



List of Delegations

**Wednesday, October 28, 2026
1:00 PM**

Henry Baker Hall, Main Floor, City Hall



OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

**City Council
List of Delegations
Wednesday, October 28, 2026**

The List of Delegations is prepared to reflect the agenda as published. The order in which items are considered, and related delegations heard, is subject to change and remains at the call of the Chair.

CR26-121 Zoning Bylaw Amendment – 3800 Rochdale Boulevard

DELEGATIONS

DE26-97 Kaitlyn Brown, Cornerstone Holdings, Regina, SK

CR26-123 Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street

DELEGATIONS

DE26-98 Charles Brittner, Regina, SK

DE26-99 Dan Devers., Regina, SK

DE26-100 James Elliott, Regina, SK

DE26-101 Mandla Mthembu, Regina, SK

DE26-102 Sean Tucker, Regina, SK

DE26-103 Nathan Kraemer, Regina, SK

DE26-104 Thabo Mthembu, Regina, SK

DE26-105 Nathaniel Cole, Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Regina, SK

DE26-106 Richard Exner, Unifor 594, Regina, SK

DE26-107 Celeste Pinder, Regina & District Labour Council, Regina, SK

DE26-108 Darin Milo, Regina, SK

DE26-109 Darcy Debert, Canadian Labour Congress, Regina, SK

DE26-110 Mark Simpson, Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Ltd., Regina, SK



OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

COMMUNICATIONS

CP26-65 Tanner Vogelgesang, Regina, SK

CM26-11 Impact of Bell AI Fabric Data Centre Campus on the City of Regina**DELEGATIONS**

DE26-111 James Elliott, Regina, SK

DE26-112 Dylan Block, Regina, SK

DE26-113 Maureen Huot, Saskatchewan Data Centre Accountability Coalition,
Regina, SK

CR26-124 Housing Accelerator Fund Update**COMMUNICATION**

CP26-66 Dan Torrie, West Oak Investments, Regina, SK

CR26-125 Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots**DELEGATIONS**

DE26-114 James Elliott, Regina, SK

COMMUNICATION

CP26-67 Vanessa Mathews, University of Regina, Regina SK

CP26-68 Mitchell Molnar, Mitchell Developments, Ltd., Regina, SK

CP26-69 Andrew Stevens, Regina, SK

MN26-19 Amendment to Official Community Plan Respecting Policies 3.17.1 and 3.17.2**DELEGATIONS**

DE26-115 Maureen Huot, Saskatchewan Data Centre Accountability Coalition,
Regina, SK



OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

MN26-20 Pedestrian and Cyclist Protection Strategy**DELEGATIONS**

- DE26-116 Meghan South, Regina, SK
- DE26-117 Carla Harris, Regina, SK
- DE26-118 Tamela Friesen, Regina, SK
- DE26-119 Janelle Lubkiwski, Bike Regina, Regina, SK
- DE26-120 John Klien, Regina, SK

COMMUNICATIONS

- CP26-70 James Elliott, Regina, SK
- CP26-71 Meggie Freed, Regina, SK
- CP26-72 Josh Campbell, Regina, SK
- CP26-73 John Klien, Regina Car Share Co-Operative Ltd., Regina, SK

October 26, 2026

Office of the City Clerk
2476 Victoria Avenue
Regina, SK S4N 6M5

RE: CR26-121 Zoning Bylaw Amendment – 3800 Rochdale Boulevard

To Your Worship and Members of City Council,

My name is Kaitlyn Brown, I am here today representing Cornerstone Holdings, the legal landowner of the subject property.

Cornerstone Holdings has made the application for the Zoning Bylaw Amendment to align the zoning boundary with a newly adjusted property boundary. The subject property was previously part of Block 1, zoned MLM, and through the subdivision process the land was removed from Block 1 and combined with the property immediately to the north of it, Block 9. The north property is zoned MH. The result of the subdivision was that the property line and zoning boundary were no longer aligned. This application moves to bring them back into alignment.

At Planning Commission, Administration was asked why the proponent would want to move the land to MH and not MLM, given that MH was more restrictive to other uses. Administration noted that the proponent's project was discretionary in both zones and that the land could have moved to MLM or MH and would have followed the same administrative process.

As some of you may know, construction has begun on the north property for a new Car Dealership. The Retail Trade, Motor Vehicle light land use is discretionary in both MLM and MH zones. As such we completed a discretionary use application for this project and received approval meeting the more restrictive MH requirements. For us, this building is purpose built. It is a car dealership, the land is fully utilized, opportunities for land uses that are permitted in MLM and not MH is not something that needs to be considered, from our perspective, for this project.

We are in support of Administrations recommendation, and further recommended by the Planning Commission, for the approval of this Zoning Amendment. I am available for any questions and appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today.

Regards,

Kaitlyn Brown

Good afternoon, Mayor and councillors. My name is Charles Brittner. I work at the Co-op Refinery and belong to Unifor Local 594. I am here as a concerned citizen. I am asking you to refuse this application today.

*

Councillors,

Public office is a public trust and Public safety IS part of this decision.

Section 1E.3.5 of Regina's Zoning Bylaw 2019-19, sets out the criteria for reviewing a discretionary-use application.

Paragraph D, subparagraph six, expressly includes:

“any other matter(s) affecting public health and safety.”

That is part of the City's own test for this application.

At the October 20 Planning Commission meeting, there was considerable discussion about which responsibilities belong to the province.

I accept that provincial authorities enforce provincial workplace-safety requirements as mentioned by City administration.

But Council is deciding whether this location is suitable for the permitting of residential accommodation.

Provincial responsibilities do not remove the public-safety criteria from the City zoning bylaw 2019-19.

**

For example, In April, Administration assessed a proposed daycare beside SARCAN at 5100 Parliament Avenue. It considered the neighbouring industrial operation, loading bays, separation and fencing before approving it. The risks differ, but the principle is the same: the City must consider how surrounding industrial activity affects people occupying a new development.

