect to the July 11, 2007 report, since the June 13 meeting of the PC, we are not aware of any invitation by either the developer or the City administration to any of the area residents for their input into any of the issues set out in the motion. Our understanding is that if not all, then the vast majority of these residents, do not agree with the development as proposed. The July 11th report is replete with references to the developer and her various positions on the options the PC directed to be added to the proposed development. There is not one word about the concerns of the area residents. Our emphatic view is that they and we have not been accorded a fair hearing. As a result of the position taken by the City administration and by its excluding the area residents from the planning process, the PC was
effectively being used to broker a resolution of the concerns of area residents and members of the PC.

The motion passed as the June meeting directed that a report be prepared, “which would include the feasibility of adding” the 4 listed options.

The Webster’s New World Dictionary defines feasible as “capable of being done.” Lowering the height of the proposed building is most certainly capable of being done and is therefore feasible. On page 7 of the administration’s report of July 11th, there are not one but three methods of accomplishing this. The report states as follows: “The height of the building could be reduced by (1) reducing the number of dwelling units, by (2) accommodating parking outdoors at grade, or (3) underground rather than at grade.” There are many arguments as to why the height of the apartment building should be reduced. Privacy insofar as the adjacent residential properties is a principal one. Another important concern is that of aesthetics. As we endeavoured to illustrate at the June meeting, our view is that Wascana Park is the jewel of Regina. The Planning Commission and City Council are to be congratulated for this jewel. From an aesthetic perspective, our view is that the height of the building should be reduced. Our first preference would be that the apartment building be located at the other end of the property so as not to front on 23rd Avenue facing Wascana Park. It should be noted that at the PC meeting on July 11 there was also addressed the matter of the former Diocese of Qu’Appelle lands. Three delegations, including a delegation from the Wascana Centre Authority spoke in support of the concept of buildings in the proposed development being set back from Broad Street so as not to detract from Wascana Park. When that matter (which is now evidently in the advertising stage) comes before City Council undoubtedly the same representations will be made. It is therefore likely important that there be consistency in set back requirements for all developments that border on Wascana Park. If the building is to front on 23rd Avenue, our suggestion was that the height be reduced is certainly feasible in accordance with the three possibilities listed in the City administration’s report. The developer’s response to this concern as set forth on page 7 of the July 11th report is that she, and we quote “is not willing to reduce the height of the apartment by compromising the number of dwelling units contained within.” You will gauge what motives might be at play here, but rest assured concerns for the privacy of area residents and aesthetics are not among them.

At the July 11th meeting, members of the PC asked the developer a number of questions with respect not only to parking at grade and underground parking as set out in report of the City administration, but whether partial underground parking was possible. She responded that were any of these suggestions undertaken it would “reduce the green space” in the proposed development and was therefore unacceptable to her. It is noteworthy to point out that at the original meeting of the PC on June 13th, area residents voiced concerns about increased traffic and the density of the proposed development. These concerns were not part of the referral motion unanimously passed by the PC, however were the proposed development less dense, there would be no green space issue and the height of the apartment block could be reduced. It will also be noted in the report tabled at the June 13th meeting of the PC, that in response to concerns about density of the development raised by the area residents, it is stated on page D.1 in appendix D – “The developer has indicated that she is willing to sell double lots should such an interest occur.” Making all the lots double lots would address both the density and green space issues not to mention traffic. One might ask why the density of the development is dependent on the “interest” of prospective buyers.
While it is appreciated that the concept of infill housing is a good one, with the Marian Chateau, Marion Gardens and the proposed development, there will now be infill from 23rd Avenue to 25th Avenue, and while development guidelines are important, so is common sense. It is submitted with respect that if underground parking jeopardizes green space, then the development is either too dense or should be reconfigured to allow appropriate green space, which is an aesthetic matter, while at the same time addressing aesthetic and privacy concerns with respect to the apartment building by reducing its height.

The final overture from a member of the PC was whether the developer could address the height and privacy issues by reducing the upper level of the apartment building by the elimination of two units on the east side. She responded that she might consider this. In light of the developer’s intransigence to date, we have no doubt this suggestion will not come to pass unless expressly mandated.

Regrettably, the PC then passed a motion, which did not relocate the apartment building away from 23rd Avenue, nor reduce its height, nor reduce the upper level of the apartment building by eliminating two units on the east side.

It is because of this decision that this presentation is being made. We were always of the opinion that a developer asking for an “up zone” was a supplicant to the City Planning Department and the PC. With respect to the matter of location or height of the apartment building, the result is that even though the alternatives set out in the city administration’s report exist to remedy the problem, the developer, far from being a supplicant, is the person who to this point, has dictated the result. If she is unwilling to agree to alternatives suggested by members of the PC to remedy a problem, then the problem is not remedied and the development proceeds as proposed by the developer, rather than acceding to the reasonable requests of the PC and the area residents with respect to privacy and aesthetic concerns.

2. Request being made to City Council

In summary and conclusion it is requested that because of the developer’s absolute intransigence with respect to the reasonable requests of the PC and the area residents, and the failure of the PC to make the developer grant any undertaking with respect to the concerns related to the apartment building other than a vague verbal undertaking to consider a reduction in the number of units on the upper level of the building, that this matter be again referred back to the city administration to obtain a specific proposal for either moving the apartment building so the issue of set back with respect to Wascana Park is addressed, or alternately that its height be reduced by one story and that an area representative be included in this process.

Respectfully submitted this 18th day of July, 2007

(Councillor Hincks returned to the meeting during the presentation.)

Mr. McLean answered a number of questions.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.
Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Tom Robinson addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

I've read the attached report to a letter dated July 4, 2007 from the City of Regina and I find the contents of the report that address the recommendations from the Planning Commission meeting on June 11, 2007 related to the above to be troublesome.

Not being one who usually attends meetings of the Regina Planning Commission, I found the process a little awkward. I thought (perhaps naively) that the role of the Administration would be to try to find some common ground between the Developer and the Residents and perhaps even to arrange a meeting between the Developer and representatives of the Residents to openly discuss concerns, discuss options to address these concerns and discuss a potential resolution that the Developer and the Residents could all agree on.

Rather, what I found was that the Administration met and consulted with the Developer several times and has not with the Residents at all. I find this odd. The option then left to the Residents was to make presentations to the Regina Planning Commission and to City Council to voice their concerns. In effect the Planning Commission is put into a position of trying to broker a deal, when it would appear to me that this should be done by the Administration. I thought the role of the Administration would be to develop a compromise solution based on discussions with all affected parties and present this proposed solution to the Planning Commission.

