REVISED PUBLIC AGENDA
MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 8, 2018, 12:00 p.m.
Committee Room E, Ground Floor, City Hall

Members:

Mr. J. Jackson, Chair (Public)
Mr. R. Mowat, Vice-Chair (Public)
  Councillor M. Loewen
  Mr. N. Anwar (Public)
Mr. D. Bazylak (Saskatoon Greater Catholic Schools)
  Ms. D. Bentley (Public)
  Mr. S. Betker (Public)
Dr. C. Christensen, Vice-Chair (Public)
  Ms. D. Fracchia (Public)
Mr. S. Laba (Saskatoon Public Schools)
  Ms. M. Schwab (Public)
  Ms. S. Smith (Public)
  Mr. G. White (Public)

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Recommendation

1. That a request to speak from DeeAnn Mercier, Executive Director, Broadway Business Improvement District, dated May 4, 2018 be added to Item 7.1;

2. That a request to speak from Robert Freberg, President, Saskatoon Wildlife Federation, dated May 4, 2018 be added to Item 7.2; and

3. That the agenda be approved as amended.

3. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Recommendation
That the minutes of Regular Meeting of the Municipal Planning Commission held on April 24, 2018 be adopted.
5. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

6. **COMMUNICATIONS**

7. **REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATION**

7.1 **Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 Amendment – Cannabis - Related Businesses [File No. CK 4350-68 and PL 4005-9-16]**

A request to speak from DeeAnn Mercier, Executive Director, Broadway Improvement District, dated May 4, 2018 is provided.

**Recommendation**
That the Municipal Planning Commission recommend to City Council at the time of the Public Hearing that the proposed amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770, as outlined in the May 8, 2018 report of the General Manager, Community Services Department, be approved.


A request to speak from Robert Freberg, President, Saskatoon Wildlife Federation, dated May 4, 2018 is provided.

**Recommendation**
That the Municipal Planning Commission recommend to City Council at the time of the public hearing that the proposed amendment to Bylaw No. 8770, the Zoning Bylaw, as outlined in the May 8, 2018 report of the General Manager, Community Services Department, be approved.

8. **REPORTS FROM COMMISSION**

8.1 **2018 Planning Conferences**

At its meeting on April 24, 2018 the Commission discussed planning conference attendance and contacting the Committee Assistant regarding member availability. The Commission referred the above matter to the May 8, 2018 meeting for further discussion. A revised attachment is provided.

Commission member conference interest is below:

- SPPI (Saskatoon) - 3 members
- Winter Cities (Saskatoon) - 2 members
- CIP (Winnipeg) - 1 member
Recommendation
That the Municipal Planning Commission provide direction with regard to conference attendance and budget allocation.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 Amendment – Cannabis-Related Businesses

Recommendation
That a copy of this report be submitted to City Council recommending that at the time of the public hearing, City Council consider the Administration’s recommendation that the proposed amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770, as outlined in this report, be approved.

Topic and Purpose
This report proposes amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 that will regulate cannabis-related businesses. The regulations provide accommodation for cannabis retail stores and cannabis production facilities to be established in Saskatoon while ensuring that these land uses are appropriately separated from sensitive land uses.

Report Highlights
1. Proposed amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 (Zoning Bylaw) for the regulation of cannabis-related businesses are outlined.
2. A reduction of the 160-metre separation distance between cannabis-related businesses and sensitive land uses for the B5B – Broadway Commercial District is proposed.
3. The proposed zoning amendments align with the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8769.

Strategic Goals
This report supports the City of Saskatoon’s (City) Strategic Goals of Sustainable Growth and Economic Diversity and Prosperity. Appropriate local regulations for cannabis-related businesses will provide certainty for business in the emerging cannabis industry while ensuring that possible adverse effects on business districts, neighbourhoods, and citizens, are mitigated.

Background
Bill C-45, the Cannabis Act (Bill C-45) has passed second reading in the Senate of Canada and is expected to become law in summer of 2018.

At its April 9, 2018 meeting, the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services received as information a report that outlined the Administration’s proposed approach to regulating cannabis-related business through Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 (Zoning Bylaw). The report also included the proposed regulations and the process undertaken in preparing them, as well as the collection of public input. The previous report is included as Attachment 1.
This report proposes the specific set of amendments to the Zoning Bylaw’s text that are necessary to implement this regulatory approach.

**Report**

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 to Regulate Cannabis-Related Businesses

The Administration is proposing amendments to the text of the Zoning Bylaw that will establish specific regulations for cannabis-related businesses within the bylaw:

- a) introduce and define two new land uses: cannabis retail store and cannabis production facility;
- b) specify the zoning districts in which these two land uses are proposed to be either a permitted or discretionary use;
- c) establish criteria for evaluating a discretionary use application;
- d) specify parking and site development standards for these land uses;
- e) establish a minimum separation distance of 160 metres between cannabis retail stores and between all cannabis-related uses and other specified land uses, except for the Broadway District where the distance will be 60 metres; and
- f) prohibit cannabis-related activities from being operated as a home-based business.

The report to the April 9, 2018 meeting of the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services, included as Attachment 1, should be consulted for a detailed discussion of the regulations.

The specific set of amendments to the Zoning Bylaw text which are necessary to implement the proposed regulatory approach summarized above is included as Attachment 2.

**Reduced Separation Distance for Broadway District Proposed**

The previous report to Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services noted that applying a separation distance of 160 metres in a uniform matter throughout the city would have the effect of eliminating the Broadway District from consideration for a cannabis retail store due to the two schools located in the area.

It is recognized that Broadway’s compact area warrants special consideration. The proposed zoning amendments include a reduced separation distance of 60 metres for the B5B – Broadway Commercial District. This provides opportunity for a cannabis retail store to establish in this area.

**Alignment with Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8769**

Regulations in the Zoning Bylaw are required to conform to the provisions of the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8769 (Official Community Plan). In this respect, the
proposed zoning regulations for cannabis-related businesses support the Official Community Plan’s fundamental values of economic diversity and equity in land use decisions by providing broad opportunity throughout Saskatoon for cannabis-related businesses to establish, while ensuring that potential impacts on community facilities and sensitive uses are mitigated. The Official Community Plan’s commercial land use policies also advocate for commercial areas that appropriately serve the needs of the population.

**Public and Stakeholder Involvement**

**Public Engagement**
A public online survey that was open from Wednesday, January 24, 2018, to Wednesday, February 7, 2018, gave Saskatoon residents the opportunity to provide input on the considerations in identifying regulations for cannabis-related businesses. Approximately 3,700 responses were collected. A representative study of 405 respondents in Saskatoon that balanced gender, age range, and location of residence within the city was also conducted by Insightrix Research, Inc. during this period. The results of the surveys are included in Attachment 1.

**Stakeholder Engagement**
Engagement with multiple stakeholders, including multiple departments within the City of Saskatoon, Saskatoon Police Service, the executive directors of the five BIDs, local school divisions, the provincial health authority, and the Saskatoon Liquor and Gaming Authority has occurred throughout the process of drafting these regulations. Input from prospective operators of cannabis retail stores has also been received and taken into consideration.