The City Identified specific protective measures for the daycare and made fencing and conformity with the proposed plans conditions of approval.

I acknowledge that CRC submitted an engineer's summary.

The 2019 CRC work camp received a permit under accessory-use rules. After the labour dispute, Council changed the bylaw to require discretionary approval for camps of this size—the review you are conducting today.

In my opinion, that change was not for show.

The question before you is whether that summary, together with the other information presented, adequately supports the decision you are being asked to make.

For example, on October 20th when the Commission asked about evacuation arrangements for the camp, CRC indicated that these would be addressed during “final detailed planning”. That answer did not demonstrate how people living or sleeping at this location would safely evacuate during a refinery emergency. It left that important question for later. Later permits do not, by themselves, establish that this location is suitable for people to live.

CRC also described buses and other vehicles being available . But having transportation available does not, by itself, establish that evacuation will be safe.

Gasoline and diesel engines can become ignition sources where flammable gases or vapours are present. A release could also affect the routes people need to use.

The evidence presented has not demonstrated to me how occupants would be protected if moving vehicles themselves were unsafe, an exit route were affected, or people needed to remain sheltered.

CRC does have an existing emergency-response system.

My concern is that the camp-specific arrangements relied upon to support this location were described as work still to be completed.

Describing the camp as temporary does not resolve these concerns.

I also want to address the labour context directly.

The City says collective bargaining concerns are outside its discretionary-use review.

Please understand that I acknowledge and respect that position. My request for refusal rests on whether this application adequately satisfies the planning criteria.

The camp cannot proceed without City approval. By approving it, Council would enable accommodation that could support CRC’s operations during a labour disruption. Calling the process neutral does not change the consequences of a yes vote. The fact is, a no vote is the only truly neutral choice: it preserves the existing situation rather than strengthen one side’s position in a labour dispute, and thus, adding a 3rd party dynamic to the bargaining process.

People staying in this camp would be residents as well as workers. They would sleep, eat and spend their off-duty hours at the refinery. Contrary to CRCs comments on the 20th, familiarity with refinery operations does not establish that the location is suitable for accommodation. Council needs to assess it as a place to live, not simply a place to work. An Administration recommendation deserves consideration. It does not replace your judgment.

Taken together, the information presented leaves important questions unanswered about whether the proposed protections are adequate for people living at this location.

That is why I am asking you to refuse this application, today.

Promises are not plans, and reassurance is not evidence. Approval should follow the answers—not come before them. This application has not met the City’s zoning bylaw test. Councillors, the decision is yours, and so is the responsibility. Please refuse this application.

Public office is a public trust.

Sources supporting this submission

The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 — Bylaw No. 2019-19, Chapter 1

Section 1B.1, page 1.2: the bylaw’s purpose includes residents’ health, safety and general welfare.

Section 1E.3.5(d)(vi), page 1.17: discretionary-use review includes “any other matter(s) affecting public health and safety.”

Section 1E.3.9, pages 1.18–1.19: Council’s decision-making options, including refusal.

<https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/bylaws-permits-licences/bylaws/.galleries/pdfs/Zoning-Bylaw-2019-Chapter-1-Authority-and-Administration.pdf>

Discretionary Use — 5100 Parliament Avenue, application PL202600009

Administration’s report dated April 2, 2026, with approval dated April 10, 2026.

Page 3 discusses the neighbouring SARCAN operation, loading-bay location, fencing and separation. Page 5 specifies approval conditions, including conformity with plans showing play-area fencing and landscaping. Page 6 records the approval.

<https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/business-development/land-property-development/.galleries/pdfs/Proposed-Development/PL202600009-Record-of-Decision.pdf>

Council report CR26-123 — Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street, October 28, 2026

The two-page Council report forwards Planning Commission’s recommendation to approve the camp, subject to five conditions. The package includes the original Administration report RPC26-20 and its supporting appendices.

<https://reginafiles.blob.core.windows.net/media/council/2026-10-28%20City%20Council%20-%20Full%20Agenda-5695.pdf>

Administration report RPC26-20 — Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street, October 20, 2026

Report page 4, October 20 agenda PDF page 28: approval of the previous camp under accessory-use provisions and subsequent changes to work-camp regulations.

Report page 5, agenda PDF page 29: Administration's safety rationale, emergency-response arrangements, Regina Fire's reported comments and reliance on the quantitative risk-assessment summary.

Appendix B, agenda PDF pages 37–39: public concerns and Administration's responses, including its position on collective bargaining considerations.

Appendix C, agenda PDF pages 40–41: submitted quantitative risk-assessment summary material.

<https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/city-government/city-council/council-meetings/.galleries/pdfs/2026-10-20-Regina-Planning-Commission-Full-Agenda-5688.pdf>
Regina Planning Commission meeting recording — October 20, 2026

1:28:19–1:28:35: discussion of buses being available on site around the clock and other vehicles available for transportation.

Approximately 2:15:00–2:15:08: discussion of camp evacuation arrangements as part of final detailed planning.

2:48:13–2:48:37: Administration's explanation concerning the full risk assessment and reliance on an engineer-signed summary.

3:02:46–3:03:13: confirmation that further permits, code compliance and inspections would follow before occupancy.

Timestamps refer to the original meeting. References were checked against the displayed transcript in the supplied recording. Select the October 20 Planning Commission video on this page:

<https://www.regina.ca/city-government/city-council/council-meetings/agendas-and-meeting-documents/>

Occupational Safety and Health Administration — Internal Combustion Engines as Ignition Sources

Pages 1–2 explain how gasoline and diesel engines, including vehicle engines, can ignite flammable gases or vapours.

Charles Brittner

<https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/osha3589.pdf>

Statement of Concern from Retired Refinery Workers Opposing the 510-Bed Work Camp

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am here today carrying the voices of many retired men and women who spent their careers at the Co-op Refinery — people who worked the units, maintained the equipment, trained new generations, and lived through the last lockout.