However, I believe the Regina Planning commission was very clear in their direction to the Administration as provided in the following motion:

"This report be referred to the Administration to prepare a report for the July 11, 2007 meeting of the Regina Planning commission which would include the feasibility of adding the following options to the proposed development:

1. The development be moved to the west which would provide for a wider easement and ensure that no trees be removed.

2. The height of the apartment be reduced;

3. Moving the access to 23rd Avenue; and

4. Including a multi-use pathway."

The Administration’s response is as follows:

1. To not move the development to the west, but rather to move the proposed public road to the west and make the size of the lots on the east side of the road deeper. This does not allow for a wider easement, and it does not allow for a pathway and although the developer would not have to remove any tress, the trees would still be on private lots and their removal would be at the discretion of the future owners of the lots. It appears the
Administration has not determined the feasibility of this option as recommended by the Planning Commission, but rather has discussed this option with the Developer and not with the Residents and has once again put the Developer's position forward to the Planning Commission?

2. To not reduce the height of the building but rather to support at grade parking and keep the building the same height and to move the building 9 feet to the west and change the windows on the top 2 floors. The issue is not just one of privacy, it's also having a 4 story structure in such close proximity to residential lots. Once again it appears the Administration has not determined the feasibility of this option as recommended by the Planning Commission, but once again it appears this option was discussed with the Developer and not with the Residents and the Administration has once again put the Developer's position forward to the Planning Commission?

3. To agree to move the 23rd Avenue access.

4. To not include a multi-use pathway. It appears that one point made by the Administration in particular which says "An effective and safe public walkway should connect public space to public space and not "dead-end on private property" is wrong. The public walkway would connect 23rd avenue (a public space) with the grounds of Leboldus high School (another public space). Once again it appears the Administration has not determined the feasibility of this option as recommended by the Planning Commission, but once again it appears this option was discussed with the Developer and not with the Residents and the Administration has once again put the Developer's position forward to the Planning Commission.

During the discussions by the members of the Planning Commission at the June 11, 2007 meeting, I believe that Mr. Phil Selenski, (a member of the Planning Commission) made the suggestion to the other members of the Planning Commission and to the Developer that he had run into a similar situation in a previous development that he was involved in and that they arrived at a solution with the area residents by agreeing not to have their development abutt to the existing residents (who had also encroached upon an existing easement, similar to what has happened with residents backing onto the former Campion School Site) but rather to provide for a wider easement of approximately 20 feet that respected the privacy of the existing area residents, made sure that utility and service connections didn't have to be moved (therefore no demolition and reconstruction activities), made sure that no trees had to be removed and provided access through the easement to public spaces.

I believe that this discussion was instrumented in developing the referral motion to the Administration to consider the feasibility of moving the development to the west which would provide for a wider easement and ensure that no trees be removed.

Based on the discussion that took place at the Planning Commission meeting on June 11, 2007, I'm disappointed by the apparent non-discussion of this recommendation by the Planning Commission at its meeting on July 11, 2007.

Clearly, it appears that there are precedents between other developers and area residents that could be followed to provide for a reasonable solution of this particularly troubling aspect regarding this development.
For the above reasons I cannot support the Administration’s recommendations and I respectfully request that Regina City Council refer this report back to the Administration for further review.

Mr. Robinson answered a number of questions.

**Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.**

DE07-48 Mr. Ted O’Brien: Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Ted O’Brien addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

I am a resident of 89 Calder Crescent, Regina. I have resided at this location since 1988.

Make no mistake about it, I bought my property because it backed onto a field to the west, operated, I understood, by Wascana Center Authority. It is a valuable and sought after home and location because it is a quiet crescent with a central location and access to Wascana Park. I will lose this under the current plan. I will lose the view. I will lose access to Wascana Park. I will lose the privacy I paid for. I will lose my chosen neighbor to the west. I will pay in lost privacy and utility.

In my June presentation to the Planning Commission, I raised the issue of losing the sports field. In its July 11 response the commission indicates that Hillsdale has adequate open space. The Commission has missed the point. Open space does not equate to a sports field. Hillsdale and the City need more sports fields for practice and games.

The city is losing an excellent location for a sports field, a location to hold field sporting events, adjacent to Wascana Park (where field sport events are not allowed and practice activities are prevented). The potential synergy between recreational landscape with lake facility and sporting field will be lost. Conflicts with those sport teams that are looking for practice space have the potential to increase. The sports field is an excellent location and potential venue for the City to hold field sporting events. Residents, visitors and accompanying tourists will be adjacent to Wascana the jewel of Regina, where they can take advantage of the open space and lake during their free time.

The city is losing an opportunity to take ownership of this land and use it as a scheduled sports field. Because it has not been managed as such it has not reached its potential in recent years and I believe its real potential is being ignored. In fact the field has not even been made available for booking in recent years while teams practicing on land behind the MacKenzie Art Gallery across the street are asked not to practice there.
I ask you to put on your planning hat for the next while and see the possibilities for this land, something that the planning committee has failed to do. I know that this outright confrontational statement will not win me the consideration and hearts of the members of the planning commission but their total indifference to my position and my requests, their preference to be planned by a developer rather than plan for the City does not win my respect either. I request that City Council examine this potential use and consult with field sport associations in the City before approving these zoning and bylaw amendments.

Should City Council give further consideration to these proposed amendments, I would like the following to be taken into consideration. The residents of Calder Crescent backing onto the field have asked that a corridor including the current land west of our fences and line of Caraganas westward to the north south running line of trees, which includes the current utility lines, be retained and/or obtained by the City and that public access from the Leboldus field to 23rd Avenue be retained.

The Planning Commission has raised the issue of the cost to maintain this land in statement 5b of its July 11 discussion paper. I have a petition/request/offer to submit to City Council signed by residents indicating that they would be prepared to maintain this corridor and work with the planning commission to establish guidelines to do so. I want to inform City Council that these residents have been maintaining the north south line of Caragana bush and removing the garbage from the bushes for several decades. This maintenance has been carried out by the residents as an obligation, by word of mouth and as an act of good faith for access to the field and Wascana Park.

With respect to any further consideration to remove this access, I would ask City Council to seek legal council to determine if there is any legal precedence in the City of Regina that would protect the residents backing onto this proposed development from losing:

1. Pre-existing encroachments, including fence lines, Caraganas, trees, and the existing utility corridor location.
2. The pre-existing utility lines have been in place for many decades. We seek a guarantee that they will not be moved inside existing fence lines.
3. Pre-existing public access, in this case, I am referring to the residents proposed loss of access to the corridor to Wascana Park through the north south line west of the Caraganas and over the current line of utilities to the westward line of trees.

I want to ensure City Council that the corridor has the potential to meet the City’s 15 meter buffer strip requirement. I would also like to inform the Council that the decision to place the utility corridor in its current location was done decades ago and long before most, if not all residents, purchased their homes.

