



List of Delegations

**Wednesday, March 25, 2026
1:00 PM**

Henry Baker Hall, Main Floor, City Hall



OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

**City Council
List of Delegations and Communications
Wednesday, March 25, 2026**

**CR26-31 Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendments - 4025
Parliament Ave**

DELEGATIONS

- DE26-22 William Wells, Albert Park Community Association, Regina, SK
- DE26-23 Michael Thomas, Regina Youth Flag Football, Regina, SK
- DE26-24 Dustin McCall and Chad Jedlic, City Land Development, Regina, SK

CR26-33 Animal Bylaw Review Report

DELEGATIONS

- DE26-25 Terina Nelson, Regina, SK
- DE26-26 Pierre Sadik, Animal Justice, Toronto, ON
- DE26-27 Angela McLean, Regina, SK
- DE26-28 Jessica Brown, B Their Voice, Regina, SK
- DE26-29 Lisa Koch and Lindsay West, Regina Humane Society, Regina, SK

**CM26-2 Debt, Other Capital Funding Considerations, and Opportunities for
Central Library Renewal Project**

DELEGATIONS

- DE26-30 James Elliott, Regina, SK
- DE26-31 Joanne Havelock, Friends of the Regina Public Library, Regina, SK
- DE26-32 Jeff Barber, Regina Public Library, Regina, SK

COMMUNICATIONS

CP26-11 Florence Stratton, Regina, SK

CP26-12 Shawne Arzab, Regina, SK

MN26-2 Continuous Improvement in Construction Practices

TABLED COMMUNICATION

CP26-10 James Elliott, Regina, SK

CR26-35 Review of Nuisance and Derelict Properties

DELEGATION

DE26-33 Wendy Miller, Heritage Community Association, Regina, SK

COMMUNICATION

CP26-13 Pat Faulconbridge, North Central Community Association, Regina, SK

CP26-14 Denis Simard, Al Ritchie Community Association, Regina, SK

CP26-15 Amber Phelps Bondaroff, Regina, SK

CP26-16 Ryan Hill, Regina, SK

CP26-18 Andrew Stevens, Regina, SK

MN26-3 Accessible Playground Guidelines Related to Grant Program

DELEGATION

DE26-34 Connie Buchan, Regent Park Community Association, Regina, SK

DE26-35 Vanessa Rodriguez, Regina, SK

DE26-36 Blake Turnbull, Regina, SK

DE26-37 Terina Nelson, Regina, SK

COMMUNICATION

CP26-17 Jonathan Tremblay, City of Regina Accessibility Advisory Committee, Regina, SK

Presentation to Regina City Council
Re: RPC26-4 Parliament Avenue

APCA appeared before the Regina Planning Commission on March 17th with what we believe is a “win – win” solution to this re zoning application.

Specifically, we recommended 3 outcomes to the RPC recommendation to Council:

- 1) That the RPC recommend to Council a ML zone, not a MH zone**
- 2) That the RPC recommend to Council the development of additional off-street parking, such as Parcel T, and potentially a portion of parcel being rezoned**
- 3) That the RPC recommend to Council pedestrian crossing lights on three sides of the Rugby Fields**

These are only two development options for this property.

ML – MIXED LOW-RISE ZONE and MH – MIXED HIGH-RISE ZONE

It warrants consideration that the vast majority of the uses in **MH** and **ML** zones are permitted and identical. (See Schedule #2 attached) Consequently Council has only one chance to get this decision right!

The only significant differences are that **MH** includes:

1. Gas station
2. Car Wash
3. Drive-thru Restaurant
4. Mechanic and auto-body shops
5. SARCAN like businesses
6. Businesses that operated, serviced, repaired heavy equipment or printing businesses.

and **ML** does not.

It is noteworthy that the “4B.1 Intent” of the MH zoning states the following:

“Lands zoned Mixed High-Rise are intended to:

- (b) contemplate a variety of medium intensity commercial uses oriented towards both high-traffic volume and positive pedestrian experience;”**

In addition, “4B.2 Application” of the MH zoning states the following:

“The Mixed High-Rise zone shall apply to lands intended to:

- (a) provide for intensification while ensuring compatibility with the surrounding uses;**

The streets and the land uses adjacent to the 4025 Parliament Avenue parcel under consideration currently do not achieve and are unable to achieve either of these goals. Unfortunately, traffic, parking, pedestrian safety and compatibility issues are not discussed in this report.

Finally, it should be noted that two gas stations and car washes and one drive thru restaurant are within 200 metres of this location. The report provides no evidence that there is a pressing need or interest in any of these services at this location on Parliament Avenue or that more such businesses are economically viable.

We would direct Council members to review the commentary of Mr. Chad Jedlic, of the City Land Development office with respect to this parcel between 37 and 40 minutes on the video recording of the RPC meeting. He indicated that the interest in this parcel to date has been professional services in line with the current developments along Pasqua Street. We appreciate his goal of not advancing something that will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. We recognize his observation that developers are hesitant to present their proposals to Council if they are discretionary use proposals. This hesitation would exist regardless of whether it is ML or MH.

APCA is prepared to work with developers in such instances to find a win – win option to present to Council.

The discussion during the RPC's consideration of the report suggested MH zoning **might** provide a higher sale price for the land although no such evidence was offered nor sought from the administration.

We will live with the legacy of your decision for decades. The sale price you get once.

We believe that 3 gas stations and car washes within 200 metres of each other will not immediately increase the value of this parcel or of a neighbourhood?

We submit that gas stations (and other uses on the MH UNIQUE PERMITTED USES list on the attached Schedule #2) by their function are isolated from residences and other businesses and thus it will lessen the development along the balance of 4025 Parliament Avenue.

We cannot identify an example in Regina where a gas station or an autobody shop etc. has been a magnet for the range of uses identified amongst the ML or MH permitted uses.

We want to emphasize that we clearly expressed a preference for developments for 4025 Parliament Avenue like the ML zone immediately north of this parcel on Pasqua Street.

We do not believe that a gas station (or the other exceptions on the MH UNIQUE PERMITTED USES list on the attached Schedule #2) on this parcel will attract developments like the ML properties that exist around the corner on Pasqua Street....

*churches,
temples,
doctors' offices,
medical clinics,
union offices
engineering firms
bakeries*

will be clamoring to be beside beside a gas station/car wash?

The desirable developments along Pasqua Street did not require a gas station to encourage their development.

2) That the RPC recommend to Council the development of additional off-street parking, such as Parcel T, and potentially a portion of parcel being rezoned

During what might be called the Flag Football Season the adjacent streets and private parking lots are overwhelmed with vehicles. The administration pointed out during the RPC meeting that during this season between 1000 and 1200 people currently come and go every hour for 8 weeks in the spring.

The Administration verbally identified 230 on-site parking spaces and approximately 230 potential parking spaces on parcel T during the meeting. Assuming 2 spectators and 1 player per vehicle the following projection is possible:

230 onsite parking spaces + 230 parcel T parking spaces = 460 parking spaces.
3 people per vehicle X 460 spaces = 1380 people
which exceeds the administration 1000 to 1200 pedestrians per hour.

This does not fully address the parking issues, but it has an impact and can focus the pedestrian traffic crossing the street.

Other similar city facilities have adequate parking facilities such as:

- Mount Pleasant
- Douglas Park
- University
- REAL
- City recreation facilities
- Pacer Ball Park

3) That Council receive a report on how safe pedestrian crossing can be achieved on the three sides of the Rugby Fields.

It should be noted that there are virtually no sidewalks on all three sides of the Rugby Fields property. This and the absence of sufficient parking results in routine jay walking during flag football games.

PART 4A
ML – MIXED LOW-RISE ZONE

4A.1 INTENT

Lands zoned Mixed Low-Rise are intended to:

- (a) accommodate a variety of **low intensity commercial uses that serve the local community and do not draw customers from beyond their neighbourhood boundaries or generate substantial vehicle traffic;**
- (b) **promote pedestrian-oriented storefronts as a means to enhance the vitality of street and businesses, and reduce automobile dependence; or**
- (c) promote the development of neighbourhood hubs as described in the Official Community Plan.

PART 4B
MH – MIXED HIGH-RISE ZONE

4B.1 INTENT

Lands zoned Mixed High-Rise are intended to:

- (a) provide for mixed use development within a building or on a single lot;
- (b) **contemplate a variety of medium intensity commercial uses oriented towards both high-traffic volume and positive pedestrian experience; and**
- (c) promote medium intensity development along non-local streets, key transportation corridors, near transit stops or area suitable for intensification.