These retirees may no longer punch a clock, but they still care deeply about the Refinery, about the workers who are there today, and about the community that surrounds it. Their experience gives them a perspective that cannot be ignored.

And from that perspective, they are deeply concerned about the proposed 510-bed work camp.

Retirees Remember What a Lockout Does to Families and the City

Those who lived through the last lockout remember it vividly:

- the strain on families
- the division in the community
- the uncertainty about the future
- the fear of losing livelihoods
- the long months of tension and hardship

Retired workers watched their friends and former coworkers stand on picket lines in bitter cold. They saw relationships strained, trust eroded, and the city pulled into conflict.

They do not want to see Regina go through that again.

A 510-Bed Camp Raises Real Concerns About Labour Stability

Retired workers are not making accusations. They are raising **reasonable concerns** based on lived experience.

A camp capable of housing more than five hundred workers on refinery property naturally raises questions:

- Could it be used to house replacement workers in a future dispute?
- Could it give management the ability to sustain a lockout longer?
- Could it weaken the bargaining position of local union members?
- Could it reignite the kind of conflict that once divided this city?

Retirees know what a lockout looks like. They know what it feels like. And they know how quickly tensions can escalate when one side appears to be preparing for a prolonged dispute.

Even the **perception** of such preparation is damaging.

Retired Workers Built This Facility — Their Concerns Deserve Respect

These men and women spent decades:

- operating units safely
- responding to emergencies
- training apprentices
- maintaining equipment
- protecting the refinery and the community

They understand the risks of industrial operations better than anyone. They know the importance of trust between workers and management. They know how fragile labour peace can be.

When they say this camp raises red flags, Council should listen.

While we, the retirees, are no longer part of the Refinery's day-to-day operations, we maintain a strong interest in its future. Having devoted many years of service to the Refinery, we remain concerned about the relationship between the company and its employees and the impact this relationship may have on the Refinery's long-term stability, success, and prosperity.

Safety Concerns Are Not Theoretical — Retirees Lived Them

Retired workers have seen:

- fires
- shutdowns
- evacuations
- near misses
- hazardous releases

They know how dangerous a refinery can be, even on a normal day. Housing 510 people on-site — people who may not be familiar with refinery hazards — creates a safety burden that retirees recognize immediately.

They spent their careers keeping people safe. They do not believe this camp supports that goal.

Retirees Want a Strong Refinery — But Not at the Cost of Community Trust

Retired workers want the refinery to succeed. They want it to thrive. They want it to remain a pillar of Regina's economy.

But they also know that success depends on:

- stable labour relations
- trust between workers and management
- respect for the people who built the place
- a community that feels secure and included

A 510-bed work camp threatens that balance.

Conclusion

Retired refinery workers are asking Council to consider not only the technical details of this proposal, but the human reality behind it.

They lived through the last lockout. They saw what it did to families, to workers, and to the city. They do not want to see Regina return to that kind of conflict.

The relationship between the Union and the Co-op Refinery has, in our opinion, deteriorated significantly over time. What was once a collaborative partnership grounded in mutual respect and a common vision has been eroded. We are concerned that the drive for profit has come to outweigh the cooperative values and integrity that formed the foundation of our existence and guided our success for many years.

For the sake of safety, community trust, labour stability, and respect for the people who built this facility, we urge Council to **reject** the Discretionary Use application for the 510-bed work camp.

Our message is simple: **Regina deserves better than repeating the past.**

Dan Devers, Regina, SK

CR26-123 - PL202600240 – 1102 N Fleet Street

Dear Members of the Regina Planning Commission,

My name is Jim Elliott and live in Regina.

I completely oppose this proposal. This is weaponizing our valued bylaws against the people of this city.

What the proponent is proposing is not a work camp. This is a measure to REPLACE not AUGMENT, LIMIT not DIVERSIFY the current employees in the time of collective bargaining.

As shown by the previous actions of the proponent, this is a way to circumvent the abilities of the current workers to limit their capacity to collectively bargain their wages in a civil and reasoned manner. In the event of a job action, this would remove one measure of bargaining action from the employees by restrict scab labourers access to the property.

I completely oppose this proposal as it goes against the valued provision of collective bargaining by leveraging the use of the city of Regina bylaws to put inappropriate pressures on the legitimate bargaining of a collective agreement between the employer and the union representing the workers of the facility.

This is standing on the side of the employer and not employees and residents of this city. This is discretionary for a reason because it is a political act and therefore should bring in the social implications as well as the input of the residents of this community.

Furthermore, how is it appropriate to have a proponent oppose a residential development further away from the refinery and now propose to have residential housing even closer to the refinery?

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

A key goal of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan, Bylaw 2013-48 (OCP), is fostering economic “vitality and competitiveness” (Section D10; Goal 1).

Work Camps represent additional assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output. (page 2)

Per Chapter 2, Part 2B of the Zoning Bylaw, a Work Camp land use is defined as “... a temporary residential land use intended to provide accommodation for employees or contractors of industrial or construction operations...”. Allowing a work camp provides industrial operators and businesses with an opportunity to diversify or augment employee/staffing resources on a temporary basis. (page 4)

My name is Mandla Mthembu, and I am a resident of the heritage neighborhood of Regina. I oppose this development because it violates labor rights and human rights, and it is not in any Regina resident's interest. My delegation will elaborate on the affirmation of these concerns and the condemnation of corporate greed over the workers and residents of our city that stand to be harmed if this project is approved.

City of Regina Council Delegate (re: Coop Refinery's discretionary land use application)
Sean Tucker, University of Regina
October 26, 2026

I am a part-time professor of occupational health and safety at the University of Regina and a consultant for public and private sector organizations. My work includes providing independent opinion and recommendations on a variety of health and safety issues.

Since 2014, I have followed and publicly commented on OHS and public health issues related to the refinery. I have also participated in the city's consultation process for the current application, including appearing as a delegate at last week's city planning commission meeting.