The decisions and recommendations put forward by the Developer and the Planning Commission in the course of this application indicate that pre-existing conditions are most changeable and proposals and currently non existing conditions are the least changeable. This not only defies logic but also demonstrates a predetermination to support this development despite the lack of an appropriate assessment by the Planning Commission and its impact on residents who use this corridor to access Wascana Park.
An indifference to the request for this north south corridor would be disrespectful of the residents who have worked for years to maintain this site. A decision to support us and our efforts to assist the City by maintaining the corridor would be received very positively and thankfully by the residents.

Mr. O’Brien answered a number of questions.

**Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.**

DE07-49 Ms. Ariel Cote: Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Ariel Cote addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

Greetings City Council Members and City Administration,

There are 2 issues I want to bring to your attention. I have attached my email, which further explains these issues, just in case you did not receive it last week or you did not get a chance to read it. The 2 issues are 1) leaving a buffer space or utility corridor between the east property line of the new development and the existing residents 2) making sure that the utilities stay where they are located now. I have pictures showing the utility corridor as it presently sits to help visualize. These pictures are facing south.

I have spoken with the City Administration, the developer and to Stantec and all have given different answers on whether or not the utilities will be moved. I want to know if anyone has consulted with the utility companies. We can be told by the City Administration and the developer that they will not be moved but someone needs to check with the people that will make that decision, ultimately the utility companies. Moving these utilities creates a large problem. The problem is because the existing residents’ utilities are now located on the developers property and the possibility exists that they might be moved onto the city easement. This city easement is a part of the existing residents’ backyard which in some cases has structures such as fences and sheds located on it. According to the City Administration encroaching on the city easement is not uncommon in areas of this vintage and this encroachment probably goes back to the time of subdivision. I realize this does not make it right to build on the city easement, but there has been confusion for the residents on this subject. For example, when we bought our property last August we called the city to see where the property line ended and was told to call SPMC, who told us to call Wascana Authority, and they told us to call the city. Not only was this frustrating but it shows me the great confusion higher up.

There is a carragana hedge that has been there since subdivision that separates the properties. There are also 2 rows of trees that the utilities run in between. If the utilities are to be moved the carragana and the trees will have to be taken out, let alone the existing
residents’ encroachments will also have to be taken out. I want to know who owns this property because no one seems to know if it has been purchased outright by the developer. I also want to know if the past owner knew that the utilities for the existing residents was on their property before they tried to sell it to the developer. I have asked Mr. Mario, “Who owns this property”. “He said there was only an offer for purchase pending on the zoning changes”. Yet I asked a few Planning Commission members and to their knowledge they understand that she, Evans Developments, owns it and therefore she is the only person that can move the property line. Moving the east property line along with the rest of the development is the easiest solution to guaranteeing the safety of the trees and hedges and the piece of mind of the existing residents. The last thing we want is our backyards being torn up.

Leaving a six meter utility corridor is good for the existing residents and it will be good for the new neighbors to have a green space between the homes. There is also an increasing number of people that walk and bike through this park on a regular basis. They will lose their green friendly pathway. Using the enhanced sidewalk on Albert Street that is busy with traffic and smells of fumes is exactly what these people are trying to avoid. To date there are very few pathways in Hillsdale. This is an opportunity to change that. Hillsdale needs a path system that leads to Wascana Park. As we speak they are tearing up old Broad Street to make a multi use path system that goes to nowhere but 23rd Ave. I think a pedestrian connection behind our homes starting at 23rd Ave to 25th Ave connecting to the ample paths in Whitmore Park would be most beneficial. Here is a chance to enhance south Regina. Maybe a pathway is not in the plans today but as the city grows greener we should keep our options open and leave some space between the 2 properties for future pathway development. The City Administration has told me that they don’t know if it is legal to put a path there, that there is not enough space and are worried about who will take care of the land. 1) I don’t know why it would not be legal but I urge you to ask them. 2) In Whitmore Park there are sidewalks, not enhanced sidewalks, just regular sidewalks used for pathways that work just fine. And 3) The existing residents have all agreed to maintain this green space.

In conclusion, please take into account these issues. I am sure you would not be happy if there was a threat to your backyard being torn up because of a new development. I am asking for an amendment to the proposed plan that preserves the trees and cararagana hedges and preserves the existing location of the utilities by moving the east property line of the new development six meters to the west. As per the referral from the Planning Commission the developer did move the development six meters to the west but did not move the east property line. Without moving the east property line the referral does nothing for the existing residents. It does not change where the new properties meet the existing ones. In fact we believe it is the developer’s clear intention to relocate the utilities east of the current location which will require destruction of our backyards. If she can move the whole development to the west six meters she can move the east property line six meters. Moving the property line will not take any space from the new homes backyards because they will be the same depth as originally planned. As the individual lots sit now after the last Planning Commission meeting they are six meters deeper but at the expense of the existing property owners.

I understand that your task is to ensure that things are done right, but it is more important to do the right thing. Save the trees and keep the utilities where they are and move the
developer’s east property line to the west 6 meters. If an amendment cannot be done at
tonight’s meeting then I request that the matter be referred back to the Administration for a
facilitated meeting between the developer and the existing residents, something which has
never happened even though I have been told is a normal practice in similar cases.

Thank you

Ms. Cote answered a number of questions.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw
9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the
Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.

DE07-50 Mr. Doug Toth: Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Doug Toth, representing Saskatchewan Property Management, addressed Council and
presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

Good evening. My name is Doug Toth. I am a realty manager with Saskatchewan Property
Management. Saskatchewan Property Management is an agency of the Crown. The Crown
is the owner of certain real property commonly known as the former Campion College
lands. The Crown desires to divest itself of this land and to this end has entered into certain
agreements with Evans Development Group Inc. and the Regina Christian School
Association.

At this time I am here simply to indicate the Crown’s support for the recommendations that
City Administration has put forward in its July 4, 2007 report.

Additionally, I will be glad to answer any questions that Council may have at this time.

(Councillor Hincks temporarily left the meeting during the presentation.)

Mr. Toth answered a number of questions.

(Councillor Hincks returned to the meeting during questions.)

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw
9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the
Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.
Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Merna Evans, representing Evans Development Group Inc., addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

Good afternoon Mister Chairman and members of Council. My name is Merna Evans, President of Evans Development Group Inc. I am here today to ask for your support for our proposed residential development on the eastern 1/2 half of the former Campion College land fronting 23rd Ave.

In keeping with City policy to achieve a compact urban form by promoting infill residential development, Evans Development proposes to build a mix of residential uses on the former Campion playing fields. The former Campion College building, which is owned and occupied by the Regina Christian School, will remain, as will the existing landscape fronting Albert Street.