**Communication Plan**
The Administration will ensure that the establishment of regulations for cannabis-related businesses is well communicated to residents and prospective business owners through the City’s regular communication channels, such as news releases, social media, and the development of an informational webpage, as well as other information pieces as necessary.

**Financial Implications**
The need for additional resources to support the implementation and continuing oversight of a regulatory regime for cannabis-related business is unknown at this time. Once the reach of Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority’s regulatory oversight in this area is known, and the scope of licensing regulations is established by the City, a determination will be made of required staffing resources. This is expected later in 2018 when proposed business licensing regulations are brought forward.

**Safety/Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)**
Limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop and ensuring the safety of employees and patrons were top considerations identified through the public engagement. The principles of CPTED will be considered in the development of the business license regulations for cannabis-related businesses, where operational
requirements relating to the safety and security of a business premises and its employees and patrons may be appropriate.

**Other Considerations/Implications**
There are no other policy, environmental, or privacy implications.

**Due Date for Follow-up and/or Project Completion**
Further reporting to City Council in 2018 will be necessary to establish business license requirements for cannabis-related businesses, and is anticipated to take the form of a standalone cannabis licensing bylaw.

Other reports addressing proper alignment of the City’s regulations with provincial legislation, as well as proposed changes resulting from a review of the effectiveness of the regulations following legalization, may be necessary in the coming months.

**Public Notice**
Public notice is required for consideration of this matter, pursuant to Section 11(a) of Policy No. C01-021, Public Notice Policy.

Once this application has been considered by the Municipal Planning Commission, it will be advertised in accordance with the Public Notice Policy, and a date for the public hearing will be set. A notice will be placed in The StarPhoenix two weeks prior to the public hearing. Key stakeholders will also be notified of the public hearing date.

**Attachments**
1. Report to April 9, 2018 Meeting of Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services – Proposed Approach to Regulating Cannabis-Related Businesses through Zoning Bylaw No. 8770
2. Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 to Regulate Cannabis-Related Businesses

**Report Approval**
Written by: Brent McAdam, Acting Manager of Business License and Bylaw Compliance
Reviewed by: Jo-Anne Richter, Acting Director of Community Standards
Lesley Anderson, Director of Planning and Development
Approved by: Randy Grauer, General Manager, Community Services Department
Proposed Approach to Regulating Cannabis-Related Businesses through Zoning Bylaw No. 8770

**Recommendation**
That the information be received.

**Topic and Purpose**
This report outlines a proposed approach to regulating cannabis-related businesses through Zoning Bylaw No. 8770. The regulations provide accommodation for cannabis retail stores and cannabis production facilities to be established in Saskatoon while ensuring that these land uses are appropriately separated from sensitive land uses.

**Report Highlights**
1. Current zoning regulations are inadequate to maintain appropriate control over cannabis-related businesses.
2. Regulations are proposed for both cannabis retail stores and cannabis production facilities.
3. A separation distance between cannabis retail stores and production facilities and sensitive land uses is proposed, with consideration being applied to the Broadway District.

**Strategic Goals**
This report supports the City of Saskatoon’s Strategic Goals of Sustainable Growth and Economic Diversity and Prosperity. Appropriate local regulations for cannabis-related businesses will provide certainty for business in the emerging cannabis industry while ensuring that possible adverse effects on business districts, neighbourhoods, and citizens, are mitigated.

**Background**

**Update on Federal and Provincial Responses to Legalization**
The Government of Canada has proposed a framework for the legalization and regulation of cannabis through Bill C-45, the *Cannabis Act* (Bill C-45), which is expected to become law in summer of 2018. At the time of writing this report, Bill C-45 is at a second reading in the Senate of Canada.

In January 2018, the Province of Saskatchewan announced that the retail sale of cannabis will be conducted through private vendors, with regulatory oversight provided by the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority (SLGA). Of the approximately 60 vendor licenses that will initially be issued by SLGA, seven will be allocated to Saskatoon.
Prior Direction from City Council
At their January 29, 2018 meeting, City Council approved proposed amendments to Bylaw No. 8286, The Smoking Control Bylaw, 2004, to broaden the definition of smoking in public places to include cannabis. City Council also authorized Administration to report back on options for the municipal regulation of cannabis in relation to business licensing, zoning, and community standards within the City.

This report outlines the Administration’s proposed approach to addressing the zoning component of the municipal regulation of cannabis.

Report
Current Zoning Regulations Inadequate to Control Cannabis-Related Businesses
Upon legalization, existing zoning regulations would accommodate cannabis-related businesses within Saskatoon, but would not provide adequate control to ensure that this new business sector is introduced in a measured and appropriate way where possible adverse land use impacts are mitigated.

Under the current zoning regulations, cannabis retail stores would be permitted as a retail store in a broad range of commercial, industrial, and specialized zoning districts with no special restrictions such as separation distances. Cannabis production facilities, depending on the processes involved, would likely be permitted within a number of industrial and specialized zoning districts where general production of goods and products or agricultural uses of land are permitted.

Public engagement, including a public survey, a statistically representative survey, as well as consultation with stakeholder groups and internal departments was undertaken in preparation for this report. That engagement indicated some desire among the public and stakeholders to ensure that cannabis retail stores are appropriately separated from sensitive and incompatible land uses. Further, the Administration is of the view that a specialized approach to regulating this new form of legal enterprise is warranted given that the true impacts on the community and adjacent properties are not necessarily known.

Proposed Approach to Regulation through Zoning Bylaw No. 8770
The Administration is proposing amendments to the text of Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 (Zoning Bylaw) that will establish specific regulations for cannabis-related businesses within the bylaw:

a) Introduce and define two new land uses: cannabis retail store and cannabis production facility;
b) Specify the zoning districts in which these two land uses are proposed to be either a permitted or discretionary use;
c) Establish criteria for evaluating a discretionary use application;
d) Specify parking and site development standards for these land uses;
e) Establish minimum separation distances between cannabis retail stores and between all cannabis-related uses and other specified land uses which serve a broad range of youth and vulnerable sectors; and

f) Prohibit cannabis-related activities from being operated as a home-based business.

Cannabis Retail Stores and Cannabis Production Facilities will be Defined

Zoning regulations for cannabis-related business will include new land use definitions for a cannabis retail store and a cannabis production facility. The definition of a cannabis retail store will reflect the type of operation that will be permitted under the provincial framework, which will involve the retail sale of cannabis and related accessories and ancillary items, but will not include manufacturing or processing of products to be sold on-site. The definition of a cannabis production facility will allow for the range of processes involved in the growing, processing, and manufacturing of cannabis and cannabis products.

Cannabis Retail Stores to be Permitted in a Broad Range of Zoning Districts

The range of zoning districts where cannabis retail stores are proposed to be permitted are broad and provide opportunity throughout the city.

The districts proposed to accommodate cannabis retail stores as a permitted use include areas that encompass the Downtown and other Business Improvement Districts (BID), major arterial corridors, suburban centres, and industrial areas. A number of smaller-scale commercial districts, that are intended to provide services at the neighbourhood level, are not proposed for inclusion. This aligns with the public engagement input that expressed high support to permit cannabis retail stores in major commercial areas, moderate support in industrial areas, and low support in small scale neighbourhood commercial areas.