As a guiding principle, I believe there is nothing more important than the health and safety of the occupants of the proposed work camp.

In my opinion, there are two questions city council must address:

First, does council have a legal obligation to consider the potential health impacts of the work camp on the camp's 510 occupants?

And, second, if you do have a legal obligation to consider the potential health impacts, do you currently have sufficient information to exercise your due diligence and to make an informed decision?

With respect to the first question – your legal obligation to consider health and safety impacts on the occupants – Section 3.5 (Review Criteria) of Chapter 1 of the Regina Zoning Bylaw (2019) is clear that you do. It states: "Every application for a discretionary use shall be evaluated based on the following criteria." Four parts are listed including (d).

"(d) potential adverse impacts or nuisances affecting:
[...]
(vi) ... public health and safety."

I would also note, in the past, the city has considered health impacts with respect to the refinery. In 2008, the city and provincial Ministry of the Environment required, as a condition of permit for a major expansion of the plant, an independent, comprehensive major hazards risk assessment report. The 186-page report assessed the potential of death and illness of a "worst case scenario" to residents living near the refinery.

In 2011, Regina Qu'Appelle Health, the Ministry of the Environment and the VP of the Refinery opposed the Somerset residential development, which is just under 1km away from the plant, due to public health concerns.

So it is clear in law and in past practice that the city must carefully consider health impacts of the refinery's operations.

Regarding my second question: do you currently have sufficient information to exercise your due diligence and make an informed decision on the application? I would argue that you do not have adequate information for the following reasons.

First, you do not have an independent, comprehensive risk assessment supporting locating a sizable work camp just 250m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

During last week's planning commission meeting the refinery's representative characterized the 1/3-page letter provided by Baker Risk, which was a "joint effort" between Baker Risk and the refinery, has "definitive proof" that the camp is safe.

Further, regarding the risk assessment, the refinery's representative seemed to acknowledge:

- an extraordinary, worse-case scenario was not considered in the assessment
- only the risk of death to occupants of the camp was considered. It does not appear that serious illnesses due to exposures to toxic gases and other adverse conditions, including long-latency cancers, were considered.
- that standards for public health issues for residents may not be the same for those living on-site.
- no direct consultations with SHA, OHS and Regina Fire have occurred.

The representative stated "If this application gets approved there's a bit more work to do" including an emergency evacuation plan, where air monitoring will be placed and how they will be managed, and a fire plan.

Another significant omission is any evidence that SHA Public Health has reviewed and supports this plan to house over 500 people for two years next to one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

In closing, this is a serious matter as you are being asked to approve a work camp for 510 human beings living 250m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries. There appears to be no urgency whatsoever to approving this application. Given the incomplete planning and serious shortcomings of the risk assessment, I strongly urge you to either reject the application or table it in order to gather more information.

I would like to speak in opposition to this item and share why I feel that it is unsafe, and not in the best interest of regina citizens and would provide no value or benefit to the local economy.

Nathan Kraemer, Regina, SK

Setting up this camp is dangerous to the people that will be potential workers. This fights against the workers there now and treats them as disposable. This is another example as to why we need anti-scab legislation. I have worked at the refinery and seen how poorly they treated new workers.

Thabo Mthembu, Regina, SK

Let me introduce myself – I'm Nathaniel Cole, and I am the Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.

Off the top, let me put it all on the table – I am both a trade unionist and a cooperator. And I know in Saskatchewan, that's not uncommon. It's because our vibrant labour movement and cooperative movement were born at the same time and out of the same desire for economic democratization, to build solidarity, and with a concern for community.

We're a big family. And it sucks when mom and dad are fighting, so to speak. But in the case of building a work camp on the site of the Coop Refinery Complex, the choice for me is clear.

Firstly, the camp is not necessary for refinery operations.

Should any commercial operation require additional temporary labour, Regina already has existing accommodation capacity to house temporary workers. The creation of a work camp is designed to isolate these 'workers' from the community.

It is another signal that this work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason CRC would need lodging on-site is because they'd expect be limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action like the last time.

For the information of council, the use of 'replacement workers' or as they've been more commonly known, 'scabs,' is actually illegal in parts of this country. And there are good economic and ethical reasons for why banning this type of labour practice makes sense:

1. Restoring the balance of power to contract negotiations.
2. Preventing prolonged, bitter labour disputes.
3. Reducing picket-line conflict, tensions, and safety issues.
4. Protecting the constitutional right to strike.
5. Preserving community and worker stability.

While it's not illegal in Saskatchewan, is it really worth sticking Council's neck out on the this one? Because this application for a 'work camp' already signals that the Coop Refinery Complex is prepared for another tense lock out while skirting the constitutional rights of working people.

Which takes me to my next point – the increased likelihood of community tension. Labour disputes are emotional and contentious. Concentrating these labourers in a single location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations like a war zone ---- certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I'd implore council to avoid this development. The camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. Should council's decisions seek to escalate or mitigate tension in our city?

Others surely will note the public safety concerns, so I will make that part of my objection to this development brief. Have we thoroughly canvassed the health and safety concerns of having workers sleep right next to a refinery for weeks or months? Especially when the risk factors increase as the complex becomes less safe, simply due to the fact that the skeleton crew of scab labourers running the place will be less familiar with the operations altogether.

And when it comes to the additional traffic, security, policing, and emergency services, who bears the cost of those services? Surely the ratepayers of Regina will not be completely insulated from the expense of a city-approved work camp on the refinery grounds.

Council's responsibility **is not** to determine the outcome of a labour dispute. The City needs to remain neutral in labour disputes, but approving a dedicated replacement-worker camp creates the perception that municipal resources and approvals are being used to support one side of this potential dispute.

Council's responsibility **is** to protect the long-term interests of Regina residents. The proposed camp raises legitimate concerns regarding public safety, community impact, municipal costs, and the perception of municipal involvement in a private labour conflict. For these reasons, Council should decline to support the proposal.