We believe the proposed development is in keeping with adjacent residential development in the immediate area and achieves a viable balance of infill residential uses located at the southern edge of Wascana Park.

Our Plan achieves this by proposing single detached homes backing onto the 3 meter City owned parcel which separates our land from the existing single detached homes on Calder Cres. Single detached homes would also be build on the southern boundary of our property. Medium density residential is proposed in the centre portion of the plan for condominium townhomes; and higher density residential forms (apartment condominiums) are planned on the northern and western portions of the site. They do not interface with the existing homes on Calder Cres. The overall density of the development is approximately 1/2 that of the Marian complex.

The first phase of development would include the single detached homes, the centrally located townhomes, and the 4 storey 36 unit apartment condominium building fronting 23rd Ave.

We concur with the Administration’s conclusion about our development that “the proposed mixed-density residential development on the subject property is consistent with the City’s housing objective contained within the Development Plan Bylaw 7877 to encourage alternate forms of housing intended for a broader range of household types, and to support infill residential development in established neighbourhoods. This development would help achieve a compact urban form, the purpose of which is to help maintain local business and amenities, such as schools, churches and other community groups within established neighbourhoods; support public transit, which this, in turn, supports the downtown; reduces the rate of peripheral expansion of the City; and reduces servicing needs beyond a
population of 300,000. As well, the proposed development meets or exceeds all requirements and minimum standards contained in the Regina Zoning Bylaw 9250.”

To further address the Calder Cres. Residents’ concerns, the Planning Commission referred this item back to the Administration on June 13, 2007, for the developer to look at the feasibility of moving the development to the west, reducing the effective height of the apartment building, moving the access on 23rd Ave., and including a multi-use pathway between 23rd and 25th Avenues.

In response to the referral motion, we have moved the road 6 meters or 20 feet to the west with the result that the proposed single detached lots backing onto the 3 meter (9.84 foot) City parcel separating our property from the Calder property, are 128.21 feet in depth. By moving the road and the western portion of the development 20 feet to the west, the existing trees located on our property would remain, and we would service the property from the existing services on our property. It is noted that the City parcel would remain as a 9.84 foot buffer separating the Calder lots from our lots.

We considered reducing the height of the apartment building approximately 9 feet by having underground parking instead of at-grade parking under the building. Provision of underground parking would reduce the number of parking stalls by some 50% which is not a viable solution. However, the result of moving the development 20 feet to the west achieves the same result by reducing the perceived height of the building some 9 feet when viewed from properties to the east, especially the Robinson residence.

To further address privacy concerns, we have deleted the eastern facing windows from the second and third floors of the apartment building. It is also noted that lot 1 is an exceptionally large lot for a large single detached dwelling which will, together with the existing and additional trees, act as a substantial transition and buffer to the Calder properties.

Access from 23rd Ave. would also be moved 20 feet to the west, which has the support of the City Traffic Department. The townhome development remains unchanged, and the developability of the western portion of the property is not adversely affected.

Finally, as noted in the Administration’s report, a multi-use pathway is a separate matter from this application.

This is an exciting project, and we appreciate the opportunity to enhance the urban fabric of Regina with this unique residential development.

While we are not able to implement all of the requests made by the Calder residents, we do believe that the changes to the plan to increase the proposed single family lot depth by 20 feet will ensure that the existing trees on our property will not be disturbed. Also, by moving the apartment building 20 feet to the west we have reduced the perceived height of the building 9 feet, and by removing the windows on its east side, we ensure existing residential privacy. We consider these changes to be significant.

We respectfully request that our Concept Plan be approved, and that the amendments to the Regina Zoning Bylaw 9250 as contained in the Administration’s report be advertised.
Thank you for your consideration.

I would be pleased to answer any questions.

Ms. Evans answered a number of questions.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.

DE07-60 Mr. Darryl Brown: Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Darryl Brown, representing the Regina Christian School Association, addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 23, 2007 which read as follows:

The Regina Christian School Association supports Council approval of the recommendations made in the Regina Planning Commission report of July 11, 2007, numbered RPC07-33, which includes Concept Plan 07-CP-1, Zoning Bylaw Amendment 07-Z-3 and Discretionary Use Approval 07-DU-5, and is willing to answer questions should there be any.

Mr. Brown answered a number of questions.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(c) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, this brief was tabled until after consideration of CR07-114, a report from the Regina Planning Commission respecting the same subject.

CR07-114 Regina Planning Commission: Applications for Concept Plan (07-CP-1) Zoning Bylaw Amendment (07-Z-3) and Discretionary Use Approval (07-DU-5) Former Campion School Site – 2200 Block 23rd Avenue

A report dated July 23, 2007 from the Regina Planning Commission, read as follows:

The Regina Planning Commission, at its meeting held on July 11, 2007, considered the following report from the Administration:

BACKGROUND

Applications for concept plan, zoning bylaw amendment, and discretionary use approval have been received to accommodate a proposed mixed-density residential development on a portion of the former Campion School Site. The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Hillsdale Subdivision and the Hillsdale Community Association.
Regina Planning Commission first considered this application on June 13, 2007 and passed the following motion:

This report be referred to the Administration to prepare a report for the July 11, 2007 meeting of the Regina Planning Commission which would include the feasibility of adding the following options to the proposed development:

1. The development be moved to the west which will provide for a wider easement and ensure that no trees be removed;
2. The height of the apartment be reduced;
3. Moving the access to 23rd Avenue; and
4. Including a multi-use pathway.

The body of this current report reads exactly the same as the report prepared for the June 13 2007 meeting of RPC with the exception of the addition of a section that specifically addresses the referral motion or where explicitly stated. Required changes have been made to appendices.

This application is being considered pursuant to Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250, Regina Development Plan Bylaw No. 7877, and The Planning and Development Act, 2007.

DISCUSSION

The Applicant’s Proposal

The applicant is requesting concept plan and zoning bylaw amendment approval for the 8.5ha former Campion School site located at 2200 Block 23rd Avenue. The proposal consists of a mix of residential and institutional uses as shown on the attached concept plan. The related discretionary use application is necessary to enable the development of a planned group of townhouse dwelling units on a portion of the subject property.

In conjunction with the subject applications, a corresponding application for subdivision approval (our file no. 07-SN-8) is being considered. The subdivision application will be reviewed in accordance with Bylaw No. 2003-3, the bylaw delegating subdivision approving authority to the Administration.

Surrounding land uses include low density residential development to the east; Wascana Centre Authority lands to the north, which includes the T.C Douglas Building and Wascana Rehabilitation Centre; Albert Street to the west, which separates the subject property from low density residential development; a condominium and retirement complex to the southwest (former Marian school site); and Dr. Martin LeBoldus High School to the south. A three metre wide utility parcel separates the subject property from existing adjacent dwellings to the east.