PERMITTED USES

Schedule #2

ML	MH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food & Beverage, Outdoor • Retail Trade, Outdoor Display • Agriculture, Indoor • Agriculture, Animal Support • Food & Beverage, Catering • Industry, Artistic • Industry, Laboratory • Industry, Food & Beverage • Institution, Education • Institution, Humanitarian Service • Institution, Training • Institution, Day Care • Retail Trade, Shop • Retail Trade, Cannabis • Service Trade, Clinic • Service Trade, Light • Service Trade, Personal • Food & Beverage, Lounge • Food & Beverage, Restaurant • Office • Open Space, Active • Public Use, General • Service Trade, Residential <li style="padding-left: 40px;">Short Term Accommodation • Utility, General • Transportation, Parking Lot • Transportation, Parking Structure • Transportation, Parking Stand • Service Trade, Accommodation • Assembly, Community • Assembly, Recreation • Assembly, Religious • Agriculture, Outdoor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food & Beverage, Outdoor • Retail Trade, Outdoor Display • Agriculture, Indoor • Agriculture, Animal Support • Food & Beverage, Catering • Industry, Artistic • Industry, Laboratory • Industry, Food & Beverage • Institution, Education • Institution, Humanitarian Service • Institution, Training • Institution, Day Care • Retail Trade, Shop • Retail Trade, Cannabis • Service Trade, Clinic • Service Trade, Light • Service Trade, Personal • Food & Beverage, Lounge • Food & Beverage, Restaurant • Office • Open Space, Active • Public Use, General • Service Trade, Residential <li style="padding-left: 40px;">Short Term Accommodation • Utility, General • Transportation, Parking Lot • Transportation, Parking Structure • Transportation, Parking Stand • Service Trade, Accommodation • Assembly, Community • Assembly, Recreation • Assembly, Religious • Agriculture, Outdoor

UNIQUE PERMITTED USES IN EACH ZONES

ML	MH
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail Trade, Fuel Station • Drive-Through, Accessory • Industry, Salvaging – Light • Service Trade, Heavy • Service Trade, Motor Vehicle - Light • Retail Trade, Motor Vehicle – Light • Service Trade, Wash – Light • Assembly, Ceremonial

NOT PERMITTED DUE TO AIRPORT

ML	MH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwelling, Assisted- Living • Dwelling, Group Care • Dwelling, Unit • Residential Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwelling, Assisted- Living • Dwelling, Group Care • Dwelling, Unit • Residential Business

PART 2B DEFINITION

– A –

The following words, terms and phrases, wherever they occur in this Bylaw, shall have the meanings assigned to them by this Part.

“Drive-Through, Accessory” means any ancillary or accessory use where a good and/or a service trade is dispensed or provided to a person who remains in a motor vehicle.

“Industry, Salvaging – Light” means a land use located entirely indoors where light salvaging operations take place which includes the collection, packaging, repackaging, purchase and/or processing, as well as temporary storage, of any of the following for the purpose of dismantling, repurposing, reusing, salvaging or recycling:

- (a) paper, metal (including scrap metal) and plastic material;
- (b) glassware, pottery and ceramics;
- (c) clothing, fashion accessories, leather material and textiles;
- (d) computers, computer components and household electronics;
- (e) furniture and household appliances;
- (f) materials that are, in the opinion of the Development Officer, similar to those listed above. **Excludes** the collection, storage, sale or purchase of farm equipment, motor vehicles, similar heavy equipment, and accessories of motor vehicle or similar heavy equipment, as well as the storage of hazardous materials including hazardous waste.

“Service Trade, Heavy” means a land use where tools, goods, machinery and equipment, including tools large household appliances, commercial scale operations, building and specialized trade, landscaping, and construction are operated, serviced, repaired or maintained, including commercial publishing and printing. **Excludes** tools, goods, machinery and equipment associated with farming or motor vehicles.

“Service Trade, Motor Vehicle - Light” means a land use where light motor vehicles are maintained, repaired or serviced. May include sales of and services related to lubricating oils, fuels, tires or motor vehicle accessories to members of the general public. **Excludes** the sales of motor vehicles as well as any land use defined as Service Trade, Wash – Light, Service Trade, Wash – Heavy or Service Trade, Motor Vehicle – Heavy.

Urban planning (also called **city planning** or **town planning** in some contexts) is the process of developing and **designing land use** and the built environment, including air, water, and the **infrastructure** passing into and out of **urban areas**, such as **transportation**, **communications**, and **distribution networks**, and their **accessibility**.^[1] Traditionally, urban planning followed a top-down approach in master planning the physical layout of **human settlements**.^[2] The primary concern was the **public welfare**,^{[1][2]} which included considerations of efficiency, **sanitation**, protection and use of the environment,^[1] as well as taking account of effects of the master plans on the social and economic activities.^[3] Over time, urban planning has adopted a focus on the social and environmental "**bottom lines**" that focuses on using planning as a tool to improve the health and well-being of people and maintain sustainability standards. In the early 21st century, urban planning experts such as **Jane Jacobs** called on urban planners to take resident experiences and needs more into consideration.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urban_planning

Community development planning consists of a public participatory and usually interactive form of **town** or **neighborhood** planning and design in which diverse community members (often termed "stakeholders") contribute toward formulation of the goals, objectives, planning, **fund/resource** identification and direction, planned project **implementations** and **reevaluation** of documented local planning policy. It is a logical "bottom-up" evolution of (formerly "top-down") **regional**, **city** and **urban planning** in an era of plateaued or diminishing public resources, increasing local burdens and responsibilities and **public activism**. It often promotes **public/private partnership** as a means to harness physical development activities in support of community-defined goals.^[1] At a minimum, it seeks community consensus for proposed allocations of scarce resources among competing demands. In more vigorous application, community members access a full gamut of planning tools, shaping and being shaped by shared understanding of a complex community information base, directly informing and guiding local plan content, influencing resulting development budgets, projects and thus future **infrastructure** and land uses, as well as helping coordinate the work of overlapping **jurisdictions**, levels of **government**, internal and adjacent communities and various providers, such as **business associations**, **utilities** and **schools**.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community_development_planning

Good Evening, Mayor and Councillors,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Mike Thomas, and I am here on behalf of the Regina Youth Flag Football League to speak about our use of Rugby Park and the important role that space plays in supporting not only our league, but the broader Regina community.

Quick recap on our league. It began in 2007 with just 75 kids has grown into one of the largest youth flag program in Canada. In 2026, we will have approximately 5,400 kids in our program.

Our league is now delivered in two phases each year that utilize Rugby Park and the University of Regina: Spring season, with 3,700 participants and the Fall season, with approximately 1,700 participants

That level of participation is significant on its own, but it also only tells part of the story.

For every child participating, there are parents, siblings, grandparents, and friends attending as spectators. On average, we see a 3 to 4 times multiplier in attendance, meaning our game days bring thousands upon thousands of people through Rugby Park and the surrounding south end area throughout the course of a season.

That activity has a very real impact.

Our league supports:

- active lifestyles for thousands of children and families
- employment opportunities for approximately 225 young teens and young adults
- opportunities for young entrepreneurs, including local kids who set up lemonade, iced tea, and cookie stands on game day
- licensed City of Regina food truck vendors who benefit from the steady traffic our events generate
- and community groups and organizations who approach us to hold fundraisers onsite during league play

In addition to that, our operations support other local services and businesses. We utilize City of Regina services, including paying for our fields to be painted bi-weekly, and we also contract and support businesses that assist with waste management and other event-related services required to operate a league of this size.

So while we are a football league, our impact extends far beyond sport.

We are a community hub. We are a youth development platform. And we are an economic

driver in our own way, bringing consistent activity, customers, and vibrancy to the area.

The use of Rugby Park, alongside the University of Regina fields, has been foundational to our growth over the years. Without access to quality field space, our ability to serve this many residents simply would not exist.

We fully understand the size and scope of our program. We also understand that an operation of this magnitude affects the surrounding south-end area. With that comes a responsibility to be organized, respectful, and collaborative in how we operate. We take that responsibility seriously.

We also believe this program has helped bring positive recognition to Regina and Saskatchewan. In 2023, our league was recognized by the NFL and NFL FLAG as League of the Year. That is not only a reflection of the work being done within our organization, but also a reflection of what is possible when a city supports grassroots sport in a meaningful way and the future is even brighter.

With flag football being added to the 2028 Olympic Games, we believe there is a very real possibility that one day an athlete from Regina could represent Canada on that stage. When that day comes, it will not just be a victory for that athlete or their family. It will be something the entire City of Regina can celebrate.

Because for many of those future athletes, it all starts on those fields. It starts at Rugby Park. It starts with access. It starts with opportunity, and it starts with a city willing to support programs that create healthy kids, strong families, community connection, youth employment, and positive momentum for the future.

On behalf of the Regina Youth Flag Football League, I want to sincerely thank the City of Regina for its support over the years and for continuing to provide spaces like Rugby Park that allow us to grow the sport and serve residents in such a meaningful way.

We could not do what we do without that partnership.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Submitted by Michael Thomas, Regina Youth Flag Football

Thank you, and good afternoon, Mayor and members of City Council.

My name is Dustin McCall, Manager of Land Development for the City of Regina. I am joined today by Chad Jedlic, Director of Land, Real Estate & Economic Development for the City of Regina (City).

We are here today representing the City of Regina's interests as the owner of the land located at 4025 Parliament Avenue.

We are appearing as a delegation to distinguish our role with the City's Land Development Branch as the "developer," separate from our colleagues who act as the "regulator of development".

City-owned lands are developed in alignment with the principles noted in the City's Land Development and Disposition Strategy, which was approved by City Council in 2024. As we develop lands, we go through the same municipal approval processes as private developers.

The proposed re-zoning of 4025 Parliament Avenue represents an important opportunity for the City to transition underutilized land into a well-positioned commercial development that will generate one-time land sale revenue and ongoing annual property tax revenue.

The original developable area was reduced to accommodate construction of a cricket field to meet growing community demand. The cricket field development includes dedicated parking and will share underground services with the commercial development, allowing for efficient use of infrastructure and lower development costs and lower long term ownership costs to the city. If the commercial development does not proceed, construction of the cricket field would need to be delayed until separate funding is secured to service the cricket field as a stand alone project. It should be noted that this was not clearly stated at Planning Commission, so this is new information. A conceptual plan for the development of Rawlinson Crescent Park, including the cricket field, is included in our submission.

If the proposed zoning is approved, the City's Land Development Branch will subdivide and service the parcel and market it publicly for sale. Due to its proximity to the airport, the property is not suitable for residential use, but it is well positioned for commercial development.

We recognize the parking challenges that occur in the area during busy sports days. Both the proposed commercial development and the cricket field are being planned with onsite parking to meet their respective needs. This will help ensure that each site can operate without placing additional strain on the surrounding neighbourhood.

We request Council's approval of the proposed rezoning so that we may advance servicing and land sale activities

We are available to answer any questions.