Nathaniel Cole
Saskatchewan Federation of Labour
Regina, SK

October 26, 2026

Dear Council,

While I fully intended to represent the 700 unionized workers at City Council on October 28th, we are scheduled to be at the bargaining table with the Co-op Refinery at the same time, and my priority is bargaining.

In the unfortunate event I am unable to appear before you personally, please accept my written submission as our unequivocal objection to the Co-op Refinery's Discretionary Use permit application to build a work camp at 1102 N Fleet Street.

Last week, the Regina Planning Commission (RPC) voted 7-2 to recommend the application based on the Administration report and recommendation, but that should be ignored. The RPC was handcuffed by narrow criteria on which to base their decision. Not only does Council have the jurisdiction to expand the scope when making a decision of this nature, we still believe there are gaps in the original report, and the methodology that led to a flawed yes recommendation.

The Commission's report begins with:

Policy Impact

A key goal of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan, Bylaw 2013-48 (OCP), is fostering economic "vitality and competitiveness" (Section D10; Goal 1).

Work Camps represent additional assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.

Further in their recommendations:

OTHER OPTIONS

Option 1 – Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed Work Camp land use– RECOMMENDED

Advantage: *Work Camps represent additional facility assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.*

Consideration: *Public opposition was received through the public notice process, with concerns addressed by Administration in Appendix B – Public Feedback Summary of this report.*

It is our position that the work camp proposed does none of this. There is no expansion taking place, there is no diversification taking place, nor any augmentation of work. This is purely to replace workers for labour relations reasons.

Administration also relied upon Section D10: Goal 1 of Design Regina when establishing the basis for their recommendation. We feel this application does not "foster an environment conducive to economic vitality and competitiveness which supports the standard of living of residents in Regina and the surrounding region".

The Planning and Development Act, 2007, is cited several times regarding how the RPC's review of a Discretionary Use application must be confined to the prescribed land use matters. One of the stated purposes of the Act as per Part 1, 3:

is c) to support the development of environmentally, economically, socially, and culturally sustainable communities.

Labour relations is a social issue. It is not a stretch to argue that the RPC was well within their rights under the Act to make a decision based on the labour relations impacts, and reject the application.

We believe the RPC could have exercised option 3 of the report which reads:

Option 3 – Deny the Discretionary Use application for the proposed Work Camp land use – NOT RECOMMENDED

Advantage: There is no advantage associated with this option.

Consideration: Reduces options available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.

Should City Council reject the application, it is a requirement, per section 57(2) of The Planning and Development Act, 2007, that the motion reflecting City Council's decision include reasons for the decision based on the evaluation criteria set out in the Zoning Bylaw.

The report continues with:

There are no financial, legal, strategic priority, labour, or Inclusion, Diversity, Equity & Accessibility (IDEA) impacts respecting this report.

This application is not about expanding or diversifying or augmenting the refinery. It is solely about maintaining operations during a labour disruption. City Council should not rely on general benefits associated with industrial work camps without honestly considering the actual purpose of this particular camp.

Additionally, to say there are *no advantages* associated with denying the camp application is disappointingly short-sighted.

This camp is not a necessity. The refinery will not shut down, and Western Canada will not run out of fuel if the camp application is denied. The Co-op Refinery will still bring in its replacement workers; they will just have to sleep elsewhere. This means those workers stay in hotels or other short-term accommodations; they eat at restaurants and shop at retailers in Regina. These contributions to the local economy do not occur if they are housed on-site in a self-contained work camp.

Further, it is indisputable, based on the 2019-2020 lockout, that there was increased strain imposed on the Regina Police Service and other city services. Additional policing resources were required, and it pulled away from other areas of need within our city. The traffic disruptions that resulted were also an enormous headache for city residents and those attempting to access the city landfill on Fleet Street.

This all contributes to the significant reputational risk to the City of Regina if this work camp application is allowed to proceed.

Rejecting this application also removes a dark cloud over our bargaining process. Allowing a work camp to be built on site while the Union is trying to bargain in good faith a new collective agreement tilts the playing field further in favor of the employer. Lastly, the Administration's recommendation relies in part on API Recommended Practice 753. We believe City Council needs to look carefully at what it actually says.

API 753 provides guidance for managing the risks from refinery-related explosions, fires and toxic material releases to people in on-site portable buildings who are working, not for living. The proposal before you is for sleeping quarters for hundreds of people. This Council needs to be satisfied that the assessment being relied upon actually addresses the type of accommodation proposed and the risks associated with its intended use.

The standard's guiding principles say we should locate people away from process areas, minimize buildings close to those areas, and — most importantly — first attempt to eliminate the occupancy or the hazard as the first step in the hierarchy of controls.

The Union does not have to prove that the existence of a work camp is unsafe; it is on the applicant to prove that it is safe. But is city council content with "safe enough," or should we be looking at "safest possible"? What standard do you want to enforce? Because the safest possible option, according to API 753 that Co-op relies upon in their assessment from their consultant, says that not having a work camp anywhere on site is the safest option.

We are asking that City Council reject this application. The recommendation is based on flawed methodology. It is unnecessary and inflammatory. It does not meet the goals or purpose of the Official Community Plan for our great city. It would result in an economic loss that only costs taxpayers. It does not expand, diversify or augment the refinery operation.

There is no good reason to approve this application.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Richard Exner', with a stylized, flowing script.

Richard Exner

Unifor Local 594 President



October 26, 2026

To: Mayor Chad Bachynski
City of Regina Executive Council

Re: CR26-123 Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street

On behalf of the Regina & District Labour Council, I am writing in opposition and disappointment for the consideration of a 2-year permit for a 510 bed 'temporary' replacement worker camp located approximately 300m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

Firstly, the proposed camp is not essential to the refinery operations.

A temporary work camp is an isolating environment, where replacement workers are not relating with the community. This creates tension, not only in the community, but also in the workplace.