Cannabis retail stores are not proposed to be a discretionary use in any district. The Administration is of the opinion that the retail sale of cannabis, once legal, should be permitted in approximately the same areas that conventional retail stores are permitted, and that concerns around proximity to sensitive and incompatible uses can be adequately addressed through separation distances.

An analysis of the suitability of certain districts, which considered a number of commercial, industrial, and specialized zones where retail stores are currently permitted, is included as Attachment 1. A map depicting the location and extent of these districts throughout the city is included as Attachment 2.

Cannabis Production Facilities to be Permitted in Heavy Industrial and Discretionary in Light Industrial

Cannabis production facilities are proposed to be permitted in the IH – Heavy Industrial District. There are presently no federally-licensed cannabis production facilities located within Saskatoon; however, these types of operations typically take the form of enclosed structures on large, secure sites, which makes the IH District an appropriate location for any type of cannabis production facility. Further, the IH District allows for industrial
activities that may create nuisance conditions outside the boundaries of the subject site. The potential for odours resulting from the growing or production of cannabis is a cited concern, although measures to mitigate odour can be undertaken.

The IL1 – General Light Industrial District is proposed to allow for cannabis production facilities on a discretionary basis, with approval delegated to the Administration. This district is considered to be generally suitable for a cannabis production facility, but that special consideration through the discretionary use review process is warranted to ensure that there are no land use conflicts created. A proposed facility in this district would also need to demonstrate that they would not create nuisance conditions outside the boundaries of their site.

An analysis of the suitability of cannabis production facilities in certain districts is included as Attachment 3, and a map depicting the location and extent of the permitted and discretionary districts proposed is included as Attachment 4.

Separation Distances from Sensitive Uses are Proposed
A separation distance of 160 metres, measured from property line to property line, is proposed between cannabis retail stores and the following uses:
   a) Elementary and High Schools;
   b) Parks;
   c) Community centres (including recreational facilities);
   d) Public libraries;
   e) Child care centres; and
   f) Other cannabis retail stores.

For reference, one block of 2nd Avenue in the Downtown is approximately 150 metres long. A separation of 160 metres is currently established between adult service agencies and residential uses, schools, parks and recreational facilities. It is also in place as a minimum separation between pawnshops.

Restricting cannabis retail stores from establishing in close proximity to the above noted uses, through a separation distance, is intended to reduce the visibility and influence of these stores from sensitive community uses and to mitigate impacts on adjacent properties. Strong support for separation from these uses was expressed in the surveys, where respondents consistently favoured a separation greater than 300 metres. The Administration is recommending a distance of 160 metres because it is an already established standard, and a distance of 300 metres is seen to be unnecessarily restrictive.

While the survey respondents did not similarly favour a separation distance between cannabis retail stores themselves, the Administration is of the opinion that such a separation is an effective means to prevent concentration of the stores in a specific geographic area, which is a concern identified by the BIDs.
A separation distance is recommended for child care centres, but it is important to note that many child care providers operate in an unlicensed capacity with eight or less children under care (known as a family child care home), where a provincial license or municipal approval is not required. Given the incomplete information around the number and location of these providers, Administration anticipates that the separation distance will only be enforceable from provincially licensed child care centres.

A 160 metre separation distance from sensitive uses is also proposed for cannabis production facilities that are permitted in an IH District, with the exception of a separation between cannabis retail stores and cannabis production facilities. Additionally, a separation from residential uses of 160 metres is proposed. Generally, land zoned as an IH District is already well-separated from residential land use and community facilities. In an IL1 District, where proposed production facilities require discretionary use approval, consideration of proximity to sensitive uses can occur during the discretionary use review process.

Impact of Separation Distances on the Broadway District
The Broadway District has the unique circumstance of having two schools within its relatively compact area. Applying a separation distance of 160 metres in a uniform manner across the city will have the impact of eliminating this area from consideration for a cannabis retail store.

Support for this use locating within the BIDs was high among the survey respondents, and an alternative approach to applying separation distances in the Broadway District warrants consideration. City Council may choose to take such an approach to reduce the separation distance within the B5B – Broadway Commercial District. Attachment 6 compares the impact of a separation distance of 160 metres applied to the Broadway District versus a reduced distance of 60 metres, which would accommodate the establishment of a cannabis retail store.

Separation Distances from Social Support Agencies are not Recommended
Input received through the public surveys identified the protection of youth or vulnerable persons as a principal area of concern with respect to regulating cannabis-related businesses, and similarly high support was expressed for separation distances from organizations that assist these client groups, otherwise referred to as social support agencies.

However, setting a separation distance between cannabis retail stores and social support agencies is problematic for a number of reasons:

1. There is presently no specific use defined in the Zoning Bylaw for these types of agencies, and they currently fall under a wide range of land use designations based on their mandate and operations.
2. Given the lack of a defined use, it is difficult to determine what constitutes a social support agency.
3. The Administration would be required to exercise discretion in determining what constitutes a social support agency, which could be vulnerable to challenge.

4. The requirement of a 160-metre separation distance would make it prohibitive for a cannabis retail store to establish in areas that have a high concentration of social support services, such as Riversdale, Broadway, and Downtown (see Attachment 6).

5. A separation distance proposed for community facilities like schools, parks, and community centres is intended to address, in part, concern for cannabis retail stores in close proximity to places frequented by youth.

Therefore, the Administration is not recommending the establishment of a separation distance between cannabis retail stores and organizations that provide support services.

Planning and Development has previously undertaken work to assess the potential to more clearly define social support agencies; however, further study in this area is required. The locations of the social support agencies identified through this review have been mapped in Attachment 7 to illustrate the impact of a separation distance in Riversdale, Broadway, and Downtown where the concentration of these services is highest and therefore the most limiting for cannabis retail stores.

Adoption of Regulations Prior to Legalization Necessary to Maintain Control
The immediate inclusion of regulations in the Zoning Bylaw for cannabis-related businesses is necessary to maintain control once legalization of cannabis occurs and cannabis retail stores and cannabis production facilities begin to establish under the legal framework.

If legalization occurs without specific regulations in place, a cannabis retail store could be legally established in Saskatoon anywhere that a retail store is permitted, with no consideration for proximity to sensitive and incompatible uses. Should zoning regulations be put in place after a cannabis retail store is legally established, it would be considered a non-conforming use and not subject to the new regulations. This underscores the urgent need to amend the Zoning Bylaw prior to legalization.

It is anticipated that further revision to the zoning regulations may be necessary to ensure proper alignment with provincial legislation, and would result from monitoring the effectiveness of the regulations after their initial implementation.

Public and Stakeholder Involvement
Public Engagement
A public online survey that was open from Wednesday, January 24, 2018, to Wednesday, February 7, 2018, gave Saskatoon residents the opportunity to provide input on the considerations in identifying regulations for cannabis-related businesses. Approximately 3,700 responses were collected. A representative study of 405 respondents in Saskatoon that balanced gender, age range, and location of residence within the city was also conducted by Insightrix during this period. The results of the
Public online survey are included as Attachment 7, and the Insightrix study is included as Attachment 8.