Submitted by Dustin McCall and Chad Jedlic, City Land Development

Delegation Speech – Regina City Council (March 25, 2026)

Good afternoon Mayor and Members of Council,

I will speak today regarding the proposed amendments to The Regina Animal Bylaw, 2009.

I would like to begin by dedicating today's delegation to the memory of Rob Beaton, a founding

principal of BBK here in Regina. Through BBK's work with the Regina Humane Society, his legacy lives on in a place that provides care and protection to thousands of animals in our city.

His work reminds us that building a city is not just about infrastructure — it is about compassion.

I would also like to thank my daughter, Stephanie, who once stepped in to help a dog left tied

outside in extreme winter conditions — without adequate food, water, or shelter.

She believed she was doing the right thing.

When she brought that dog to the Humane Society, she was told she could potentially be charged

with theft.

That experience stayed with me.

I want to acknowledge that Administration has taken some positive steps in these amendments.

However, this bylaw does not reflect the intent of the motion passed by Council in January 2025.

That motion directed Administration to bring forward meaningful, enforceable improvements

to animal welfare standards, aligned with best practices across Canada.

It was not intended to be done in stages.

It was not intended to be partial.

And it was not intended to be diluted.

Respectfully, Administration has not fully carried out the work that Council directed.

Council sets the direction.

Administration is responsible for delivering on it.

I also want to address the suggestion that animal welfare is solely a provincial matter.

Under The City of Regina Act, Council has clear authority to pass bylaws respecting the health,

safety, and welfare of people and property — including the regulation and control of animals

within the city.

Provincial legislation sets minimum standards.

It does not prevent municipalities from doing more.

Other cities are already doing this.

Regina can as well.

This matters because provincial enforcement is largely reactive. Under The Animal Protection Act, agencies like the Regina Humane Society generally require legal authority — often a warrant — to enter private property and remove an animal. That means action typically happens after an animal is already in distress. Municipal bylaws are the proactive tool. They allow you to set clear, enforceable standards before harm occurs. And for those standards to be effective, they must be specific. Terms like “adequate shelter” or “adequate care” are open to interpretation. What one person considers adequate, another may not. That creates inconsistency, makes enforcement difficult, and ultimately leaves animals unprotected.

If we are serious about enforcement, then Administration must come back with clear, specific, and measurable standards.

So there is:

no ambiguity for owners,
no uncertainty for enforcement,
and no gap in protection for animals.

I also want to briefly address something raised during discussion.

A question was asked by a member of Council about bylaws related to not picking up animal waste.

While that may be important, it is not relevant to this motion.

This motion is about animal welfare.

So I would respectfully ask Council to remain focused on the matter before you — and on the direction that was originally set.

One of the most significant gaps in this bylaw remains tethering.

Time-based limits are nearly impossible to enforce.

And research shows that prolonged tethering increases the risk of aggression and bites.

That is why other Canadian cities have moved toward restricting or prohibiting unsupervised tethering.

If we are serious about both animal welfare and public safety, this is an area where we must do better.

This is an opportunity for Regina:

To act within its legal authority.

To move from reactive enforcement to proactive protection.

And to meet the expectations of residents who are asking for stronger animal welfare standards.

I would respectfully ask Council to:

- Reaffirm the original intent of the January 2025 motion
- Recognize this work was not meant to be done in stages
- Hold Administration accountable to that direction
- And require clear, specific, and enforceable animal welfare regulations

Closing:

At the end of the day, this is not just about a bylaw.
It is about whether we set clear standards —
or leave animals at risk because those standards are open to interpretation.
Animal protection is not just a file or a bylaw — it's a responsibility.
And I'm asking you today to take that responsibility seriously.

Submitted by Terina Nelson, Regina, SK



March 25, 2026

CR26-33 Regina Animal Bylaw Review Report

My name is Pierre Sadik. I am a lawyer with Animal Justice and I am based in Ottawa. Animal Justice is Canada's leading national animal law organization.

Thank you to the members of Council for the opportunity to appear before you on this important issue.

The Regina Animal Bylaw exists to protect the public, safeguard property, and promote the humane treatment of animals. Those purposes are all vital, and they properly engage Council's authority to regulate in the public interest.

From both a legal and policy perspective, the most effective form of public protection is preventative rather than reaction. Municipal regulation is most efficient when it enables intervention before a situation escalates into a bite incident, an animal welfare concern, or some other avoidable harm. Responsible pet ownership provisions serve that function.

Animal Justice's work with municipal bylaws across Canada indicates that other jurisdictions have adopted care and/or containment standards specifically designed to support early intervention. These municipalities have recognized that clear standards for responsible pet ownership can reduce risk to both animals and the public.

In the report before Council, the legality and/or advisability of the addition of certain provisions to the animal bylaw is called into question.

We submit that Regina City Council does have the legal authority under *The Cities Act* to adopt bylaw amendments dealing with responsible pet ownership for dogs, cats, and other companion animals. The question is whether the province's existing role in animal welfare prevents the City from also adopting local rules that promote responsible ownership, humane containment, and community safety. In my submission, it does not.

Section 8(1)(k) of *The Cities Act* gives Council authority to pass bylaws respecting "wild and domestic animals and activities in relation to them". This is broad language. It is not limited to licensing, dog bites, or pound operations. It extends to activities in relation to domestic animals, which naturally includes how animals are kept, housed, supervised, and contained within the City. If Council can regulate animals, it can regulate the conditions under which those animals are kept in ways that affect public safety and responsible ownership.

That conclusion is reinforced by the structure of *The Cities Act*. Section 327 addresses dangerous animals. Section 327.1 deals with animal control for animals at large. But section 327.1 also includes important language: “Without limiting the generality of clause 8(1)(k).” This means the specific power to regulate “animals at large” does not narrow the broader authority in section 8(1)(k). It confirms that Council’s general jurisdiction over domestic animals remains intact.

The Cities Act instructs that municipal bylaw powers are to be read broadly in order to give Council meaningful authority to address local issues. Responsible pet ownership is exactly the kind of issue that requires local judgment. The City deals directly with neighbourhood safety, complaints, nuisance conditions, and the direct consequences when companion animals are poorly contained or inadequately cared for. Those are municipal concerns, even where they may also overlap in part with provincial concerns.

It has been suggested that because animal cruelty matters are also regulated by the Province, municipal rules on care or containment risk exceeding the City’s jurisdiction. The *Animal Protection Act* deals with animal distress and cruelty. It establishes a provincial regime that prohibits causing an animal to be in distress, and it provides enforcement powers to animal protection officers and agencies.

That does not mean municipalities are barred from passing complementary bylaws. It is not suggested that municipalities would need to enforce the provincial Act in order to regulate responsible ownership locally. A Regina bylaw would not prosecute provincial cruelty offences. It would establish municipal standards such as safe containment practices or tethering limits.

A bylaw can be drafted so that where a situation amounts to provincial “distress” or cruelty it is dealt with under the provincial enforcement regime. Meanwhile, the City remains free to regulate the local conduct that falls short of that threshold but still creates risk, nuisance, or harm for the public or animals. This means the Province continues to enforce animal cruelty, while the City enforces responsible pet ownership. Those roles are complementary, not contradictory.

It has also been suggested that similar standards in a bylaw could create redundancy and confusion. But in many areas of law, different levels of government regulate the same general subject matter for different purposes. The legal question is whether the City is acting within an authorized municipal purpose. It plainly is, as rules about tethering, confinement, and animals running at large all relate directly to public safety, nuisance prevention, and responsible ownership within City boundaries.

Many other Saskatchewan municipalities have enacted bylaws that include responsible pet ownership provisions. Warman, Biggar, Estevan, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and Kindersley are among the municipalities that have adopted bylaws dealing with matters such as adequate food and water, shelter, sanitary confinement, and tethering requirements.

The same is true beyond Saskatchewan. Other provinces with provincial animal welfare legislation still permit and support local regulation of companion animals. Across Canada, municipalities routinely adopt bylaws that address tethering, confinement, shelter, supervision, and containment because those are local matters with immediate consequences for neighbourhood safety and quality of life.

In closing, the Province's role in addressing cruelty does not displace the City's role in addressing responsible ownership. *The Cities Act* gives Regina the authority it needs. Section 8(1)(k) is broad. Section 327.1 expressly preserves that breadth.

For these reasons, I respectfully suggest that Council does have authority. It has the ability to enact bylaw amendments that establish responsible pet ownership standards for dogs, cats, and other companion animals, while respecting the Province's distinct role in enforcing animal cruelty legislation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Pierre Sadik', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Pierre Sadik, LL.B.
Government and Legislative Affairs Counsel
Animal Justice

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I'm here as a resident of Regina Rosemont—but more importantly, as a parent.

In 2024, my son was attacked and bitten by a dog belonging to repeat problem owners. He was only 7 years old. It's now March 2026 and the problem owner still has not been prosecuted due to delays in the criminal justice system.

Ever since the day of my son's bite, I've carried one big problem with me:

This could have been prevented.

And that's why this matters so much.

Now, I want to acknowledge that there are positive steps in these recommendations.

Interim orders, leash requirements, and requiring identification are all reasonable improvements.

And the need for action is real. We've seen a significant increase in aggressive incidents and dog bites in our city.

So yes—something needs to change.

But this report is largely **reactive**.

It focuses on what happens after a problem is identified—after complaints are made, after patterns are established, after someone has already been put at risk.

My son didn't just need a faster response after he was bitten.

He needed a system that would have prevented that bite from happening in the first place.

The dogs were roaming everyday, they attacked multiple people, yet were returned to their owners everytime. My son's bite was **preventable**.

And that's the gap.

This report leans heavily on enforcement and fines, yet even the public engagement results show that residents are not confident fines reduce repeat behaviour.

It does not meaningfully address **repeat problem owners before incidents escalate**.