The optics appear that this work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason FCL would need lodging on-site is because there could be limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action like the last time.

This application for the 'work camp' shows that the Coop Refinery Complex is preparing for another lock out situation, prior to the commencement of bargaining the collective agreement.

Workplace labour disputes can be emotional and contentious, creating division amongst workers trying to keep their jobs and pay bills in the current economic climate. Concentrating scab labourers in a single location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I stand with Labour and implore council to avoid this development. The work camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. The decision made by this council will either seek to escalate or mitigate tensions in our city, during already increasingly difficult economic times.

The City of Regina, and this council must remain neutral , and approval of this temporary work camp would show that the municipality cares more for corporations and employers than it does for the working class people who make up a vibrant Regina. The people who live, work and play and call this city home. People who pay for the public services that this city provides. People who will bear the costs of additional policing and security should the approval be passed. Please consider all of the residents of Regina in this decision.

The safety concerns of living right on-site at the refinery are another workplace hazard. City officials and others must take whatever time is necessary to do their due diligence for the health and safety of all workers.

I ask of Council to decline to support the proposal.

Voting against this proposal is a vote for fairness, justice, and safety.

Respectfully submit,

Celeste Pinder

President

Regina & District Labour Council

Good afternoon. I am presenting in opposition to the permit application CR26-123 at the refinery due to safety concerns, risks, city involvement in labour disputes, and pressure on our health care system. We have seen the impact of catastrophic losses in places such as the Westray mine disaster, Halifax explosion, the recent fire at CFB Wainwright, and other places. The City of Regina also has cited safety concerns in the past due to risk. Housing people on site puts large amounts of people at risk and the city needs to oppose this application.

I am also requesting to present as late as possible as I will be working and would like to attend in person to present.

Darin Milo, Regina, SK

This application for a 'work camp' already signals that the Co-op Refinery Complex is prepared for another tense lock out situation, far ahead of negotiations even commencing.

This camp is not necessary for refinery operations.

Regina already offers accommodation for temporary workers needed by commercial operations. The proposed work camp is intended to keep these 'workers' isolated from the community. Could it be that these workers will be "scab" workers? We already know the answer to that.

This is another signal that the work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason FCL would need lodging on-site, would be because they expect limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action just like the last time.

Labour disputes are emotional and contentious. Concentrating scab labourers in a specific location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations like a war zone ---- certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I implore council to avoid this development. The camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. Should council's decisions seek to escalate or mitigate tension in our city? Are you not on the side of the worker?

Others will surely note the public safety concerns.

Have we thoroughly considered the health and safety concerns of having workers sleep right next to a refinery for weeks or months? Especially when the risk factors increase as the complex becomes less safe with scab workers who will be at a skeleton crew and be less familiar with the operations altogether.

Who will bear the costs of additional traffic, security, policing, and emergency services? Surely Regina's ratepayers will shoulder at least some of the expense of a city-approved work camp on refinery grounds.

Council's responsibility is to protect the long-term interests of Regina residents. The proposed camp raises legitimate concerns regarding public safety, community impact, municipal costs, and the perception of council's involvement in a private labour conflict. For these reasons, Council should decline to support the proposal.

Council's role is not to decide the outcome of a labour dispute. The City must remain neutral, but approving a dedicated replacement-worker camp would give the impression that municipal resources and approvals favour one side.

Voting against this proposal is a vote for fairness, justice, and safety. Do not support this!

cb*cope225

Written Summary Brief – City Council Meeting, October 28, 2026

Submission to Regina City Council - Discretionary Use Application at 1102 N Fleet Street

Co-op Refinery Complex Delegation

Speaking: Mark Simpson, Director, Technical Services

Also in attendance: Andrew Swenson, Manager, Communications & Public Relations

Further to the information found in the application that City Administration is recommending for approval, we are providing the following additional information and context.

Collaboration with City Administration

- We have worked collaboratively with City of Regina Administration to ensure the application we've submitted is thorough and complete.
- We are pleased that City Administration has recommended that our Discretionary Use Application be approved.

Third-Party Risk Assessment

- CRC has conducted a third-party Risk Assessment through a highly reputable third-party organization regarding the siting of the potential camp.
- The third-party assessment is independent and signed in accordance with their responsibilities as Professional Engineers.
- The results of the risk assessment reinforced that the proposed location of the camp is inherently safe and does not pose a risk to human health.

Air Monitoring and Utilities

- The proposed camp would have its own dedicated air monitoring and testing.
- Air quality and wind direction were factors in proposing the camp's siting and are inputs to the overall risk assessment, which demonstrated the inherent safety of the location.
- The proposed camp would be self-contained and not put additional strain on city services or the power grid.

Additional Requirements

- We understand that this Discretionary Use Application is only for land use and agree with City Administration that we should be granted the permit.
- We understand that more permitting is required and will work collaboratively with all regulators to ensure a seamless process if we need to proceed with the camp.
- You will note in the report from City Administration that Regina Fire has been consulted.

Safety Planning for Personnel

- We are prepared to manage all safety and security aspects of the camp and have a dedicated on-site fire department, our own emergency response equipment, experienced

process safety and occupational health and safety professionals, and three on-site Occupational Health nurses.

- We will collaborate, as we always do, with the city on all aspects of emergency preparedness as it relates to the proposed camp.

Refinery Operations and Economic Prosperity

- We play a critical role in fuelling Western Canada, and it is our responsibility to plan for any event that could significantly impact operations or lead to business interruption.
- This permit would provide the flexibility to temporarily accommodate additional workers on refinery-owned land, if needed, to support the safe and reliable operation of the refinery.
- We hope never to require the work camp, as that would mean a business interruption has occurred. This permit is a practical contingency measure that helps support safety, reliability, and energy security for our community and province.

I am writing to voice my opposition to the “Discretionary Use” application for the “Work Camp” that has been proposed. I feel the ramifications of this camp have been grossly under-examined.