Concept Plan (07-CP-1)

The proposed concept plan contemplates a range of residential densities. The following is a description of the general features of the proposed concept plan:
### Density Dwelling Unit Type Density Range Proposed Land Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Dwelling Unit Type</th>
<th>Density Range (Dwelling Units/ ha)</th>
<th>Proposed Land Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Townhouse (Planned Group)</td>
<td>25-50</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>50 or greater</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Residential densities would generally transition from low density at the eastern edge of the site to medium and high density progressing to the western edge of the site.
- Access to residential lands would be provided from a dedicated “P-loop” street via 23rd Avenue.
- A 4.96m wide emergency access would join the “P-loop” road to 23rd Avenue, separating high density residential lands from adjacent low density.
- The 2.23ha Parcel with the former Campion School Building as well as the green space to the south of the school building would remain intact as private property and designated as institutional land.

### Zoning Bylaw Amendment (07-Z-3)

The subject property is currently zoned WC – Wascana Centre. Low and medium density portions would be re-zoned as a DCD – Direct Control District, high density portions of the development would be re-zoned as R6 – Residential Multiple Housing, and the parcel that the Regina Christian School owns as well as the green space directly to the south would be re-zoned to I-Institutional. The applicant requested that an (H) – Holding Overlay Zone designation be placed on both the R6 and DCD zones until such time that a development interest in the site is evident and servicing is ready to proceed.

The Direct Control District (DCD) would allow a higher degree of flexibility with regard to the placement of individual buildings with the intention of adding streetscape character and increasing land-use efficiency of the development. More specifically, the designation would provide for reduced front yard setbacks, and reduced side yard setbacks for planned groups of dwelling units. The remainder of the zoning standards of DCD would be consistent with the R1-

Residential Detached zone. The authority, parameters and guidelines for the establishment of Direct Control Districts are contained in *The Planning and Development Act, 2007* (Sections 63 to 68, inclusive) and in *Regina Development Plan Bylaw No. 7877* (Part A, Section 12.6.3 and Part B Section 13). The proposed amendment is set forth as Appendix A to this report.

### Discretionary Use Application (07-DU-5)

The discretionary use application is necessary to enable the development of the planned group of dwelling units in the DCD zone. The applicant proposes the development of townhouse-style dwelling units on the 0.65 ha portion of the subject property, which the “P-loop” street surrounds. The plan consists of 22 dwelling units split amongst four fourplexes and two triplexes intended for condominium ownership. The proposed concept plan identifies this portion of the subject lands for medium density residential development.
Development Phasing

Development of the site would occur in two sequential phases. The first phase would consist of lands east of the westernmost portions of the proposed public street. All of the low and medium-density portions of the concept plan would be developed during this phase as well as a portion of the high-density development. Low density lands would be subdivided into 16 freehold lots for single-detached dwelling units. Medium density lands would be developed as described above in the ‘Discretionary Use Application’ section. At this time, a 36 unit, four story apartment building with enclosed ground level parking is contemplated on the area north of medium density lands.

The second phase of development would consist of further high-density development as identified in the proposed concept plan. Scale and massing of apartment buildings on these lands has not been determined, but would be required to comply with zoning regulations, would be influenced by future market conditions, and may be subject to future specific applications.

Eastern Fringe of Development Site

The eastern fringe of the development site has been identified as an area of concern which must be addressed. A three metre wide, City-owned utility parcel separates the development site from adjacent residential lots to the immediate east. SaskEnergy currently maintains facilities on this utility parcel. Further, most of these residential lots currently have rear yard access onto the development site. According to a survey prepared by the applicant, most of the nine adjacent lots have, over time, encroached onto this utility parcel. This occurrence is not uncommon in residential areas of this vintage in Regina.

The eastern fringe of the development site is also landscaped with caragana bushes and trees. A row of caragana bushes straddles the boundary between the utility parcel and the development site. In some areas the bushes are located entirely on the development site. Further, two rows of trees run north/south 5m and 7m, respectively, west of the eastern property line. Some residents whose properties back onto the utility parcel expressed concern that this landscaping would be lost during the development process.

The Administration has encouraged the developer to retain as much existing landscaping as possible throughout the development process, should approval be granted. However, the developer wishes to relocate the utility easement that currently runs north/south, 6.5m from the east property line to the area between the first row of trees and the eastern property line. It is possible that some landscaping may be lost in this process. Further, after the single detached lots are created, sections of the bushes as well as both rows of trees would be located entirely on the new lots. Although the Administration has encouraged the developer to retain as much existing landscaping as possible, it cannot guarantee that trees and shrubs along the eastern fringe of the development will not be removed.

Note: Since the June 13 meeting of Regina Planning Commission, the developer has agreed to leave utility lines as is, eliminating risk of damaging or killing existing landscaping. This is further clarified below in this report.
The Administration sees no reason to require the removal of any encroachments onto the utility parcel and bases its position from the following:

- Encroachments have likely existed since the subdivision was first developed (approximately 50 years).
- Utilities would be installed or relocated to minimize the loss of existing landscaping.
- The development site does not include the utility parcel.
- Although access to the rear of existing yards would be lost as a result of encroachments onto the utility parcel, access could be maintained if all residents willingly remove encroachments onto the utility parcel.

Removal from Wascana Centre Authority

The subject property currently lies within the boundaries of Wascana Centre Authority (WCA). On February 15th, 2007 the WCA passed a motion to remove the subject property from its jurisdiction. According to Section 12 (1) of The Wascana Centre Act, lands may be removed from WCA once the ‘participating parties’ (i.e. City of Regina, Province of Saskatchewan, and the University of Regina) provide formal consent. City Council provided its formal consent to removal of the subject lands from WCA by resolution on March 12, 2007 (CR07-40) on the condition that a zoning application related to a development is approved. If Council denies the subject zoning bylaw amendment (07-Z-3), the subject lands would not be removed from Wascana Centre. It is also noted that the 1992, 1999, and 2006 editions of the Wascana Master Plan identify the subject property for private residential development and removal from WCA.

Population and Density

The first phase of development would add 74 dwelling units to the Hillsdale Subdivision. The exact number of dwelling units contemplated in the second phase of development has not been determined, but is expected to be approximately 180. Densities would be required to comply with the proposed concept plan. Thus, the estimated number of dwelling units would be approximately 260. The dwelling unit density of the residential portion of the site would be 58.3 DU/ha (260/4.46). By comparison, the density of the adjacent Marian development is approximately 105 DU/ha whereas the density of adjacent housing units on Calder Crescent is approximately 11.4 DU/ha.