And it does not fully reflect the **comprehensive review** that Council originally directed.

But I also want to acknowledge something important:

On March 18, Executive Committee recognized this.

An amendment was made to continue this work—to go further and bring back more comprehensive solutions.

That was the right decision.

Because if nothing more is done beyond what is in this report, **another child could be hurt**, and next time the tragedy could be worse.

And that is not acceptable.

We don't have to guess what stronger, preventative approaches look like—other Canadian cities are already doing this.

Cities like Winnipeg, Calgary, Toronto, and Edmonton are using bylaws that focus on **prevention, not just reaction**.

They:

- Address **repeat problem owners** with escalating consequences beyond fines.
- Set clearer standards around **supervision and responsible ownership**
- Use **early intervention tools** to identify risk before it becomes harm
- And invest in **education and compliance**.

That's the direction Regina needs to move in.

Because we cannot fine our way to safety.

We have to prevent harm before it happens.

So today, my message is one of **concern—but also cautious optimism**.

Concern, because this report does not go far enough.

But optimism, because Council has already signaled that this is not the end—that more work is coming.

My ask is simple:

Follow through.

Ensure the next phase of this review is truly comprehensive:

Because this isn't just about bylaws.

It's about whether a 7-year-old can safely walk in their own neighbourhood.

My son deserved that safety. Every child in Regina deserves that safety.
Please make sure we finish this work. Thank you

Submitted by Angela McLean, Regina, SK

Good morning council. I would first like to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you on the current concern regarding our animal bylaws and the proposed amendments. There is an extreme importance of what amendments and additions are needed Regina and that is not being met. Many animal rescuers, trainers, groomers, concerned community members here in Regina have come together for the want for change!! I truly hope the members of council and administration will see that this is not enough we need to do this and do it right.

I have been involved with Running Wild Rescue on the front line (taking care of animals and their rehabilitation and decompression when stray, neglected or surrendered, and as well as raising funds to feed, vet, and house 1000's of animals over the last 3-1/2 years. I work alongside the Regina street team, help Regina Pet Food Bank to keep food available for people in need during tough times. I have assisted many times with animals at large in our city, when animal protection may already be dealing with the same somewhere else. I am also a local animal and human rights advocate in Regina where I call home since I was born. I state this not for vindication but to ensure you that the amendments stated before you today and last week need to be enforced. The threshold for animal welfare in Regina is heartbreaking. I ask you all do we not want better for our people and our animals?

Statistics on the behavior of neglected dogs in Canada are often derived from shelter assessments, owner-surrender reports, and welfare investigation cases. Neglected dogs frequently exhibit fear-based behaviors, aggression, and extreme stress, which can lead to higher return rates in shelters

- **Impact of Neglect** - Neglected dogs, particularly those experiencing long-term tethering or confinement, often display excessive barking, overactivity, or fear-based aggression.
- **Specific Behavioral Issues:** Research indicates that male dogs, particularly those with a history of neglect, tend to show more inter-male aggression and roaming tendencies, while younger dogs may show high fearfulness.
- **Animal Cruelty Linkages:** A study in BC found that 75 per cent of battered women with pets reported that their partners had either killed or injured their pets, suggesting a strong correlation between domestic violence and animal abuse/neglect.

Shelter Data and Welfare Findings

- **Shelter Stays:** The average length of stay for dogs in Canadian shelters (2018 data) was 21 days. Longer stays can worsen behavioral issues in neglected animals.
- **Surrender Reasons:** In 2021, many Canadian shelters reported a rise in dogs surrendered with pre-existing behavioral and medical issues.
- **Neglect Indicators:** Veterinarians identify neglect through signs like extreme thinness (emaciation), untreated wounds, severe parasitism, or embedded collars.

Animal protection officers should be allowed to do what is necessary to prevent these horrific things before it is too late.

I read a quote from Edmonton Journal "The push for change was also driven by statistics and feedback from residents, citing the rise in pet ownership since 2020 and growing concerns about safety and animal welfare. During two years of public engagement, many Edmontonians expressed a desire for tougher penalties for dog attacks and clearer guidelines for responsible pet ownership."

Changing the bylaws is more about creating a framework for long-term solutions than an immediate fix. This is after Edmonton changed their animal bylaws in 2025 after almost 2 decades. 2 years of public engagement we had only 2 meetings and a survey ??

Last Wednesday, when I attended, you heard many reasons why and what amendments are needed. Please know there is not one speech I don't support. Our bylaws need to change and in too many ways for me to capture it all in 5 minutes. I am not sure how you would not want to work more with the ones who are on the frontline with animals in our city. You have the ability to make Regina a place where both people and animals can live safely and happily. Giving the animal protection authorities the right to be proactive and to stop what they know is neglect and what they know is best to keep the animals and community safe. Just like the authorities have for our people. Let's dedicate time and resources to public education, spay and neutering programs and community involvement. So on behalf of myself and every animal owner or animal lover, I ask you today ... please do what's best for our city, let's make the changes we all know are needed. together, and let AP authorities enforce all needed to keep children .. animals, and adults safe ... let's be leaders of change and not followers of other cities, towns, or villages in animal welfare.

Thank you,

Jessica Brown

BThiervoiceanimaladvocate

Running Wild Rescue



March 25, 2026

CR26-33 Regina Animal Bylaw Review Report

Thank you, Your Worship and Members of City Council, for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Regina Humane Society.

For more than sixty years, the Regina Humane Society has worked to foster a humane community for both people and animals. Since 1988, we have partnered with the City of Regina to provide municipal impound services and, since 1998, to enforce the Animal Bylaw. We value that longstanding relationship and the trust placed in us to carry out this important work for the community.

The purpose of the Regina Animal Bylaw is to protect people, animals, and property, and to ensure the humane treatment of animals. Through our enforcement work, we see firsthand where the Bylaw can be strengthened to protect public safety and animal welfare.

In January 2025, Council directed that the Regina Animal Bylaw undergo an environmental scan, best practice review, and consultation with stakeholders. As part of that process, the Regina Humane Society examined municipal bylaws across Canada and identified best practices. Those findings were shared with Administration to help inform the proposed changes. Administration has indicated this initiative will proceed in phases. The current Bylaw updates focus on dogs and public safety with provisions related to cats and other animals to follow.

Administration has brought forward several amendments to the Bylaw, including the introduction of mandatory bite reporting, escalating impoundment fees for repeat at-large dogs, and clarification that physical control, rather than verbal control, is required. These amendments represent an important step in modernizing the Bylaw and strengthening the tools available to protect both people and animals in our community.

The addition of a judicial interim order mechanism is an important step. It allows courts to quickly impose temporary safety conditions, such as muzzling, leashing, or requirements for secure fencing and containment following a serious bite incident. These conditions remain in place until a court hearing occurs to determine whether the dog should be designated dangerous.

For these orders to be effective, however, they must be obtainable quickly and the dangerous dog hearing must proceed without delay. It is important to note that in the rare circumstances where impoundment may be necessary for public safety, owner consent or a judge-issued warrant on reasonable grounds is required. In such a situation, timeliness in the hearing process is paramount, as a dangerous dog cannot be held indefinitely for safety and animal welfare reasons.

Interim orders are critical when serious incidents occur. However, our enforcement experience shows that the most effective way to protect the public is to intervene before situations escalate.

Serious dog incidents rarely occur without warning signs. Issues such as poor containment, chronic roaming, or escalating behaviour are often present long before a bite occurs. Responsible pet care provisions within bylaws allow municipalities to address these warning signs early, before they escalate.

Public feedback gathered during this review reflects strong support for this preventative approach. In the survey conducted as part of the Bylaw review, the most common response to the question “What do you believe would help reduce aggression in dogs?” was regulations promoting responsible pet ownership, identified by 6,824 respondents.

The Cities Act provides municipalities with authority to pass bylaws respecting “wild and domestic animals and activities in relation to them.” Several municipalities in Saskatchewan already include responsible pet care and containment requirements in their animal bylaws, including Warman, Martensville, Nipawin, Biggar, and Estevan.

Across Canada, many municipalities include similar measures that support early intervention before situations escalate. Examples include Calgary, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Victoria, Vancouver, and Montréal.

The Report presents Option 2 as the addition of animal cruelty provisions to the Bylaw and does not recommend it. From the Regina Humane Society’s enforcement perspective, however, the measures discussed function primarily as responsible pet ownership requirements, such as humane care and appropriate containment.

Animal cruelty and animals in distress are addressed through The Animal Protection Act, administered by the Province of Saskatchewan. Because the legal threshold for distress is high, intervention typically occurs only after conditions have significantly deteriorated. However, a dog may still meet the legal requirements for food, water, shelter, and veterinary care while spending most of its life tethered. Situations such as this may raise animal welfare and public safety concerns, but because the legal threshold for distress is not met, provincial legislation does not provide a basis for intervention before conditions escalate.

Municipal bylaws play a complementary role by establishing clear expectations for responsible pet ownership and providing tools to educate owners, issue warnings or tickets where necessary, and address problems early — before they escalate into animal distress or public safety incidents.

Because the Regina Humane Society enforces both the municipal bylaw and the provincial Animal Protection Act, we see firsthand how these frameworks work together. Municipal standards allow issues to be addressed earlier, while provincial legislation provides authority when situations escalate to distress.

Through discussions with the provincial Ministry responsible for the Animal Protection Act, our understanding is that responsible pet ownership provisions in municipal bylaws are viewed as complementary to provincial legislation rather than duplicative.

We appreciate the work Administration has undertaken in bringing forward this review. For the reasons outlined today, we support the recommendations before Council. Of particular importance is the recommendation to continue consultation with stakeholders on responsible pet ownership provisions in the next phase of the Bylaw review.