**Stakeholder Engagement**
Engagement with multiple stakeholders, including multiple departments within the City of Saskatoon, Saskatoon Police Service, the five BIDs, local school divisions, the provincial health authority, and SLGA has occurred throughout the process of drafting these regulations. Input from prospective operators of cannabis retail stores has also been received and taken into consideration.

**Communication Plan**
The Administration will ensure that the establishment of regulations for cannabis-related businesses is well communicated to residents and prospective business owners through the City's regular communication channels, such as news releases, social media, and the development of an informational webpage, as well as other information pieces as necessary.

**Financial Implications**
The need for additional resources to support the implementation and continuing oversight of a regulatory regime for cannabis-related business is unknown at this time. Once the reach of SLGA’s regulatory oversight in this area is known, and the scope of licensing regulations is established by the City, a determination will be made of required staffing resources. This is expected later in 2018 when proposed business licensing regulations are brought forward.

**Safety/Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)**
Limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop and ensuring the safety of employees and patrons were top considerations identified through the public engagement undertaken. The principles of CPTED will be considered in the development of the business license regulations for cannabis-related businesses, where operational requirements relating to the safety and security of a business premises and its employees and patrons may be appropriate.

**Other Considerations/Implications**
There are no policy, environmental, or privacy implications.

**Due Date for Follow-up and/or Project Completion**
Following consideration of this report, a subsequent report containing a final proposed set of text amendments to the Zoning Bylaw will be forwarded to the Municipal Planning Commission and then to City Council for a public hearing. A public hearing is anticipated to occur at the May or June 2018 meeting of City Council.

Further reporting to City Council in 2018 will be necessary to establish business license requirements for cannabis-related businesses, and is anticipated to take the form of a standalone cannabis licensing bylaw.
Other reports addressing proper alignment of the City’s regulations with provincial legislation, as well as proposed changes resulting from a review of the effectiveness of the regulations following legalization, may be necessary in the coming months.

Public Notice
Public Notice will be required for consideration of this matter when the bylaw containing proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw are forwarded to City Council for a public hearing. Appropriate notice pursuant to Policy No. C01-021, The Public Notice Policy will be provided at that time.

Attachments
1. Cannabis Retail Stores – Analysis of Suitable Zoning Districts
2. Permitted Zoning Districts for Cannabis Retail Stores
3. Cannabis Production Facilities – Analysis of Suitable Zoning Districts
4. Permitted and Discretionary Zoning Districts for Cannabis Production Facilities
5. Impact of Separation Distances in Broadway District
6. Impact of Separation Distance from Social Support Agencies
7. Online Survey – Summary Report
8. Insightrix Study – Summary Report

Report Approval
Written by: Brent McAdam, Acting Manager of Business License and Bylaw Compliance
Reviewed by: Jo-Anne Richter, Acting Director of Community Standards
Lesley Anderson, Director of Planning and Development
Approved by: Randy Grauer, General Manager, Community Services Department

FINAL/APPROVED – R. Grauer March 27, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Suitability for Cannabis Retail Stores</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **B1A** – Limited Neighbourhood Commercial | • intended to serve daily convenience needs of a neighbourhood  
• small scale and limited range of commercial uses | not suitable: prohibit | • districts interface with low-density residential  
• retail stores are prohibited in B1A and limited in size in B1B  
• low support from engagement |
| **B1B** – Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed Use |  
**B1** – Neighbourhood Commercial |  
• intended to serve daily convenience needs of a neighbourhood  
• small scale and limited range of commercial uses | not suitable: prohibit |  
• some B2 sites located in small scale, historic settings that directly interface with low density residential  
• transitional district between lower and higher order commercial districts |
| **B2** – District Commercial | • intended to serve 2-5 neighbourhoods  
• intermediate range of commercial uses | not suitable: prohibit |  
• located along arterial roadways and within suburban centres  
• moderate to wide range of commercial uses  
• larger scale, shopping centre style development |
| **B3** – Medium Density Arterial Commercial |  
**B4** – Arterial and Suburban Commercial |  
**B4A** – Special Suburban Centre and Arterial  
**B4MX** – Integrated Commercial Mixed-Use | suitable: permit |  
• retail stores fully permitted  
• located along major routes and within nodes  
• typically do not directly interface with low density residential  
• typically separated from neighbourhood schools and parks  
• high support from engagement |
| **B5** – Inner-City Commercial Corridor  
**B5B** – Broadway Commercial  
**B5C** – Riversdale Commercial  
**B6** – Downtown Commercial | • historic commercial areas  
• wide range of commercial uses in a medium to high density form | suitable: permit |  
• found in the Business Improvement Districts and City Centre  
• highly flexible range of permitted uses  
• high support from engagement |
| **IL2** – Limited Intensity Light Industrial  
**IL3** – Limited Light Industrial  
**IH2** – Limited Intensity Heavy Industrial | • certain light and heavy industrial uses that do not create public assembly  
• proximity to chemical plants on Wanuskewin Road | not suitable: prohibit |  
• retail stores are prohibited |
| **IL1** – General Light Industrial | • wide range of light industrial activities and related businesses  
• uses may not create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the site | suitable: permit |  
• retail stores fully permitted  
• typically separated from neighbourhood schools, parks, and residential, with exceptions |
| **IH** – Heavy Industrial | • wide range of industrial activities  
• uses may create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the site | suitable: permit |  
• retail stores fully permitted  
• separated from neighbourhood schools, parks, and residential |
| **RA1** – Reinvestment District 1 | • flexible and wide range of uses | suitable: permit |  
• forms part of Downtown along with B6 |
| **MX1** – Mixed Use District 1 | • flexible and wide range of uses | not suitable: prohibit |  
• located in areas that directly interface with low density residential |
| Direct Control Districts (DCD1, DCD3, DCD5, DCD6, DCD8) | • DCD3, DCD5, and DCD6 accommodate large format big box retail  
• DCD1 and DCD8 accommodate mixed used development, including retail | Not recommended for inclusion at this time. |  
• further review and consultation with affected property owners required |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Suitability for Cannabis Retail Stores</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B1A – Limited Neighbourhood Commercial         | • intended to serve daily convenience needs of a neighbourhood                   | not suitable: prohibit                 | • districts interface with low-density residential  
| B1B – Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed Use       | • small scale and limited range of commercial uses                               |                                        | • retail stores are prohibited in B1A and limited in size in B1B  
| B1 – Neighbourhood Commercial                 |                                                                                    |                                        | • low support from engagement                                                                   |
| B2 – District Commercial                       | • intended to serve 2-5 neighbourhoods                                           | not suitable: prohibit                 | • some B2 sites located in small scale, historic settings that directly interface with low density residential  
|                                                | • intermediate range of commercial uses                                         |                                        | • transitional district between lower and higher order commercial districts                      |
| B3 – Medium Density Arterial Commercial        | • located along arterial roadways and within suburban centres                    | suitable: permit                       | • retail stores fully permitted  
| B4 – Arterial and Suburban Commercial          | • moderate to wide range of commercial uses                                     |                                        | • located along major routes and within nodes  
| B4A – Special Suburban Centre and Arterial     | • larger scale, shopping centre style development                               |                                        | • typically do not directly interface with low density residential  
| B4MX – Integrated Commercial Mixed-Use         |                                                                                    |                                        | • typically separated from neighbourhood schools and parks  
|                                                |                                                                                    |                                        | • high support from engagement                                                                  |
| B5 – Inner-City Commercial Corridor            | • historic commercial areas                                                      | suitable: permit                       | • found in the Business Improvement Districts and City Centre  
| B5B – Broadway Commercial                      | • wide range of commercial uses in a medium to high density form                |                                        | • highly flexible range of permitted uses  
| B5C – Riversdale Commercial                    |                                                                                    |                                        | • high support from engagement                                                                  |
| B6 – Downtown Commercial                       |                                                                                    |                                        |                                                                                                  |
| IL2 – Limited Intensity Light Industrial       | • certain light and heavy industrial uses that do not create public assembly   | not suitable: prohibit                 | • retail stores are prohibited                                                                   |
| IL3 – Limited Light Industrial                 | • proximity to chemical plants on Wanuskewin Road                                |                                        |                                                                                                  |
| IH2 – Limited Intensity Heavy Industrial       |                                                                                    |                                        |                                                                                                  |
| IL1 – General Light Industrial                 | • wide range of light industrial activities and related businesses              | suitable: permit                       | • retail stores fully permitted  
|                                                | • uses may not create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the site              |                                        | • typically separated from neighbourhood schools, parks, and residential, with exceptions      |
| IH – Heavy Industrial                          | • wide range of industrial activities                                           | suitable: permit                       | • retail stores fully permitted                                                                  |
|                                                | • uses may create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the subject site          |                                        | • separated from neighbourhood schools, parks, and residential                                  |
| RA1 – Reinvestment District 1                  | • flexible and wide range of uses                                               | suitable: permit                       | • forms part of Downtown along with B6                                                           |
| MX1 – Mixed Use District 1                     | • flexible and wide range of uses                                               | not suitable: prohibit                 | • located in areas that directly interface with low density residential                          |
| Direct Control Districts (DCD1, DCD3, DCD5, DCD6, DCD8) | • DCD3, DCD5, and DCD6 accommodate large format big box retail                  |                                        | • further review and consultation with affected property owners required                        |
|                                                | • DCD1 and DCD8 accommodate mixed used development, including retail            |                                        |                                                                                                  |