Once completed, the development is expected to increase the population of Hillsdale by approximately 400 people. As various demographic trends have caused a decrease in the total number of people living in each household, the population of Hillsdale has decreased over time as well. However, recent infill development, most of which accommodates senior citizens, and other demographic trends in Hillsdale have countered the trend of overall population decline. The decline and eventual rebound of the population of Hillsdale is shown in Figure 1 below. Development of the subject property, therefore, would not result in unprecedented population levels in the Hillsdale area.
Recent medium and high density development within the Hillsdale neighbourhood that have contributed to this population rebound include:

- Former McNiven School site
  - Selo Gardens (1991)-70 units
  - Selo Place (1993-1996)- 15 units
- Lakeshore Court (1993-1998)- 20 units
- Former Marian School site
  - Marian Gardens (1998)- 94 units
  - Marian Chateau (1999)- 150 units
  - Marian Park (2000)- 48 units
  - Marian Grande (2005)- 48 units
- 3105 Hillsdale (2003)- 113 units

**Open Space Management Strategy**

Although the subject property is publicly-used as park space, it is privately owned, and is therefore not considered to be part of the City’s open space system. According to the Open Space Management Strategy (OSMS), Hillsdale currently has a surplus of 0.15 hectares of neighbourhood open space (excluding the subject property). The increase in population from the development is not expected to cause a deficit between quantity of open space per person within the Hillsdale neighbourhood. The OSMS also notes that access to open space from Hillsdale is enhanced by geographic proximity to Wascana Park.

**Traffic and Parking Impact**

The Administration has accepted the results of a traffic impact study submitted by the applicant. The study noted the following:

- As the target market for the majority of the development is empty nesters or seniors, intensified trip demand is not expected in the peak AM/PM hours.
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- One could expect a 10 percent increase in traffic volumes on 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue during peak hours and is not expected to have a significant impact.
- The development is not expected to significantly impact the intersection of Albert Street and 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue or Hillsdale and 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue.
- Low and medium density portions of the development would provide double the required off-street parking capacity, while the low rise apartment would provide for ten visitor stalls.
- On-street parking within the development site would be minimal. It would be available along flankage of the townhouse site, in front of single-family homes, and on 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue during non-peak hours.
- The development may increase transit ridership on the route travelling along 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue.

Development Plan Implications

The proposal is consistent with the two fundamental Principles for Planning that form the basic framework of \textit{Regina Development Plan, Bylaw No. 7877} including:

- Promoting a sustainable community by encouraging development that contributes to maintenance or improvements in the quality of urban life; and
- Ensuring that development occurs in a cost efficient, environmentally responsible and socially equitable manner.

The proposal is consistent with the policies contained in Part A – Policy Plan of \textit{Regina Development Plan Bylaw No. 7877}, with respect to:

- Accommodating the demand for a variety of housing types throughout the city.
- Directing new urban growth in a sustainable manner, which supports economic sustainability by minimizing the cost of developing and maintaining services, social sustainability by giving proper emphasis to neighbourhood renewal and revitalization, and environmental sustainability by promoting a compact, balanced urban form that minimizes travel distances and supports transit.
- Promoting the revitalization of older suburban neighbourhoods as well as help to diminish the rate of peripheral expansion.
- Encouraging higher density housing and mixed use development along or adjacent to major arterial streets and encouraging the development of higher density residential development along or near transit routes.
- Ensuring that residential development and redevelopment is compatible with adjacent residential and non-residential developments.
- Encouraging road patterns which minimize through traffic in residential areas.

REFERRAL MOTION (Jun 13, 2007)

The purpose of this section is to specifically respond to the four items of the referral motion cited on Page 1 of this report.
Moving the Development to the West

The developer has agreed to move the entire proposed public road 6 metres to the west. The effect of this addresses concerns over the potential loss of existing trees and landscaping along the eastern fringe of the development site and interface between existing and proposed development.

First, moving the development increases the depth of single detached lots that directly interface existing lots on Calder Crescent by 6 metres. The developer would no longer need to move utility lines and risk killing or damaging existing trees. Utility lines would remain as is, with exception to possible relocation of utility boxes to more practical locations. Moving the development may also provide for larger rear yard setback distances of future single detached homes and increase separation distance between existing and future single detached homes.

Second, shifting the development to the west would have the effect of offsetting the height of the proposed apartment by 2.7 metres (9 feet) when viewed from Calder Crescent properties. The distance between adjacent properties and the apartment building has been increased to 48.5 metres (159 feet) from approximately 42 metres (137 feet). Two cross section drawings of the adjacent properties and the proposed apartment building are provided in Appendix E.

Third, moving the public road to the west would compromise the depth of the high density lands on the western portion of the subject property. The developer has indicated that the smaller size of parcels would not significantly constrain development options.

Height of the Apartment Building

The height of the building could be reduced by reducing the number of dwelling units, by accommodating parking outdoors at grade, or underground rather than at grade. Accommodating parking outdoors is not recommended as this would compromise the overall quality of the development by paving over otherwise landscaped areas. Typically, surface parking can consume 30 to 40 percent of the site area. Also, the developer is not willing to reduce the height of the apartment by compromising the number of dwelling units contained within.

The developer has considered the option of accommodating parking totally below grade, thereby reducing the overall height of the building. The developer notes that constructing a ramp that descends 2.7m (9 feet) below grade, designed to meet slope requirements in Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250, would eliminate a large number of parking stalls. Therefore, the most efficient way to accommodate enclosed parking, which is supported by the Administration, is enclosed, at grade.

Although the height of the proposed apartment building has not changed, the developer has considered other options to address related concerns over interface (i.e. loss of privacy) with existing residential property. The apartment would be placed further west, which would have the effect of offsetting height when viewed from Calder Crescent properties. Second, the developer has reoriented windows previously facing east to face north and south as shown in elevation drawings in Appendix B. The revised plans do not include east facing
windows on the third and fourth floor of the apartment. This more effectively protects privacy of residents in properties to the east.

The Administration supports the development of the apartment as proposed for the following reasons:

- The height of the proposed apartment is less that 13 metres and is therefore considered to be a ‘low-rise’ in the R6 zone.
- The apartment would be largely screened by landscaping and an intervening single detached unit in proposed Lot 1.
- The apartment building is oriented towards the north and south. Balconies face these directions rather than overlooking existing adjacent backyards. The developer has changed the building so that no windows on the third and fourth floors would face east, which prevents downward views onto adjacent properties.
- Approximately 48.5 metres would separate the apartment building from existing residential property.

Moving the 23rd Avenue Access

The developer has agreed to move the access onto 23\textsuperscript{rd} 6 metres to the west. The median break at the intersection of 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue and the proposed public street would be moved accordingly. The access point of the emergency access would remain unchanged, aligned with Avenue “G.” The Engineering and Works Department provided consent to moving the access to the west. Detailed design of the intersection would be required as part of the subdivision review process.