The most effective way to protect both people and animals is prevention — addressing risks early before they escalate into serious incidents.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this Bylaw review. We look forward to continuing to work with Administration and Council in the next phase of this work.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Koch
Executive Director
Regina Humane Society

Dear Mayor & Council,

Re: CR26-16 Debt Update Including Library Debt Options

My name is Jim Elliott and I have lived in Regina for over 40 years. I have in some cases been the only citizen at annual budget deliberations over the past 25 years. I was there when the 1st Cry Wolf happened in 2003 when the then Director said that the library was broke and had to close down three branches, the Prairie History Room and the Dunlop Gallery. They were told by their own task force to replace or renovate the central branch back in 2004. I was there when the 2nd Cry Wolf happened in 2009 (see photo) when the library board sprung the 10-story glass tower to be built by Harvard Development not informing or even asking the Masonic Temple about their plans to bulldoze their downtown temple.

And now we have the 3rd Cry Wolf.

My recommendation is very clear, support the Administration's report to the Audit & Finance Committee later in Q2 of 2026 and not further compromise the health and wellbeing of Regina residents.

To hear the Regina Library Board say that nothing has changed since the summer of 2024 is mind-boggling. If one is cognizant of what we hear from almost every media outlet is that it is very easy to say that everything has changed. Now we have the Regina Library Board not prepared for the fiscal survival of this city should be very concerning to everyone. The information in the supplementary report should have been known by the Regina Library Board. The City of Regina, in my mind, has extended its debt and borrowing limit far too much.

And now for the Regina Library Board to make some outlandish requests to just have the city simply hand over a \$100 million dollars from their investments when it is clearly not able means their financial acumen is not as high as it should be. And to jeopardize the integrity of our water and wastewater utilities is outrageous.

This library board has had the myth that the city will simply hand over the money it needs so entrenched in its planning brings into question how they have managed these past 18 years. But just remember that the central branch is still there and functioning and has had thousands of patrons visit over the years.

The other and more troubling aspect of this discussion is the Library Board's poor asset management. If you are sustainable, wish to be sustainable and want to be here for the long term, you, like a utility, build up reserves so that when that building is at its end, you have enough money to replace or significantly retrofit for

the coming decades. In 1993, they had a plan to renovate and rejuvenate the central library and did nothing. As the library board has said, they have been working on this for 18 years. Where is the burgeoning reserve that should have been set up beginning in 2008 to pay for the work on the central branch? That could have been in the neighbourhood of \$50-75 million dollars in reserve if implemented back then. They have been waiting for their sugar daddy to just show up and give them the money. It began with Harvard Development and now they have lost all but one sugar daddy, the City of Regina. So, they are trying to shame and cajole you and the public to get what they want. They also ask you for money prior to any full assessment of the asset needs of the city, i.e. maybe more or bigger branches. Again, something that was recommended to them as far back as 2004.

Do not listen to the cry wolf scenarios. They cannot be trusted to even exist. We found that out in previous scenarios.

In conclusion, I recommend that you stay with the recommendations of the Audit & Finance Committee that being that City Council refer this matter back to Administration to report back to the Audit and Finance Committee at its meeting in Q2 2026 with a scenario where the CHIF funding is granted and how much, then going for City Council's consideration later.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott





Friends of the Regina Public Library

frpl@sasktel.net www.friendsofrpl.ca (306)535-9570

2042 Garnet St., Regina, SK S4T 2Z6

March 23, 2026

Mayor and Councillors
City of Regina
Regina, SK, S4P 3C8

Re: City Council March 25, 2026 Meeting item CM26-2 Debt, Other Capital Funding Considerations, and Opportunities for Central Library Renewal Project

The Friends of the Regina Public Library has over its recent years has been advocating for the following:

- 1) Retain the current heritage Central Branch and look at renovations and expansion to the west, if necessary, within the confines of the heritage designation.
- 2) Maintain all the various locations and services across the city to adequately support the public in its needs for knowledge, resources and opportunities.
- 3) Adequately provide long-term financial stability through an ongoing assessment of the needs.
- 4) Engage the public in all the long-term planning of the system, whether local or at the city level.

We, along with the public, have advocated for a strong library governance model that must include a regular dialogue and engagement process with the patrons of this library.

As it relates to the current state of affairs, we feel that a renovation and/or expansion of the current Central Branch is the best option for the following reasons:

- 1) It is likely to be the least costly alternative and thus reduces the burden on the taxpayers of this city

- 2) It will retain the embedded energy that is currently in the building thus reducing the overall carbon footprint of the rejuvenation of the Central Branch
- 3) It will retain the heritage integrity of the building and thus the Victoria Park Heritage Conservation District
- 4) It should reduce the anxiety of the overall capital planning in the city by reducing the need for debt borrowing and therefore allow for more of the capital deficit to be removed

Because the needs as explained below may not have been strongly supported by the current Request for Qualifications or its applicants, the RFQ may need to be reissued so as to bring in the required skills and resources. Further, the scope of the project may need to be redone so as to fit the scope suggested below.

Under the current state of affairs, as explained in the report, the Friends of the Regina Public Library, given the needs explained above, would recommend that Regina City Council support:

Option 1 c) submit capital plans to renovate its existing main library building using current reserve (\$18.5 million) and the funds generated from the dedicated 5.5 % library mill rate to date.

For the renovation, if needed, follow Option 1a) continuing the 5.5% dedicated mill rate or Option 1 b) increasing the dedicated mill rate to 10% or 20%.

If a long-term expansion is seen as needed by the Regina citizens, apply:

Option 1.d) include a limit of \$51.2 million total project costs (estimated cash savings through dedicated mill rates plus RPL's reserve) in its Request For Proposal (RFP).

The RPL claims that all options are open (to retain and renovate the current building, put on an addition, rent and renovate an existing building, or build elsewhere) but it only allowed people with access to the SaskTenders site to see the Fall of 2025 Request for Qualifications for Central. The RFQ contained extensive details about plans for Central, and many librarian desires for the many new services and spaces they say they need, leading to a supposition of a need for a much larger building. The RPL should make the Fall 2025 RFQ more publicly available.

The RPL should also publicly list who it has selected to invite to its Request for Proposals and the basic outline of what they are proposing, which was

part of the Request for Qualifications. The public and City Council need more information on what the RPL hopes they will support to make choices on what the public wants to support.

The RPL should stop adding on new services that require extra space. The RPL should rent space nearby in the downtown for needed services, in partnership with other socially minded organizations.

The RPL's Service Points Master Plan for library locations and services throughout Regina should have been done before big plans were made for Central Library, since there will be costs associated with providing library services in older and newer neighbourhoods. A draft of the plan is apparently hoped to go to the RPL Board this Spring and be publicly available in the latter half of 2026.

Library patrons love the Central Library building and see no reason to demolish it. Central Library is already a hub of downtown, providing great services. Making the downtown more safe means everyone addressing social issues. Making the downtown more attractive to visitors requires businesses and organizations working together. A big new library is not a solution. Preserve our heritage library building and contribute to the variety that will make the downtown attractive. Don't spend a lot of money on one building when there are needs in other branches serving neighbourhoods across the city.

Sincerely,

Joanne Havelock
Friends of the Regina Public Library

Regina Public Library wishes to speak to the considerations and opportunities presented by the City's Financial Strategy and Sustainability Unit in its Debt, Other Capital Funding Considerations, and Opportunities for Central Library Renewal Project report being presented to City Council at its regular meeting on March 25, 2026.

RPL is interested in talking about the report and the opportunities it presents, and to request a decision by Council that will let us move forward.

Submitted by Jeff Barber, Regina Public Library

I have been following the news about Central Library "renewal" and must say I was greatly relieved so see that, for financial reasons, demolishing the current building and building a new Central Library is no longer likely to happen.

As you know, the RPL Board first proposed Central Library "renewal" in 2009. What you may not know is that, ever since that first proposal, a number of Regina citizens, myself included, have been speaking out against it. At one point the proposal was to demolish Central Library and turn the property over to the Hill Group to build an office tower, with a few floors devoted to the Library. But the Hill Group also wanted the Mason's property next door and when the Mason's refused to sell, the idea was dropped.

The reasons we have given over the years for keeping the current Central Library include the following:

- Central Library has a heritage designation. Built in 1962, it is a beautiful modernist building designed by internationally known Regina architect Kiyoshi Izumi. We should stop destroying our city's architectural heritage.
- The Library Board claims that a new library will help to revitalize Regina's downtown. The current library is already crucial to the vitality of Regina's downtown area. As well as drawing book-lovers to the downtown area, Central library also houses the only downtown movie theatre, the RPL Film theatre, and the Dunlop Art Gallery.
- Is there any guarantee that a new Central Library would include a film theatre or an art gallery? Why not keep what we have which includes these invaluable facilities!
- Central Library is in a perfect location. It is where Regina's first library, the Carnegie Library, was built in 1910. It is also right across the street from beautiful Victoria Park and within a couple of blocks of Regina's main downtown shopping area. However, the Library Board seems to be pushing, not only for a new building, but also for a new location.
- The Library Board frequently claims that Central Library was built to serve a city about half the size Regina has become and therefore we need a bigger library. This claim ignores the fact that, since Central Library opened in 1962, five new branch libraries have opened. It is also clear to anyone who visits Central Library that, while it is very well-used, it is not normally over-crowded.

- What repairs does Central Library require? If it's a new roof, then get one. If it's a new boiler, then get one. If such repairs are needed, it does not mean we need a new library. Do we demolish our homes when they require a new roof or a new boiler?
- There is the question of public consultation. There has only been one public meeting on the matter, held in February 2020 on the 2nd floor of Central Library. The meeting was packed, with over 100 people in attendance—all but one of whom spoke strongly in favour of keeping the current building. The wishes of the people of Regina should not be ignored! It is, after all, our library.
- Demolishing Central Library will have terrible environmental costs, including the fact that the current building will end up in the landfill.
- Finally, there is the question of money. Renovation will cost a whole lot less than demolition and replacement.