Firstly, the camp also feels like a direct threat to the bargaining leverage of the unionized workers at the Refinery. A work camp has only ever been erected twice in the refinery’s history, in 2016 and 2019. That it is happening again now feels like a slap in the face to the workers there now, and should construction of it go forward I cannot help but imagine that another strike will be imminent.

There’s also the matter of economic impact: not only will the city be spending a massive amount of money on a building that exists in a precarious location (which I will elaborate on further down), but the presence of this massive dormitory will prevent the temp workers from travelling to local hotels or restaurants, or any other establishments in the city. Not to mention, should a strike occur as per my previous point, those workers will also not be spending as normally as they do.

Finally, and in my opinion not the least of which, is the fact that this camp will be constructed on-site at the oil refinery. Any refinery is a high-risk environment, with a very real chance of catastrophic fires and/or explosions. Obviously we all hope that as many safety precautions will be taken at the refinery itself, but one of those precautions is ensuring that no one is living within a certain vicinity of the building to begin with. Furthermore, I am far more confident that these safety precautions will be followed by long-term trained employees as opposed to workers who are temporary, new to their position, and most likely not receiving sufficient training to keep things safe. These safety issues make me doubt that complete studies have been conducted regarding the safety of the camp’s location. Is it safe for the workers to spend that much uninterrupted time in such close proximity to the refinery? Are there are quality issues? Are they in a blast zone? And if any of these studies have been conducted, why are they not accessible to the public?

This entire project feels like it is lacking in forethought and planning, despite obvious dangers it presents to those who would potentially be staying there. I implore the city council to reject this proposal and stop this project before people get hurt. Thank you.

Tanner Vogelgesang, Regina, SK

CM26-11 - Impact of Bell AI Fabric Data Centre Campus on the City of Regina

Dear Mayor & Council,

My name is Jim Elliott and I live in Regina.

I dispute that your administration notes in the report that it has limited ability to comment on potential impacts related to the Project as it is outside City jurisdiction, and the administration is not directly involved in the Project.

- 1) They have expertise in environmental engineering, watershed management and atmospheric and noise pollution. They, like citizens, can and must comment and advise on any project that could have implications on the health and wellbeing of its residents and commercial activities within the city.
- 2) It is the imperative that your administration respond to threats and implications of this project. It is also appropriate to advocate for changes and to respond to the authorities who could approve or deny this or any other project.**
- 3) And this is not simply a question of zoning. As identified in my previous submission, this project implies a detriment on **at least 5 of the 6 criteria that demands a full environmental assessment be done.** This assessment includes the social and economic as well as the environmental implications the project.
- 4) As it pertains to this project, the fact that two governments and one could say three levels of government need to be engaged in a project such as this. As such this city should have demanded a joint planning committee or commission to be engaged in the review of this project and not to just walk away.

This engagement should have included full public disclosure of the information that the proponent provided to the RM of Sherwood. It should have convened an opportunity for the public to present its concerns about the project and to get answers to their concerns from the proponent.

- 5) Further, as explained in the report, the rationale for not requiring a full concept plan should have discussed and determined in public and not behind closed doors.**
- 6) Further, the extension of water and wastewater services for the project will require the piping to go through a national bird sanctuary (federal government jurisdiction) that is part of Provincial Capital Commission. It will require it to go under Wascana Creek again requiring additional permits.**
- 7) As it relates to point c. on page 6 of the report, how is it possible to fully assess the project without receiving any information on environmental or air quality impacts?**

In conclusion, I believe this administration did not want to be engaged in the project and therefore used every mechanism to remove itself from the process instead of providing the necessary and appropriate demands on the proponent's project and the review of the project.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

The information in the report from Bell about this data centre leaves a lot to be desired. I see it as nothing more than a lot of uncertainties, a lot of “likelies” and a lot of pinky promises.

If those building the data centre are going to boast that they’re outside of Regina city limits, then I say they should stay outside of Regina.

This means:

—denying them the Extra-Municipal Water Servicing Agreement,

—it means denying them the permission to use our wastewater treatment and haul away sites,

—it means administration denying and ending the conversation around their ability to purchase city water from buffalo pound water treatment plant.

If they’re not going to give Regina jurisdiction on this data centre that will impact us all, then they shouldn’t be given the luxury of using Regina facilities.

The location they’ve chosen was very specific, close enough so they think they’re guaranteed the use of Regina facilities, but far enough away that Regina doesn’t have jurisdiction. They know if it were to go to a public vote in Regina, it would be voted down. I’m not here to play their game, they need to start playing ours.

In addition, the denial of the information request from Standing Buffalo Dakota Nation should be noted. It is extremely concerning how Bell is refusing to work with indigenous nations.

Another piece of information I would like to know from Bell is if they are going to be storing any diesel on-site for their backup generators. Siting that the data centre in New Jersey recently leaked 5,000 gallons of diesel from their back up reserves into their local creeks.— If they are storing diesel near Regina, like most data centres do, there is no way to guarantee that it will not leak.

The entire process for the approval of this data centre has been undemocratic.

The councillors who approved it were appointed by the Sask party and not elected by their constituents, they approved it without public consultation or environmental assessments. When I’ve shown up to the public meetings at the RM of Sherwood, security labeled me as a protestor and not a member of the public, and barred me from entering the public meetings. When I walked up to read the pages of posted information on the windows of the

building, security guards rushed to block the door with their bodies. The doors to a public meeting.

It really paints a picture when the councillors go out of their way and spend a disgusting amount of money to put up fences, hire extra security personnel and request police presence all so they don't have to talk to the members of the public. —If this was a decision that they were proud of, that they actually believed in. They would have no issue defending it and talking to the public.

And to set the record straight, protestors are the public.

Approximately 50% of all data centres worldwide in 2026 have been paused or cancelled at any point in the construction or consultation process, often due to the significant push-back from community members.

One thing that is consistent, is that when data centres get cancelled, communities celebrate.