Inclusion of a Multi-use Pathway

As indicated in Appendix D of this report, the subject property is surrounded by private property. The City does not own any portion of the lands where a pathway may be useful. Thus, it would be impossible to require surrounding land owners to construct a pathway system leading through respective properties. The Administration sees opportunity for an informal pathway to be safely accommodated between 23\textsuperscript{rd} and 25\textsuperscript{th} Avenues through the western-most portion of the LeBoldus School site and the eastern portion of the Regina Christian School. That type of development would require co-operation from both parties and is separate matter from this application.

The Administration has been aware of this concern as it was identified early on in the review process. Although concerns over pedestrian access are acknowledged, the Administration has not changed its position articulated in Appendix D of this report.

In addition to those comments, the Administration notes the following:

- An enhanced sidewalk exists along the portion of Albert Street between 25\textsuperscript{th} and 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenues
- A walkway which runs through LeBoldus and Regina Christian School would decrease walking distance between these two destinations by about 300 metres.
- The Administration will have opportunity to revisit this issue during the second phase of development. Pedestrians can still maintain access through LeBoldus and Regina Christian School property in the meantime.
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- The Administration does not support the purchase of land from either neighbouring property owner to accommodate a dedicated walkway.
- The City would not accept a dedicated walkway of less than five metres width. However, the longer the walk, the wider the requirement. For safety reasons, the City requires a linear park to be at least 15 metres in width.
- An effective and safe public walkway should connect public space to public space and not “dead-end” on private property.

In response to other comments regarding pedestrian access made at the June 13, 2007 Regina Planning Commission, it would not be possible to accommodate pedestrian access on the eastern fringe of the parcel for reasons stated in Appendix D. Likewise, it would not be possible to purchase land and dedicate a walkway on 97 Calder Crescent without also violating zoning standards.

CIRCULATION COMMENTS

Technical

The applicant’s proposal was circulated to all affected departments and agencies for review and comment.

Community

The subject property was sign posted on April 11, 2007. The application was circulated to the Hillsdale Community Association, Lakeview Community Association, and the South Zone Recreation Board for review and comment. None of the above groups provided comment before the finalization of this report.

Information regarding the project and a notice of a public open house was distributed to approximately 180 households and surrounding major institutions and condominium buildings. The public open house was also advertised in The Leader Post on Saturday April 7 and 14th, 2007, on the City’s website prior to the open house, and on public service announcements on local radio. The discretionary use application was advertised in The Leader Post on May 5, 2007.

A public open house was held on April 19, 2007 at the Regina Christian School (former Campion School) with one-hundred-sixty-seven people registering. Representatives from City Administration, the developer, Wascana Centre Authority, and current property owners of the subject site were also in attendance. The meeting provided residents with an opportunity to comment, gather information, and provide verbal and written feedback regarding the development. The City received 83 written responses in total. Fifty-two responses expressed general support for the development, 27 indicated varying degrees of opposition, and four responses were neutral or indicated a specific concern related to the development. In addition, the Administration received several telephone inquiries for general information about the development.

Those who provided written opposition or general criticism to the development cited a broad range of concerns, such as: the higher density of the development; traffic and parking impacts on 23rd Avenue; threats to school children; increased noise and air pollution and
other environmental impacts; adjacent resident’s loss of backyard privacy and loss of view of sky; possible loss of landscaping along the east portion of the site; loss of open space; lack of government transparency and resident consultation throughout the process; lack of on site green space and play areas for small children; devaluation of adjacent properties; aesthetics of the design; lack of pedestrian connections to nearby amenities and through the development site; and increase of crime in the area. The Administration has addressed these and other concerns more specifically in Appendix D.

In addition, a letter of opposition to the development was submitted to the Administration on May 3, 2007. Thirty-two people from 17 different addresses all located within 100m to the east of the development site signed the letter. The caption on the top of each page of the petition read:

“We the undersigned, being residents of the City of Regina, oppose the discretionary use application for a proposed development at former Campion School Site and request that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the application be DENIED.”

Those who provided written comments expressing general support for the development cited the following reasons: the need for infill development to reduce the “footprint” of Regina; strengthening of public transit, the downtown, and nearby businesses and amenities; loss of open space would be justified considering proximity to Wascana Park; the development site is underused and would therefore be more efficiently used for housing; alternative housing choices for the growing 50+ demographic; mix of housing forms; development would provide more choice and competition for the housing market in the area; and architectural detail and retention of landscaping would compliment Wascana Park.

Government Agencies

The applicant’s proposal was circulated to the Public and Separate School Boards and Wascana Centre Authority. The Separate School Board indicated that it had no major concerns with the proposal. The Public School Board noted that the development would not qualify for school bus service and expressed concern over ease of access and pedestrian safety to the nearest public elementary school, Marion McVeety. The Public School Board also noted that there would be no direct access to Calder Crescent or Jubilee Avenue and that there is currently no sidewalk along the south side of 23rd Avenue.

Wascana Centre Authority indicated that it had no objections to the proposed development but expressed concern that the height of structures in future phases could exceed 15 metres in height. This would contravene recommendations contained in the Wascana Master Plan. The WCA also wishes to ensure that landscaping along 23rd Avenue should be maintained.

Concerns over pedestrian access, building height, and landscaping are addressed in Appendix D.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The subject property is located within a mature neighbourhood that already receives a full range of municipal services. However, as the development contemplates the construction of
a new public road, municipal services will be extended and installed at the developer’s expense pursuant to a servicing agreement. The City will be responsible for a corresponding increase in the provision of municipal services and the associated costs. The costs of water, sewer, and storm drainage services are fully recovered through the utility charges.

COMMUNICATION PLAN

If City Council so resolves, the proposed zoning amendment would be advertised twice in the Leader Post prior to formal bylaw consideration by City Council. The applicant and other identified interested parties, including approximately 50 residents who have indicated they wish to be notified, will receive written notification of City Council’s decision.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed infill development will help to maintain a compact urban form, effectively utilize existing infrastructure, and enhance the viability of the area, which may offset the need for expansion of the urban footprint on the surrounding rural area and natural environment.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY

City Council’s approval is required pursuant to Parts IV and V of The Planning and Development Act, 2007

CONCLUSION

The proposed mixed-density residential development on the subject property is consistent with the City’s housing objectives contained within Development Plan Bylaw No. 7877 to encourage alternate forms of housing intended for a broader range of household types and to support infill residential development in established neighbourhoods. This development would help to achieve a compact urban form, the purpose of which is to help maintain local businesses and amenities such as schools, churches and other community groups within established neighbourhoods; support public transit, which, in turn, supports the downtown; reduce the rate of peripheral expansion of the city; and meet servicing needs beyond a population of 300,000. As well, the proposed development meets or exceeds all requirements and minimum standards contained in Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250. The development site is not required for local open space as Hillsdale currently has a surplus of open space according to the Open Space Management Strategy. As well, the Hillsdale neighbourhood enjoys the benefits of proximity to Wascana Park.