Please consider these reasons for keeping Central Library.

Submitted by Florence Stratton, Regina, SK

CM26-2 Debt, Other Capital Funding Considerations, and Opportunities for Central Library Renewal Project

Good day :

As a frequent visitor to Central Library, I was surprised when I opened its webpage nearly 2 weeks ago, and found an RPL Board member's letter urging the public to contact city council about the 'Renewal' (demolition and replacement) of Central Library, one of the most useful and iconic buildings still left in downtown Regina.

Then the following week, on March 17th, an article in the Leader-Post repeated, at greater length, the same statements --- particularly the 17 year delay, in attending to the more outstanding infrastructure problems even though there would seem to have been ample opportunities for repair and renovation during that 17 year time period.

On a personal note, I went on a public tour of Central Library in 2012, during which time the staff member guiding us spoke specifically about concerns with the boilers, the roof, and the wiring, but provided no answers for the delay in fixing those problems. 10 years later, in 2022, there was a similar tour and the same problems were mentioned, but again, no reasons given for the failure to remedy those issues. The Central Library has been assessed more than once, and the soundness of its structure has been particularly noted.

The option still exists to repair and renovate the building, and even to construct an addition on the west side which could provide the space regarded as so essential for the library's continued existence. An addition could also address the accessibility and service issues raised in the RPL Board member's letter, while presumably costing less than a new building. Other buildings even older than Central Library have been successfully renovated, for example : the one presently housing the Globe Theatre Company.

To conclude, I sincerely hope that a way can be found to preserve the Central Library, and keep it standing in its present form and location for many years to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion on this topic.

Shawne Arzab
Regina, Saskatchewan

Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Jim Elliott and live in Regina. As a city that has embraced the goal of being a bird-friendly city, I thought that you should be aware of a new standard for window design has been approved internationally to reduce the potential of bird collisions with windows.

The city should be proactive in their pursuit of excellence and where new construction is occurring in the city, the best and highest standard should be the choice going forward. Therefore, I would encourage your administration to include this standard in your actions as it relates to building construction, whether civic or private.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

High-rise glass buildings pose immense dangers to birds. In the United States alone, up to 2 billion birds are killed yearly due to collisions with glass, according to the American Bird Conservancy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

To reduce those numbers, the glass industry has fabricated specialized architectural glass and has worked with regulators to produce guides and standards.

This includes the addition of "

" in ASHRAE 189.1 and the International Green Construction Code. The addendum was approved by ASHRAE and the American National Standards Institute on Jan. 30, 2026. It introduces a new bird-friendly design requirement for building facades to promote uniformity around glazing requirements. It is written as a jurisdictional option to fit a region's particular environment.

"Research on bird-friendly glazing for collision prevention has guided the development of bird-friendly building design," reads the addendum's forward. "Creating visual markers on the glass at a specific spacing and geometry to interrupt reflections and transparency has been shown to

significantly reduce bird collisions. This addendum specifies requirements for the location and characteristics of this type of glass.”

The addendum’s language applies to vertical windows, spandrel glass, skylights, corner glazing and glazed railings in areas up to 100 feet above grade in new buildings and major alterations. According to Section 5.3.7 of Addendum o, bird-friendly glass should be installed in a new vertical fenestration area that is being replaced during existing building renovations.

Furthermore, the first or second surface of the bird-friendly glazing should have opaque, translucent or ultraviolet reflective visual markers not smaller than 1/8 inch, not more than 2 inches between linear continuous visual markers and a density pattern such that a circle with a diameter no more than 2.7 inches will fit between discrete point visual markers. The glazing should also have a bird-friendly configuration, including opaque, etched and ultraviolet reflective markers approved by the jurisdiction.

Several exemptions to the above section include places of religious worship and buildings on the National Register of Historic Places.

March 22, 2026

RE: Review of Nuisance and Derelict Properties Heritage Community

I am here today speaking on behalf of the Heritage Community Association to formally request immediate, proactive action regarding the growing number of derelict, abandoned, and vacant properties in the Heritage neighbourhood, we do not agree with the recommendation to stay doing what we are doing. Over many months-years, the proliferation of the many properties in the community has severely impacted the quality of life, safety and economic stability in the Heritage community. The many blighted locations are not only unsightly but they represent significant negative impact and messaging in the community, I am confident you are aware of these as they have been in conversation for many years.

-Public Safety Risks, these unsecured, boarded up homes attract squatting, vandalism, and illegal activities which continue to place an unnecessary burden and cost on local resources including local fire and police.

-Health and Environmental Hazards; overgrown lots and accumulated refuse encourage rodents, unhygienic conditions to name a few. Once buildings are down, empty lots pose problems aswell.

-Depressed property values; the presence of these properties continues to reduce the value of surrounding homes and community overall

I urge you, City Council to adopt a more in real time approach to these derelict and nuisance properties, have some things been done; yes but has enough been done? Absolutely NOT. The Heritage Community Association supports a proactive approach however it needs to be done in a more efficient real time frame, the decrease in the demolition budget is not helpful and worrisome.

-Stronger bylaw enforcement, there simply are not enough by law officers

-Accelerated remediation, at the rate we are going what is the anticipated time frame to have this under control?

-Encouraging reinvestment, streamlining investment from start to finish.

The Heritage neighbourhood deserves to be safe, clean, and vibrant. We continue to be committed to do our part, but we need the city to take decisive action against negligent

property owners. The current system is not being taken seriously, it continues to be a problem because quite simply it can be with no consequences attached for many. It has become a game with community losing. Reality is this continues to be a problem and what we are doing is not working in real time. We continue to feel like we are a forgotten community, we continue to see the same boarded up houses, overgrown empty lots for years on end and wonder why other communities in the City of Regina are not subject to this neglect. We encourage the City of Regina to have and enforce the same messaging to landowners, no matter where they are located and for the consequences to be enforced. We encourage the City of Regina to establish a property tax subclass for Nuisance and Derelict properties.

Thank you for your time, attention and commitment to the Heritage community.

In Friendship,

Wendy Miller, Executive Director, Heritage Community Association



March 20, 2026

CP26-13

His Worship Mayor Bachynski and Members of Regina City Council
Queen Elizabeth II Court
PO Box 1790
Regina, SK
S4P 3C8

Dear Mayor and Council,

We respectfully urge Council to consider a previous motion suggesting the city should create a new property subclass with higher taxation rates for boarded-up or chronically vacant buildings and for downtown parking lots.

North Central and Heritage residents have been asking the City of Regina to address the issue of derelict houses for several years. These properties include homes deemed abandoned, unsafe, unfit for habitation, have severe outstanding safety/maintenance issues and pose significant safety and fire risks in our neighbourhood.

Although council heard that demolitions of nuisance properties tripled between the fall of 2022 and the fall of 2025 from 14 to 45 annually and that the majority were in the north central community (formerly Ward 3) there is more that could be done to encourage redevelopment, remediation, or the sale of neglected properties.

The availability of safe, affordable housing is an issue in our community, and the application of a substantive subclass tax penalty could compel the offending homeowner(s) to sell or remediate their properties vs. doing nothing.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to improving the wellbeing of the north central community and its' residents.

Sincerely,

Pat Faulconbridge

Executive Director
North Central Community Association
3355 6th Avenue, Regina SK S4T 4L8

exec.director@nccaregina.ca

306-791-9888 or cell: 306-527-3988



Who we are: The *North Central Community Association* incorporated in August 1976, and our mission is to enhance, engage and represent our diverse neighborhood by coordinating the delivery of programs for residents and facilitating community partnerships and other services.

- The delivery of our programs directly advances the City of Regina’s strategic priorities: Recreation Plan, Community Safety & Wellbeing Plan, and the Culture Plan.

Where we are located: In the māmawêyatitân centre along with City of Regina, Regina Public Schools Scott Collegiate and Daycare, Regina Public Library, Regina Police Service, Regina Fire & Protective Services, Chili for Children, RTSIS Youth Programs and Growing Young Movers.

Who we serve: North Central is one of the largest inner-city neighbourhoods in the City of Regina. It’s boundaries are defined by the CP tracks to the south and McKinley Avenue tracks to the north and between Albert Street and Lewvan Drive. It serves a population of approximately 10,000 people in an area of 183 square blocks, consisting of 4300 homes and over one hundred businesses and organizations and includes two urban First Nations: Piapot Cree Nation Urban Reserve and Cowessess Urban First Nation.

Current demographics include a significant Indigenous population, Newcomers to Canada and long-time residents who have lived in the community for generations and is comprised of marginalized low-income families who are living in poverty, many who are facing addictions, mental illness, violence, inadequate/substandard housing, and property crime. We believe the core cause of these issues are born out of economic, social, educational, and cultural poverty.

Position Paper: Nuisance and Derelict Properties in Al Ritchie & Eastview

***Submitted by: Al Ritchie Community Association (ARCA) &
Queen City Eastview Community Association (QCECA)***

1. Purpose

This position paper is submitted to City Council's Executive Committee in response to Report EX25-114: Review of Nuisance and Derelict Properties.

We write on behalf of residents, families, seniors, and frontline community organizations in Al Ritchie and Eastview—two neighbourhoods that experience the direct, daily impacts of nuisance and derelict properties.

Our position is clear:

Maintaining the current approach is not sufficient.

We need stronger tools, including a property tax subclass, to address chronic neglect and protect our communities.

2. The Reality on the Ground in Our Neighbourhoods

While the report outlines administrative processes and improvements, it does not fully capture the lived experience in neighbourhoods like ours.