Not recommended for inclusion at this time.
Permitted Zoning Districts for Cannabis Retail Stores

NOTE: Subject to applicable separation distances
## Cannabis Production Facilities – Analysis of Suitable Zoning Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Suitability for Cannabis Production Facilities</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IL2 – Limited Intensity Light Industrial | • light and heavy industrial uses that do not create public assembly  
• proximity to chemical plants on Wanuskewin Road | Not suitable: **prohibit** | • manufacturing, processing or packaging of food products currently prohibited due to proximity of chemical plants  
• similarly, production of cannabis unsuitable due to this proximity |
| IL3 – Limited Light Industrial  
IH2 – Limited Intensity Heavy Industrial | | | |
| IL1 – General Light Industrial | • wide range of light industrial activities and related businesses  
• uses may not create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the subject site | Generally suitable: **permit as a discretionary use** | • potential for a diversity of land uses in an IL1 area, including proximity to community facilities, warranting special consideration  
• concerns around processing methods and possible side effects, such as odour, can be addressed through discretionary review |
| IH – Heavy Industrial | • wide range of industrial activities  
• uses may create a nuisance beyond the boundaries of the subject site | Suitable: **permit** | • separated from community facilities  
• nuisances beyond the subject site, such as odour, are permitted |
| AG – Agricultural District | • large scale, specialized land uses (including University of Saskatchewan and Innovation Place) and rural-oriented uses on urban periphery | Not suitable: **prohibit** | • cannabis production facilities could impact long-term planned growth of the city in these areas |
Permitted and Discretionary Zoning Districts for Cannabis Production Facilities

- CITY BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED STREETS
- PERMITTED ZONING DISTRICTS
- DISCRETIONARY ZONING DISTRICTS

NOTE: Subject to applicable separation distances
Impact of Separation Distances in Broadway District

160 m Separation Distance – No Permitted Sites

60 m Separation Distance – Permitted Sites
Impact of Separation Distance from Social Support Agencies

Broadway BID

Downtown BID

Riversdale BID

Note: Only separation distance from social support agencies are illustrated here. Separation distances from other uses, such as schools and parks, are not shown.
Online Survey – Summary Report

Question 1: Do you live within the City limits of Saskatoon?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>51.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>30.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: Into which of the following age ranges do you fall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>51.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>30.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>17.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: What neighbourhood do you live in?
### Question 4: How important is it for the City of Saskatoon to consider each of the following when making decisions about regulating cannabis retail stores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on adjacent properties and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>30.85%</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
<td>21.01%</td>
<td>13.14%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consumption of cannabis</td>
<td>33.57%</td>
<td>29.26%</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
<td>14.88%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious odors from people smoking cannabis</td>
<td>32.19%</td>
<td>24.28%</td>
<td>22.66%</td>
<td>20.43%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of employees and patrons</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting youth and vulnerable persons</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting youth and vulnerable persons</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question5: Do you believe there will be any of the following benefits by establishing cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon? (Select all that apply)

- Economic benefit for nearby businesses: 59.66% (2051)
- Increased business activity in commercial areas: 56.75% (1951)
- Safe access to cannabis products: 85.92% (2954)
- The emergence of a new local industry: 71.73% (2466)
- Economic benefit to Saskatoon overall: 74.52% (2562)
- None of the above: 9.69% (333)

TOTAL: 3438
Question 6: Where in the city should cannabis retail stores be located? (Select all that apply)

- **Industrial areas**: 30.52% (1048)
- **Downtown and the other Business Improvement Districts (i.e. Broadway, Riversdale, Sutherland, 33rd Street)**: 75.13% (2580)
- **Arterial and suburban commercial areas (i.e. 8th Street, 22nd Street West, Lawson Heights commercial area, Confederation commercial areas, etc.)**: 75.66% (2598)
- **Small scale neighbourhood commercial areas (i.e. retail stores located in residential neighbourhoods)**: 40.83% (1402)
- **None of the above**: 5.77% (198)

*Answered 3434*
Question 7: How important is it for the City of Saskatoon to have minimum separation distance between cannabis retail stores and each of the following places?

How important is it for the City of Saskatoon to have minimum separation distance between cannabis retail stores and each of the following places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other cannabis retail stores</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and playgrounds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care facilities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations that assist youth or vulnerable persons</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 8: What would be an appropriate separation distance to set between cannabis retail stores and each of the following places? For reference, one block of 2nd Avenue in downtown is approximately 150m long, although block lengths vary throughout the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>150 m (approx. one block)</th>
<th>300 m (approx. two blocks)</th>
<th>75 m (approx. half a block)</th>
<th>Further than 2 blocks</th>
<th>No separation distance needed</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other cannabis retail stores</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>46.22%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>13.39%</td>
<td>50.99%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and play grounds</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>13.87%</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>26.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care facilities</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>43.76%</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
<td>56.06%</td>
<td>23.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations that assist youth or vulnerable persons</td>
<td>16.51%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>49.58%</td>
<td>49.58%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram shows the percentage of responses for each distance option in relation to the following places:
- Organizations that assist youth or vulnerable persons
- Community centres
- Child care facilities
- Parks and playgrounds
- High schools
- Elementary schools
- Other cannabis retail stores

- Not sure
- No separation distance needed
- Further than 2 blocks
- 75 m (approx. half a block)
- 300 m (approx. two blocks)
- 150 m (approx. one block)
### Question 10: Who are you completing this survey on behalf of?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A business</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community association or community group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A special interest or advocacy group</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself or your family</td>
<td>3274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Saskatoon

2018 Cannabis Public Survey
Study Background & Methodology

In April 2017, the federal government introduced legislation to legalize and regulate recreational cannabis in Canada by July 2018. The City of Saskatoon (hereinafter referred to as the City) is interested in collecting public input with respect to how cannabis should be sold within the city.