After Regina Planning Commission referred this proposal back to the Administration on June 13, 2007, the developer reviewed the feasibility of moving the development to the west, reducing the height of the apartment building, moving the access on 23rd Avenue, and including a multi-use pathway between 23rd and 25th Avenues. In response to the referral motion, the development has been moved 6 metres to the west, which effectively ensures that the existing landscaped buffer would remain throughout the development process and increases the separation distance between existing and proposed structures. The developer considered reducing the height of the proposed apartment building, but instead opted to remove windows facing east toward existing residential properties to ensure privacy. In
addition, moving the development to the west offsets the height of the building by approximately 2.7 metres (9 feet) when viewed from properties to the east. The access onto 23\textsuperscript{rd} has been moved accordingly with the entire development. With regard to the inclusion of a multi-use pathway, the Administration has not changed its initial position: it does not see a pathway as necessary considering the alternative route between 23\textsuperscript{rd} and 25\textsuperscript{th} Avenues is not significantly longer. Opportunity exists for an informal pathway on Regina Christian School and Dr. Martin LeBoldus school sites. Development of a pathway would require cooperation between the two land owners.

RECOMMENDATION

Your Administration recommends that:

1. The Concept Plan identified as “Concept Plan 23\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue (Former Campion Site) and attached to this report be APPROVED;

2. The following amendments to Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250 be ADVERTISED:

   a) A new Section 3.14 of Subpart 9C.3 (Direct Control District) be established as per Appendix A to this report;

   b) The lands encompassing proposed Parcel E and Lots 1-16 of Parcel F, as shown on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., dated June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be rezoned from WC-Wascana Centre to DCD 8(H)—Direct Control District 8 (Holding);

   c) The lands encompassing proposed Parcels D and C as shown on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be rezoned from WC-Wascana Centre to R6(H)—Residential Multiple Housing (Holding); and

   d) To rezone the lands (currently occupied by Regina Christian School) encompassing Parcel X, Plan no. 101699095; Parcel A, Plan no. 101136619; and Parcel B, Plan no. 101136631 from WC-Wascana Centre to I-Institutional;

3. The discretionary use application for a planned group of dwelling units on proposed Parcel E on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., dated June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be APPROVED subject to City Council approval of the related zoning amendment and that a Development Permit be issued subject to the following conditions:

   a) The development shall be consistent with the attached site plan, and elevation drawings, contained within Appendix C of this report.

   b) The development shall comply with all applicable regulations and standards under Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250.

4. City Council TABLE recommendation 3 pending consideration of the required Zoning Bylaw amendment pursuant to recommendation 2.
REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION – JULY 11, 2007

The following addressed the Commission:

- Mr. Tom Robinson;
- Mr. Al MacLean;
- Ms. Rosalie Zagorin;
- Mr. Paul Cote;
- Ms. Elizabeth Toporowski Bredohl;
- Ms. Ariel Côté;
- Ms. Eliane Parslow;
- Mr. Paul Cote for Ms. Sandra Pace; and
- Ms. Merna Evans, representing Evans Development Group.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE REGINA PLANNING COMMISSION
- JULY 11, 2007

1. The Concept Plan identified as “Concept Plan 23rd Avenue (Former Campion Site) and attached to this report be APPROVED.

2. City Council TABLE recommendation 1 pending advertisement of a Public Notice with respect to approval of a Concept Plan for the subject site.

3. The following amendments to Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250 be ADVERTISED:

   a) A new Section 3.14 of Subpart 9C.3 (Direct Control District) be established as per Appendix A to this report;

   b) The lands encompassing proposed Parcel E and Lots 1-16 of Parcel F, as shown on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., dated June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be rezoned from WC-Wascana Centre to DCD 8(H)—Direct Control District 8 (Holding);

   c) The lands encompassing proposed Parcels D and C as shown on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be rezoned from WC-Wascana Centre to R6(H) — Residential Multiple Housing (Holding); and

   d) To rezone the lands (currently occupied by Regina Christian School) encompassing Parcel X, Plan no. 101699095; Parcel A, Plan no. 101136619; and Parcel B, Plan no. 101136631 from WC-Wascana Centre to I-Institutional;

4. The discretionary use application for a planned group of dwelling units on proposed Parcel E on the plan of proposed subdivision prepared by Barry G. Clark of Midwest Surveys Inc., dated June 28, 2007 and attached to this report in Appendix A, be APPROVED subject to City Council approval of the related zoning amendment and that a Development Permit be issued subject to the following conditions:
a) The development shall be consistent with the attached site plan, and elevation drawings, contained within Appendix C of this report.

b) The development shall comply with all applicable regulations and standards under Regina Zoning Bylaw No. 9250.

5. City Council TABLE recommendation 4 pending consideration of the required Zoning Bylaw amendment pursuant to recommendation 3.

Councillor Fougere moved that the recommendation of the Regina Planning Commission contained in the report be concurred in.

Councillor Clipsham moved, in amendment, seconded by Councillor Browne, that the matter be referred to the Administration for a report to the Regina Planning Commission for further investigation into a pathway between Calder Crescent and the development, including the utility parcel between Lots 22 and 21.

The motion was put and declared LOST.

(Councillor Bryce temporarily left the meeting.)

Councillor Browne moved, in amendment, seconded by Councillor Fougere, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that recommendation #6 be added to read as follows:

6. The Administration be directed to preserve a pathway for Calder Crescent residents to 23rd Avenue.

The main motion, as amended, was put and declared CARRIED.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 16(11)(d) of City Council's Procedure Bylaw 9004, the briefs presented by Al MacLean, Tom Robinson, Ted O'Brien, Ariel Cote, Doug Toth, Merna Evans and Darryl Brown were received and filed.

RECESS

Councillor Clipsam moved, seconded by Councillor Murray, AND IT WAS RESOLVED, that Council recess for 10 minutes.

Council recessed at 8:10 P.M.
Council reconvened at 8:25 P.M. in the absence of Councillors Clipsham and Bryce.

Ms. Wilma Staff: Former Diocese of Qu’Appelle Lands

Pursuant to due notice the delegation was present.

The Deputy Mayor invited the delegation to come forward and be heard.

Wilma Staff addressed Council and presented a brief dated July 19, 2007 which read as follows:
APPENDIX B: Site Plans