Derelict properties are not abstract policy issues—they are:

- Boarded-up homes next to families with young children
- Vacant structures attracting fires, vandalism, and criminal activity
- Chronic safety risks within walking distance of schools, parks, and community centres
- Symbols of neglect that erode pride and mental well-being

The report itself confirms:

- Derelict properties create fire hazards, structural instability, and crime risks
- They reduce housing opportunities and neighbourhood vibrancy
- They disproportionately impact neighbourhoods with higher Indigenous populations and vulnerability levels

This is not theoretical for us—this is our daily environment.

3. Disproportionate Impact on Core Neighbourhoods

The data shows that demolitions are heavily concentrated in specific wards (notably Ward 3 and Ward 6) —areas that include or border neighbourhoods like ours.

This reinforces a critical truth:

Core neighbourhoods are carrying a disproportionate burden of derelict properties in Regina.

In Al Ritchie and Eastview, this results in:

- Increased strain on community-based organizations
- Greater demand on volunteer-led safety and beautification efforts
- Ongoing pressure on already stretched social services
- Barriers to investment, housing development, and family retention

4. The Limits of “Staying the Course”

Administration recommends continuing the proactive enforcement approach and not implementing a tax subclass.

While we acknowledge improvements in enforcement and increased demolitions since 2024, we must be clear:

This approach alone is not enough.

Key limitations:

a) Enforcement is reactive and resource-limited

- The system still relies heavily on compliance orders, inspections, and lengthy processes
- Prosecution is described as “lengthy and resource intensive”

b) There is no meaningful financial consequence for neglect

- Property owners can hold derelict buildings with minimal carrying cost
- This creates perverse incentives to delay action indefinitely

c) Demolition capacity is shrinking

- With reductions in demolition budgets (as highlighted in the email), even improved enforcement cannot keep pace

5. Why a Property Tax Subclass is Necessary

The report acknowledges that:

- Edmonton's tax subclass increased demolition of derelict properties
- It served as an effective incentive for action

Despite this, it is not recommended due to administrative burden.

From our perspective:

Administrative complexity should not outweigh community harm.

A property tax subclass would:

1. Shift Accountability

Make it financially unsustainable to leave properties boarded and abandoned.

2. Accelerate Redevelopment

Encourage owners to:

- Repair
- Sell
- Redevelop

3. Reduce Long-Term Costs

Prevent:

- Fires
- Emergency responses
- Repeated bylaw enforcement cycles

4. Create Fairness

Responsible homeowners should not subsidize neglectful ownership.

6. Community Well-Being and Safety

The report aligns this issue with the Community Safety & Well-Being Plan

From our frontline experience:

Derelict properties directly impact:

- Perceived and actual safety

- Children’s ability to safely play outdoors
- Mental health of residents
- Community cohesion and trust

We operate spaces where residents come daily because they feel safe and supported.

Every neglected property undermines that trust.

7. Housing and Revitalization Impacts

The City’s broader goals include:

- Housing growth
- Intensification
- Neighbourhood revitalization

Yet derelict properties:

- Sit idle for years
- Block infill development
- Reduce available housing supply

In a housing crisis, leaving properties unused is unacceptable.

8. Our Position

We strongly support a dual approach:

1. Continue Proactive Enforcement

AND

2. Implement a Property Tax Subclass for Nuisance & Derelict Properties

This is not an either/or decision.

We need every tool in the toolbox.

9. Recommendations to Council

We recommend that City Council:

1. Amend the current recommendation to include:

- Development and implementation of a property tax subclass

2. Allocate resources accordingly

- Assessment capacity
- Inspection support

3. Prioritize high-impact neighbourhoods

- Including Al Ritchie and Eastview

4. Establish clear timelines

- For classification, enforcement, and resolution
-

10. Closing Statement

Al Ritchie and Eastview are strong, resilient, community-driven neighbourhoods.

We have:

- Built trust with residents
- Created safe, welcoming spaces
- Delivered programs that respond to real needs

But we cannot do this alone.

When derelict properties are ignored, it sends a message that our neighbourhoods are acceptable places for neglect.

We reject that.

We ask Council to act with urgency, fairness, and courage.

Submitted by Denis Simard, Al Ritchie Community Association, Regina, SK

His Worship Mayor Bachynski and Members of Regina City Council
Queen Elizabeth II Court
PO Box 1790
Regina, SK

Dear Mayor and Council,

I respectfully urge Council to support the creation of a property subclass for nuisance and abandoned properties and buildings and to update bylaw enforcement to adequately address the important and ever increasing problems that these properties create for our neighbourhoods.

I am a resident of the Heritage neighbourhood. In my six years of living in this neighbourhood, I have witnessed a high number of properties (both residential and commercial) fall into disrepair, become boarded up, and often burn to the ground. (See attached photos and please note that the photos included below, are only a small sample of the many examples of derelict properties in the Heritage neighbourhood. These are all found within 3 blocks of one another). Some of these properties remain burnt and boarded up, for months and years, creating an inhospitable, un-healthy and environmentally detrimental environment for all residents. This problem isn't only an issue in the Heritage neighbourhood. Many other neighbourhoods, including North Central, Cathedral and Al Richie are host to nuisance properties, and the problem has only increased over the past few years. Council needs to take decisive action to address increasingly dire issue, and must make delinquent and neglectful property owners accountable for the state of these properties.

In consideration of the City's recently approved Strategic Plan, which claims to prioritize Infrastructure, Vibrancy, Livability, and Prosperity, I ask council to consider, whether the photos attached to this letter, represent a livable, vibrant, prosperous and accessible city for its residents.

Derelict properties negatively affect everyone in the neighbourhood, while also reflecting negatively on the city as a whole and this problem needs support from many angles. I support the proposal, presented by Councilor Flores, to create a property sub-class for increased taxation for nuisance and abandoned properties. This proposal has precedence in other cities, and would bring in additional, much needed tax revenues for the city. I believe that this is only one of many steps needed, to support the vibrancy and liveability of our neighbourhoods, and I urge Council to vote in favour of any motions that support this initiative.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to the wellbeing of Regina residents.

Sincerely,



Amber Phelps Bondaroff,

Heritage Resident, and Chair of the Heritage Community Association Board of Directors



His Worship Mayor Bachynski and Members of Regina City Council
Queen Elizabeth II Court
PO Box 1790
Regina, SK

Dear Mayor and Council,

I respectfully urge Council to support the creation of a property subclass for nuisance and abandoned properties and buildings and to update bylaw enforcement to adequately address the important and ever increasing problems that these properties create for our neighbourhoods.

I am a resident of the Heritage neighbourhood. In my 14 years of living in this neighbourhood, I have witnessed a high number of properties (both residential and commercial) fall into disrepair, become boarded up, and often burn to the ground. Some of these properties (see attached photos) remain burnt and boarded up, for months and years, creating an inhospitable, un-healthy and environmentally detrimental environment. This problem isn't only an issue in the Heritage neighbourhood. Many other neighbourhoods, including North Central, Cathedral and Al Richie are host to nuisance properties, and the problem has only increased over the past few years.

In consideration of the City's recently approved Strategic Plan, which claims to prioritize Infrastructure, Vibrancy, Livability, and Prosperity, I respectfully ask Council to consider whether the photos attached to this letter represent a livable, vibrant, prosperous and accessible city for its residents.

Derelict properties negatively affect everyone in the neighbourhood, while also reflecting negatively on the city as a whole. I support the proposal, presented by Councilor Flores, to create a property sub-class for increased taxation for nuisance and abandoned properties. This proposal has precedence in other cities, and would bring in additional, much needed tax revenues for the city. I believe that this is only one of many steps needed, to support the vibrancy and liveability of our neighbourhoods, and I urge Council to vote in favour of any motions that support this initiative.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to the wellbeing of all Regina residents.

Sincerely,

Name Ryan Hill,

ANY TITLES OR OTHER ASSOCIATIONS YOU MIGHT WANT TO INCLUDE

Dear City Council:

I write to voice my opposition to Administration's recommendation to maintain the status quo approach to derelict properties (CR26-35). City Council approved a motion in 2024 that demanded further action on nuisance, derelict, and underutilized properties. Today's state-of-affairs can be attributed to a sad reality: that for years, the City of Regina did little to nothing to confront a growing socio-economic crisis in communities like North Central and Heritage. That was a consequence of ignoring pleas from residents, certain Councillors, and even City staff who flagged policy shortfalls and identified the absence of real, political will to take to task awful landlords and property owners.

While the municipality cannot shoulder all of the responsibility for what has unfolded in inner city communities, it should take ownership for dragging its feet on matters that fall squarely in its own wheelhouse of authority. Specifically, implementing mechanisms that address the state of derelict, abandoned, and nuisance properties through Bylaws and tax mechanisms. It's a matter of carrots and sticks. Real change only started to happen around 2020, when the Mayor and Council at the time demanded change. City Administration was onboard, and there was movement. The report before you shows that. But the new approach meant the City was picking up the tab on a massive backlog of demolitions, which was allowed to accumulate for the better part of a decade.

What my own research, and evidence from other municipalities (large urban centers and small towns) demonstrates, is that dedicated mill rate subclasses shape part of a broader revitalization strategy. Make it financially painful to allow derelict and nuisance properties to drag down neighbourhoods. Make the owners of these properties pay a higher share of the costs that are otherwise shouldered by the balance of ratepayers in Regina. Property subclasses are but one tool that can be paired with existing strategies related to community revitalization, bylaw enforcement, and rejuvenating underutilized spaces.

It's my opinion that the costs associated with this motion in the report are a means to dissuade Council from using the tax structure to address a problem. Everything has a price tag, and the use of a subclass will not generate a windfall for the City, but such a policy is part of a long-term solution aimed at reducing the burden on honest ratepayers, and that contributes to other revitalization efforts. We also know they can work when skillfully deployed.