To achieve these research objectives, Insightrix conducted an online research study using its SaskWatch Research® panel, resulting in 405 responses. A questionnaire was developed in collaboration with City representatives to meet the study objectives.

Data was collected between January 23rd and February 1st, 2018. A breakdown of the respondents surveyed is included below.

This report provides a summary of the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings
Summary

Youth & Age restriction
• Four in ten residents feel age restriction is among the most important factors that should be considered in regulating cannabis.
• Two in ten spontaneously mention a concern that cannabis may be too easily accessible, specially when it comes to minors.

Law Enforcement
• About one third mention controlled sales as a key benefit of establishing cannabis retail stores, which they believe is likely to cut down the black market.
• However, roughly two in ten expressed concern regarding the possibility to detect impaired driving due to cannabis consumption.
• Furthermore, around one in ten recommend imposing similar regulations to alcohol.
• When it comes to making decisions about regulating cannabis retail stores Saskatoon residents care the most about Protecting youth and vulnerable persons followed by Limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop and Safety of employees and patrons.

Taxes and Revenue
• The most commonly perceived benefit of establishing cannabis retail stores is increased tax revenue which could benefit the economy.

Location
• In terms of store locations, roughly two thirds prefer cannabis retail stores to be located in arterial and suburban commercial or downtown and the other Business Improvement Districts. Locating stores in small scale neighbourhood and commercial areas is much less popular.
• The majority of residents suggest a distance exceeding 300m (approx. 3 blocks) between cannabis stores and any organizations that cater to children and youth (schools, youth centers, child care facilities, parks and playgrounds).
• Concerns are less with respect to cannabis stores being in close proximity to each other.
Detailed Findings
Four in Ten respondents felt that age restriction is among the most important factors that should be considered in regulating cannabis in Saskatoon. Other important factors include: distance to schools, strict enforcement of laws, location and having similar regulations to Alcohol.

- **Age Restriction, 41%**
- **Distance to Schools, 17%**
- **Strict Law Enforcement, 13%**
- **Location, 12%**
- **Similar regulation to Alcohol, 11%**

**q6: What are the most important things that you feel should be considered in regulating cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon? Base=All Respondents, n=405**

- Clear rules on where it can be used, how much you can have with you. Education to the public.
- Stores need to be located far away from schools & playgrounds. No one under the age of 19 should even be allowed to enter the store.
Key benefits of establishing cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon is seen to include **increased tax revenue** which may benefit the economy, having more controlled sales that may **cut down the black market** and having **better availability** and accessibility of cannabis products. Of note, only one in ten feel there are **no benefits** to establishing cannabis retail stores in the city. Key perceived drawbacks include concerns about the ability to **detect impaired driving** and cannabis products being **too easily accessible** specially when it comes to **minors**.

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased tax revenue/economic benefit</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled sales/cut down black market</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability/accessibility</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality control/safety of product</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less strain on police/judicial system</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/business opportunities</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less crime-unspecified</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less social stigma/increase awareness</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no comment</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/no benefit</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drawbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawback</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impaired driving detection/enforcement</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier access/too accessible</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage/minor usage/accessibility</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse/addiction</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems-general</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety/security/policing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not curb black market/illegal trade</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowds/hangouts in front of stores</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public usage</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working while high</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/expensive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odour/expensive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same/similar problems as with alcohol</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no comment</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/no drawbacks</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7 What do you see as the key benefits and key drawbacks that may result from establishing cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon?**

*Base=All Respondents, n=405*
Q7: What do you see as the key benefits and key drawbacks that may result from establishing cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon?

Base=All Respondents, n=405

**Benefits**

- "Helping people manage pain related to illnesses and conditions and having the government benefit monetarily from the sale of legal cannabis."
- "Availability and curtailing criminal involvement."
- "Reduction of black market and illegal trade. Quality of cannabis will be consistent and monitored."
- "Simple and easy access for those that chose to access it, as well as regulated control over distribution and increased tax revenue."

**Drawbacks**

- "I shudder at the thought of having to inhale second hand marijuana smoke while I'm trying to enjoy the outdoors."
- "Exposure to minors (arguably this is already occurring with the illegal market), increased accessibility for consumers with addictions or mental health issues, similar to the alcohol industry."
- "Cannabis could end up accessible to someone who otherwise would not have tried it, such as a child."
- "Easier access means issues like driving while under the influence of drugs."
Among the supplied list of benefits, safe access to cannabis is the most common benefit noted among Saskatoon residents. Other benefits are noted by one half or fewer residents. Men and younger residents are more likely to see each of the items below as benefits than females and older residents.

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe access to cannabis products</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefit to Saskatoon overall</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emergence of a new local industry</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefit for nearby businesses</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased activity in business areas</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe access to cannabis products</td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefit to Saskatoon overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emergence of a new local industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefit for nearby businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased activity in business areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q8: Do you believe there will be any of the following benefits by establishing cannabis retail stores in Saskatoon? (select all that apply)**

Total n=405, Male/Female n=52/48, 18-34/35-54/55+ n=138/141/126
When it come to making decisions about regulating cannabis retail stores, Saskatoon residents care the most about protecting youth and vulnerable persons followed by limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop and safety of employees and patrons. Females and older residents have higher concerns in general and residents living on the west side of the river are less concerned with matters relating to impact on public places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>% of Those Who Said Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting youth and vulnerable persons</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of employees and patrons</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on adjacent properties and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consumption of cannabis</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious odours from people smoking cannabis</td>
<td>48/47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Who said “Very Important”</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting youth and vulnerable persons</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting the opportunity for criminal activity to develop</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of employees and patrons</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on adjacent properties and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consumption of cannabis</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious odours from people smoking cannabis</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious odours from cannabis related businesses</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q9. How important is it for the City of Saskatoon to consider each of the following when making decisions about regulating cannabis retail stores? (% of those who said Very important)
When it comes to having a minimum separation distance between cannabis stores and other establishments, organizations that cater to children and youth are seen to be of highest importance. However, there are mixed opinions regarding the proximity of cannabis stores to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care facilities</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations that assist youth or vulnerable persons</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and playgrounds</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cannabis retail stores</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10: How important is it for the City of Saskatoon to have minimum separation distances between cannabis retail stores and each of the following places? Base= All respondents, n=405
The majority of respondents indicated that they would like to keep most youth and children-related organizations, as well as community centres as far away as possible from Cannabis retail stores. Meanwhile, opinions on how much distance to keep between cannabis retailers were mixed.