I urge you to reject the status quo recommendation, and to pursue a more aggressive approach to neighbourhood renewal. The people in these affected communities deserve it.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Stevens

Ward 3 resident

Former City Councillor (2016-2024)

PRESENTATION TO COUNCIL RE: MN26-3. Accessible Playground Design Standard and Grants. What makes sense and works.

I have been thinking about how to say this in the traditional way of Council. I struggled. I gave up on that Brain Ache. So here it is plainly, as I see it **and feel it**.

This is a dog's breakfast. The way things sit right now, there will never be another playground built in Regina. The Standards are too stringent and too expensive and don't make sense for every situation. Here is an easy example. The Standard says you have to have 15 trees. No mention of the size of the land you are using. If I'm in a tiny pocket park and all I want are a few swings in a small green space, I need 15 trees? And what does 15 trees have to do with Accessibility?

And the rules around qualifying for grants has some crazy things too. You have to already have 40% of your total budget raised to qualify for the new Accessible Playground Grant. How does that help a small group like ours who have been doing fundraising for over 2 years now and have a significant amount of money raised but inflation and ever-growing details keep moving the goal posts?

We have gotten very limited assistance from City Administration on how to go about making our way through this process. Just when that seems to be improving there is another roadblock thrown up.

The steps of the process are duplicated. If I have my plan okayed by Recreation and Parks why do I have to again answer all the particulars with the Grant people? Playgrounds that are built on City land have to meet all the Accessibility Standards. Therefore, the Grant people can rightfully assume all Standards are met because otherwise, we wouldn't be able to build and we wouldn't need the grant money. If a plan is

okayed why would the garbage can people be coming back with a 'no' and more demands, or the parking people, or whatever other department? Those 'T's' have been crossed and those 'i's' dotted.

And why are benches and garbage cans even a Community Associations responsibility? That should be up to the City to arrange and pay for.

And a designated parking spot for a neighbourhood level playground in a residential area where there are already people able to park fine on a street? How is an Accessible spot any different? There is plenty of parking every day. Why is this even an issue; and an issue that could kibosh a whole plan for an Accessible playground, to boot.

There isn't enough money to have the kind of playground the Standards demand, especially when it is Community Associations, parent groups and other volunteer organizations having to come up with the money, the design, and the momentum to forge through this time-consuming, complex process. **I swear**, it feels like the City doesn't really want any more playgrounds built for our kids to enjoy. This is a mess. The left hand doesn't know what the right hand **is doing**. The right hand doesn't agree with what the left hand **wants** and everyone is stuck on making **their point**, the important one.

Meanwhile, the 15% of school age kids who have special needs, go without a playground. The 85% of other kids go without a playground. Parents, Community Associations and volunteer groups give up in frustration and **NOTHING** improves or gets done.

Keeping this in the realm of Councillors or moving it under Administration control doesn't matter. Neither of them can make this work on their own. **Together, along with affected groups**, need to be involved, have input and come up with what actually works.

Can someone **please** get everyone in the same room, at the same table and talk this all through? By everyone I mean, Councillors, **all** the departments that a new playground build would touch, Community Associations, parent groups, volunteer organizations who are the grass roots of a neighbourhood improvement. Can **someone**, whoever has the power to do this, **please** pull everyone together and sort this out? Things are unworkable the way they are and the families and residents of Regina are suffering for it.

Submitted by Connie Buchan, Regent Park Community Association, Regina, SK

I will speaking on behalf of the Accessible advisory committee:

Councillors, I write to you today as the Chair of your Accessibility Advisory Committee. I am also a Board Member of SaskAbilities, the CEO of St. John Ambulance Saskatchewan, a father and resident of Ward 2 in Regina.

I am quite proud of Regina's Accessible Playground Design Standards. They do not reinvent the wheel, and many of our playgrounds in Regina are still inaccessible to people like my son who uses a wheelchair, others with mobility impairments, the elderly and more. However, new playgrounds and a progressive update of current parks means they can increasingly participate in their community and use municipal services like others.

The Committee and I are extremely concerned with this motion attempting to give dispensation for certain groups to disregard this standard and build playgrounds that only some will be able to use, under the guise of saving costs. Allowing and endorsing schools to underserve part of their student body is offensive and short-sighted.

I understand that providing service to people experiencing disability can cost more, can be more complicated, and can be more time-consuming. It's less of a headache not to serve them. They can sit in the corner during recess. Perhaps these schools can petition legislators to be able to deny admission to children experiencing disability altogether. It would be cheaper. On the other hand, it is shown that the accessible standards are not more expensive if designed properly and that rubber surfacing is less expensive in maintenance cost than engineered wood fiber. The argument that accessibility costs more in playground design is a myth. We understand the City of Regina is conducting a thorough investigation that will show this with proof in an upcoming report in the fall. Please ask your Administration about this during the Council meeting.

Specifically concerning the motion, I fully support the concept of consulting on the standards and if they require review. However, I question the effort to "delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, City Planning & Community Services or designate to approve future changes to the Accessible Playground Design Standard." Giving the ability to modify, reduce or eliminate accessibility standards, without any public scrutiny or accountability is alarming to say the least. As the saying goes, "democracy dies in darkness". Anything that decreases accessibility should go through the Accessibility Advisory Committee, not to consult, but recommend, and then discussed in public at executive meeting.

With the support of the City of Regina Accessibility Advisory Committee, I encourage you to reject this discriminatory motion, or to amend it to maintain transparency, maintain service to the 25-30% of the residents you represent, and prevent organizations from flouting your rules in the pursuit of cost-cutting.

Submitted by Vanessa Rodriguez

Hello

I am Blake Turnbull, I am a 7 year old wheelchair user and I wanted to come to council to tell you how important it is for me and my friends to play.

I want to stop woodchips because they hurt me, and they don't let me play.

I want to play at recess and at playgrounds with my friends.

I have lots of friends some who walk, some who talk with their bodies, some who use wheelchairs and we all matter.

I am 7, and I have spent most of my life coming to council asking regina to make things for everyone to use. Then I watch regina take them away. Please don't take away this too. I matter. My friends matter. Don't let the new accessible rules be able to be changed.

Submitted by Blake Turnbull, Regina, SK

Delegation to Regina City Council – March 25

DE26-37

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

I am here to speak to item MN26-3 regarding the Accessible Playground Design Standard.

I am not in support of this recommendation.

This Council made a deliberate and important decision to raise the standard for accessible playgrounds. That decision reflected your role as elected officials — to set policy, establish standards, and define what inclusion looks like in our city.

Because of that decision, we moved from a reality where individuals using wheelchairs could not even enter playground spaces, to one where accessibility is being meaningfully addressed. That is not a small administrative detail — that is a policy choice rooted in values.

And that is exactly why it should remain with Council.

Delegating authority to Administration to change these standards removes that accountability. These are not technical adjustments; they are decisions about equity, inclusion, and who gets to participate in public spaces. Those decisions belong in this chamber, not behind administrative processes.

We would not delegate changes to building code standards in this way. Building codes exist to protect safety, ensure consistency, and uphold a minimum standard across the community. Accessibility standards should be treated with the same level of importance and oversight. They should not be subject to interpretation or modification without public debate and Council approval.

Additionally, while consultation with school boards and community groups is valuable, those stakeholders should inform decisions — not define or alter the standards themselves. The authority must remain with the body elected to represent the public.

If Council believes the standard needs to be revisited, then Council should debate and decide those changes openly and transparently.

Accessibility is not an administrative detail. It is a public commitment.

I urge you to reject the delegation of authority and retain Council's responsibility for any future changes to the Accessible Playground Design Standard.

Thank you for your time.

Submitted by Terina Nelson, Regina, SK

Councillors, I write to you today as the Chair of your Accessibility Advisory Committee. I am also a Board Member of SaskAbilities, the CEO of St. John Ambulance Saskatchewan, a father and resident of Ward 2 in Regina.

I am quite proud of Regina's Accessible Playground Design Standards. They do not reinvent the wheel, and many of our playgrounds in Regina are still inaccessible to people like my son who uses a wheelchair, others with mobility impairments, the elderly and more. However, new playgrounds and a progressive update of current parks means they can increasingly participate in their community and use municipal services like others.

The Committee and I are extremely concerned with this motion attempting to give dispensation for certain groups to disregard this standard and build playgrounds that only some will be able to use, under the guise of saving costs. Allowing and endorsing schools to underserve part of their student body is offensive and short-sighted.

I understand that providing service to people experiencing disability can cost more, can be more complicated, and can be more time-consuming. It's less of a headache not to serve them. They can sit in the corner during recess. Perhaps these schools can petition legislators to be able to deny admission to children experiencing disability altogether. It would be cheaper. On the other hand, it is shown that the accessible standards are not more expensive if designed properly and that rubber surfacing is less expensive in maintenance cost than engineered wood fiber. The argument that accessibility costs more in playground design is a myth. We understand the City of Regina is conducting a thorough investigation that will show this with proof in an upcoming report in the fall. Please ask your Administration about this during the Council meeting.

Specifically concerning the motion, I fully support the concept of consulting on the standards and if they require review. However, I question the effort to "delegate authority to the Deputy City Manager, City Planning & Community Services or designate to approve future changes to the Accessible Playground Design Standard." Giving the ability to modify, reduce or eliminate accessibility standards, without any public scrutiny or accountability is alarming to say the least. As the saying goes, "democracy dies in darkness". Anything that decreases accessibility should go through the Accessibility Advisory Committee, not to consult, but recommend, and then discussed in public at executive meeting.

With the support of the City of Regina Accessibility Advisory Committee, I encourage you to reject this discriminatory motion, or to amend it to maintain transparency, maintain service to the 25-30% of the residents you represent, and prevent organizations from flouting your rules in the pursuit of cost-cutting.

Jonathan Tremblay