**Q11. What would be an appropriate separation distance to set between cannabis retail stores and each of the following places? For reference, one block of 2nd Avenue in downtown is approximately 150 m long, although block lengths vary throughout the city. Base = All respondents, n=405**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>No distance</th>
<th>75 m (approx. half a block)</th>
<th>150 m (approx. one block)</th>
<th>300 m (approx. two blocks)</th>
<th>Further than two blocks</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/Vulnerable persons organizations</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care facilities</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and playgrounds</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cannabis retail stores</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the majority of respondents, the preferred places to locate cannabis retail stores would be near *arterial and suburban commercial* areas as well as *downtown and the other Business Improvement Districts*. Locating stores in small scale neighbourhood and commercial areas is much less popular.

**Q12: Where in the city should cannabis retail stores be located? (select all that apply) Base= All respondents, n=405**

- Arterial and suburban commercial areas (e.g. – 8th Street, 22nd Street West, Lawson Heights commercial area, Confederation commercial area, etc.) 61%
- Downtown and the other Business Improvement Districts (i.e.- Broadway, Riversdale, Sutherland, 33rd Street) 61%
- Industrial areas 39%
- Small scale neighbourhood commercial areas (i.e. retail stores located in residential neighbourhoods) 24%
- None of the above 7%
Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 to Regulate Cannabis-Related Businesses

A. Definitions

- **“cannabis retail store”** means a provincially-licensed retail store where cannabis or cannabis products are sold, and which may include the sale of related accessories and ancillary items, but does not include the manufacturing or processing of products to be sold on-site. A cannabis retail store is not a pharmacy or a medical clinic.

- **“cannabis production facility”** means a federally-licensed facility used for the purposes of cultivation, harvesting, production, processing, manufacturing, packaging, testing, storage or shipping of cannabis or goods and products derived from cannabis.

B. Permitted/Discretionary Zoning Districts (subject to separation distances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannabis retail store</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3 – Medium Density Arterial Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4 – Arterial and Suburban Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4A – Special Suburban Centre and Arterial Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4MX – Integrated Commercial Mixed-Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5 – Inner City Commercial Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5B – Broadway Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5C – Riversdale Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6 – Downtown Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL1 – General Light Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IH – Heavy Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA1 – Reinvestment District 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannabis production facility</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IH – Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>IL1 – General Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Evaluation of applications should have due consideration for the following (in addition to the criteria that already apply to all discretionary uses):

- The mix and proximity of other land uses present in the area, in particular community facilities and residential zoning districts, and the potential impact on these uses.
D. Parking and Site Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Development Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis retail stores</td>
<td>• Same as for retail stores (varies by zoning district).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis production facilities</td>
<td>• Same as for “all other permitted uses” in IH and IL1 (1 space per 93 m² of gross floor area).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Minimum Separation Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use to Separate From</th>
<th>Cannabis Retail Store in B5B – Broadway Commercial District</th>
<th>Cannabis Retail Store – All Other Zoning Districts</th>
<th>Cannabis Production Facility – IH – Heavy Industrial and IL1 – General Light Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Retail Stores</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and High Schools</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centre</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>160 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measured property line to property line.

F. Home-Based Businesses

Add to the list of prohibited home-based businesses:

- The cultivation, harvesting, production, processing, manufacturing, packaging, testing, retail sale, storage or shipping of cannabis or goods and products derived from cannabis.
Submitted by anonymous user: 207.47.245.128
Submitted values are:

Date: Friday, May 04, 2018
To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
First Name: DeeAnn
Last Name: Mercier
Address: Broadway Ave
City: Saskatoon
Province: Saskatchewan
Postal Code: 
Email: 
Comments:
Hello,

I would like to speak to the Municipal Planning Commission on Tuesday, May 8th regarding Item 7.1 Proposed Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 Amendment. If possible, could the map of the Broadway area be shown on the screen, page 14 of Attachment 1, while I give my presentation? Thank you.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.saskatoon.ca/node/398/submission/228099
Proposed Rezoning – AG by Agreement – Saskatoon Wildlife Federation – University Heights Sector

Recommendation
That a copy of this report be forwarded to City Council recommending that at the time of the public hearing, City Council consider the Administration’s recommendation that the proposed amendment to Bylaw No. 8770, the Zoning Bylaw, as outlined in this report, be approved.

Topic and Purpose
An application has been submitted by the Saskatoon Wildlife Federation, proposing to rezone their existing site located on Block A, Plan No. 78S31217 in the University Heights Sector, subject to a Rezoning Agreement, to accommodate the ongoing operation of the private club and certain activities on the site.

Report Highlights
1. The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation has relocated the outdoor ranges but continues to use the existing clubhouse, hall, fishpond, and indoor ranges for activities and programs related to their organization.
2. The current operation and buildings on the site are not permitted under the FUD – Future Urban Development District and would be considered non-conforming.
3. To facilitate certain existing uses and proposed interim development of the site, as well as ensure these uses are compatible with future urban development, surrounding land uses, and municipal infrastructure, a rezoning to AG – Agricultural District, subject to a Rezoning Agreement, is being proposed.

Strategic Goal
This rezoning supports the City of Saskatoon’s (City) Strategic Goal of Sustainable Growth as it will provide for the ongoing use of the existing facility until such time as urban development occurs in this area of the city.

Background
The subject lands are located in the University Heights Sector, northwest of Aspen Ridge neighbourhood, in an area identified as a future residential neighbourhood (refer to Attachment 1).

The University Heights Sector Plan provides a broad framework for future urban development, including the location and size of future neighbourhoods, employment areas, parks, and significant natural areas; it also identifies servicing components that will need to be addressed for future development.
The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation site, along with other properties in the University Heights Sector, were designated as Urban Holding Areas on the Official Community Plan Land Use Map and zoned to FUD - Future Urban Development District in May 2017. These amendments were part of a larger process to apply the appropriate land use designation and zoning under the City’s bylaws in the University Heights Sector. The land use designation and zoning applied provide for interim land uses for these future development areas.

Report

The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation has operated out of the subject site for several years and has included indoor and outdoor archery and firearm ranges, a clubhouse, a hall, and a fishpond. To facilitate construction of the North Commuter Parkway and to accommodate future urban development, the outdoor ranges were relocated to a new site in the Rural Municipality of Aberdeen and site reclamation was undertaken. While the outdoor ranges have been relocated, the Saskatoon Wildlife Federation continues to use the existing clubhouse, hall, fishpond, and indoor ranges for activities and programs related to their organization.

The current operation and buildings on the site are not permitted under the FUD – Future Urban Development District and would be considered non-conforming. Non-conforming means that the use and buildings were legally established under a previous zoning bylaw, but do not comply with current zoning regulations. Non-conforming uses and buildings may continue to be used on a site, but any future development or use must comply with the current zoning regulations.

As future development will likely not be occurring in this area of the city for approximately five to ten years, the Saskatoon Wildlife Federation is considering options for ongoing use and development of their site and facilities. The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation will also be exploring options of how their site may be incorporated into the future residential neighbourhood.

Rezoning by Agreement

To facilitate certain existing uses and proposed interim development of the site, as well as ensure these uses are compatible with future urban development, surrounding land uses, and municipal infrastructure, a rezoning to AG, subject to a Rezoning Agreement, is being proposed. The location map showing the proposed rezoning is included in Attachment 2. The terms of the Rezoning Agreement will dictate the manner in which the site may continue to be used, as well as what future development may occur.

The terms of the Rezoning Agreement will need to ensure that the development is compatible with the future urban development, surrounding land uses, and municipal infrastructure. The proposed terms of the Rezoning Agreement will address:

i) permitted uses of land and will provide for a private club with administrative offices, an interpretive centre and classrooms, a community centre, commercial recreational uses limited to the fish pond and indoor firearm and archery range, a campground, and a park and playground;
ii) a maximum building height of 10 metres for permitted and accessory buildings;

iii) a minimum front yard setback of 6 metres;

iv) regulations governing parking and loading as per the AG District. The requirement to hard surface parking spaces will be at the discretion of the Development Officer;

v) landscaping at the discretion of the Development Officer; and

vi) outdoor storage permitted only if it is suitably screened and associated with a principal permitted use.

The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation asked to have an outdoor archery range and ATV/snowmobile training on site as part of its proposed development. The Planning and Development Division has advised that these uses would not be able to be accommodated in the Rezoning Agreement as they would be incompatible with the urban form, future residential development, and municipal infrastructure. The Saskatoon Wildlife Federation has agreed to move ahead with the application to rezone the property to AG by Agreement without the outdoor archery range.

The draft terms of the Rezoning Agreement and proposed site plan are included in Attachments 3 and 4.

Comments from Other Divisions
No comments or concerns were received through the administrative referral process that would preclude this application from proceeding.

Options to the Recommendation
City Council could choose to deny this application. This option is not recommended as this application is consistent with the University Heights Sector Plan and allows for the use of the site until such time as urban development occurs in this area of the city.

Public and/or Stakeholder Involvement
The Planning and Development and Saskatoon Land Divisions had a number of meetings with the Saskatoon Wildlife Federation to discuss the proposed uses of the land, the land development process, as well as future development of the area as a residential neighbourhood.

Other Considerations/Implications
There are no policy, financial, environmental, privacy, or CPTED implications or considerations; a communication plan is not required at this time.
Due Date for Follow-up and/or Project Completion
No follow-up is required.

Public Notice
Public notice is required for consideration of this matter, pursuant to Section 11(a) of Policy No. C01-021, Public Notice Policy.

Once this application has been considered by the Municipal Planning Commission, it will be advertised in accordance with Policy No. C01-021, Public Notice Policy and a date for a public hearing will be set. A notice will be placed in The StarPhoenix two weeks prior to the public hearing.

Attachments
1. Location Map (University Heights Sector)
2. Location Map – Zoning Amendment (University Heights Sector)
3. Proposed Terms of Rezoning Agreement
4. Proposed Site Plan (University Heights Sector)

Report Approval
Written by: Darryl Dawson, Manager, Development Review Section
Reviewed by: Lesley Anderson, Director of Planning and Development
Approved by: Randy Grauer, General Manager, Community Services Department

Location Map
(University Heights Sector)

City of Saskatoon

Disclaimer: This information is supplied solely as a courtesy and the City of Saskatoon makes no guarantee as to its accuracy. The recipient accepts all risks and expenses which may arise from the use of this information.

© Copyright - City of Saskatoon
Zoning Amendment

From FUD to AG by Agreement
Proposed Terms of Rezoning Agreement

Saskatoon Wildlife Federation Site – University Heights Sector
Draft Terms of Zoning Agreement: FUD – Future Urban Development District to AG - Agricultural District by Agreement

Civic Address: To Be Determined
Legal Description: Block A, Plan No. 78S31217

1. Use of Land:
   a) Private club
      Note - "private club" is defined in Bylaw No. 8770, the Zoning Bylaw, as a place used for the meeting, social, or recreational activities of the members of a non-profit philanthropic, social service, athletic, business, or fraternal organization, and may include rooms for eating, drinking, and assembly but shall not include onsite residences.
   b) Uses considered accessory to a private club, including:
      • administration offices; and
      • interpretive center and classrooms.
   c) Community centre
      Note – this use would provide for the request for a hall on the site. "Community centre" is defined in the Zoning Bylaw as a building or facility used for recreational, social, educational, or cultural activities and which is owned by a municipal corporation, non-profit corporation, or other non-profit organization.
   d) Commercial recreational use limited to:
      • indoor firearm and archery range; and
      • fish pond.
   e) Campground
   f) Park and playground
   g) The site must be developed substantially in accordance with the site plan that will form part of the Agreement and is shown in Attachment 4 of the report.

2. Development Standards:
   a) The development standards applicable to the land shall be those applicable to the AG District, except as follows:
      • the building height shall not exceed 10 metres;
      • the building height for any accessory use shall not exceed 10 metres; and
      • minimum front yard shall be 6 metres.

3. Parking:
   a) all required parking and loading facilities shall be clearly demarcated, have adequate storm water drainage and storage facilities, and be hard surfaced at the discretion of the Development Officer; and
b) The regulations governing parking and loading are per the AG District as contained in Section 6.0 of the Zoning Bylaw.

4. **Landscaping:** Landscaping shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.

5. **Outdoor Storage:** Outdoor storage is not permitted unless associated with a principal permitted use. Any such storage shall be suitably screened to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.

6. **Signage:** Signage shall comply with Signage Group No. 4 of the Sign Regulations with the following provisions:
   a) lighting of signs must be sensitive to neighbouring properties and infrastructure and shall only be illuminated during the hours of operation applicable to the particular permitted land use.

All other provisions of the AG District shall apply.
Proposed Site Plan
(University Heights Sector)
From: City Council
Sent: May 04, 2018 8:44 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Form submission from: Write a Letter to Council

Submitted on Friday, May 4, 2018 - 08:43
Submitted by anonymous user: 216.174.143.114
Submitted values are:

Date: Friday, May 04, 2018
To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
First Name: Robert
Last Name: Freberg
Address: [redacted]
City: Saskatoon
Province: Saskatchewan
Postal Code: [redacted]

Comments: Robert Freberg, President of the Saskatoon Wildlife Federation with be presenting to the Municipal Planning Commission on May 8, 2018 at 12:00 p.m. on contract re-zoning application brought by the City Administration led by Darryl Dawson, Manager, Development Review Section, Planning and Development.

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
https://www.saskatoon.ca/node/398/submission/228048
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFERENCE</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>FEES</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Canadian Institute of Planners           | Winnipeg, MB | July 19 to 22, 2018 | full conference - $989  
1 day fee for July 20, 21 - $500  
1 day fee for July 22 - $250  
all fees subject to 5% GST | $164 to $249/night |
| Saskatchewan Professional Planners Institute (SPPI) | Saskatoon, SK | September 17 to 18, 2018 | 2 day full conference - $395.75  
1 day conference - $315.00 | N/A |
| Winter Cities Conference                 | Saskatoon, SK | January 23 to 25, 2019 | Full conference - $460.00 (before Dec 19)  
Single Day Fees - $200/day - Feb 16, 17  
Single Day Fees - $150/day - Feb 18(before Dec 19) | N/A |