I know it wasn't this council in front of me today that initially voted to approve it, so please don't take it too personally. But I hope you're as mad about this as we are. I want you on our side. I am fighting for not only our futures, but our present, which includes yours. I am fighting for you.

We have the responsibility to preserve harmony in the natural world, to demonstrate compassion to all who call this home.

Regina can stop the data centre by ending the negotiations with Bell, and denying them the services.

There are not enough restrictions and protections in place, emissions and environmental disasters do not know city limits.

Dylan Block, Regina, SK

Main speaking points:

- in favour
- thank you for quick turnaround on report
- note that this report is only a good start. Ask how frequently stakeholders will be updated, and how construction is occurring before environmental impact assessments.
- acknowledgement of jurisdictional rights and responsibilities
- Responsibilities of Bell and what recourse if they fail?
- need for more discussion with Provincial government (SARM SUMA on same page, no sneaky back room deals)
- environmental concerns seem downplayed
- noise at 45 decibels?
- light?
- smell?
- traffic?
- potential areas of community building, like the once mentioned greenhouse? Economic development? Non-profits?
- The initial process Bell took does not show respect to Council or citizens, but they seem willing g to be more transparent since MN26-18
- any project of a scale and scope of this deserves more time. This report is telling g us what we should have known months ago.
- asking for clarification before and ensuring the impacts/changes/disruption citizens and the ecosystem we live in are weighted as much as projected economic gains.
- ensure we get more benefits from what we have lost, and the ongoing changes this project will bring.
- encourage council and Bell to continue a more transparent path.

Maureen Huot

Saskatchewan Data Centre Accountability Coalition

October 26, 2026

Mayor Chad Bachynski and Members of City Council
City of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan

RE: EX26-108 – Housing Accelerator Fund Update – Market Housing Capital Grant Incentive

Dear Mayor Bachynski and Members of City Council,

On behalf of West Oak Investments, I am writing to express our strong support for Administration's recommendation to introduce the Market Housing Capital Grant Incentive for Regina's Downtown and Centre Square neighbourhoods.

As a company actively investing in and developing properties in Regina, we see firsthand the challenges of making infill development financially viable.

The City has made it clear that it wants to encourage development in established neighbourhoods, make better use of existing infrastructure, and bring more people into our downtown. We share those goals.

The challenge is that the economics of development don't always align with those objectives.

Building in established areas often comes with higher costs, more complexity, and greater uncertainty than developing on the outskirts of the city. Every development project needs to generate a reasonable return on the capital invested and the risk taken. When the costs of development exceed what the market can financially support, otherwise desirable projects simply don't move forward.

The proposed \$50,000-per-unit incentive is meaningful because it helps address that financial gap.

It's important to recognize that this \$50,000 isn't simply money going into a developer's pocket. It's about bridging the gap between a project being a "no" or a "yes." It helps make projects financially viable in the very areas where the City wants to encourage investment and growth.

When these projects move forward, the benefits extend well beyond the developer. They create housing, construction jobs, additional property tax revenue, and more people living and spending money in our downtown. They also leverage significant private investment alongside the City's contribution.

I think this is an important example of the City recognizing that good policy and good economics need to work together. If we want to encourage private investment in specific areas of our city, we need to create the conditions that make that investment possible.

We commend Administration for bringing forward a practical solution that responds to the realities of development and encourage City Council to approve the recommendation in Report EX26-108 at its October 28, 2026 meeting.

Sincerely,



Dan Torrie
President
West Oak Investments



CR26-125 - Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots

Dear Mayor & Council,

My name is Jim Elliott and I live in Regina.

I listened to the discussions this past week at Executive Committee and I have some observations;

- 1) Due to the presence of the delegation from the Regina & District Chamber of Commerce, I believe the discussion was skewed to talk only about business development in Regina's downtown and rightfully so if you were only talking about them.
- 2) With the current vacancy of commercial property at 17% identified by the delegate, the likelihood of the discussions of new businesses downtown needing undeveloped or vacant land is further down the road than is likely if that vacancy was much lower. And if the overall malaise around economic development continues, then that future might be even further.
- 3) The scope of this discussion is far too narrow and only looks at commercial business development. It needs to be looking more at residential building as a principal focus not more office towers.
- 4) Further to the transportation planning considered in the motion, other options need to be seen as scenarios worth pursuing. Focusing simply to those that can afford to spend upwards of \$15-\$20,000+ on their vehicle while having their vehicle parked for upwards of 20 hours a day is far too narrow. Moving away from private automobile travel could potentially eliminate very expensive capital budget items and their ongoing maintenance.

Given what I have heard presented,

- a) The City Centre Transportation Study and Parking Travel Demand Strategy should include the proviso of having free public transit. I believe this would put pressures on vacant or underdeveloped land downtown because revenue could decrease to almost zero while the expenses would remain.
- b) The review of the Downtown Vacant & Underdeveloped Lands should shift its focus from looking only at commercial development and look for residential developers exclusively.
- c) As has been talked about before, the need for grocery store downtown would expand if more people lived downtown. One current tenant of the Cornwall Centre, the former Hudson Bay store, has sufficient space to accommodate redevelopment for housing and the grocery store. It has the delivery bays to the north, access to public transit to the south and would augment use of the Cornwall Centre food vendors by the new residents. There is also an appended parkade that could most likely accommodate additional parking for residents.

- d) Part of the congestion and frustration of vehicle owner when going downtown is to easily find a parking spot close to their destination as well as dealing with other drivers doing the same. With most spaces downtown now provisioned with online mechanisms to pay for parking, it should not be too tough to further that internet app with another one that drivers could use to identify empty parking spots and therefore reduce congestion or drivers driving to their destination and finding no parking nearby. They would, as they are close to the downtown, know where a parking spot is vacant and drive directly there immediately.

On average, there are 8 parking stalls for every automobile in North America and most likely in Regina. More and more residents and newcomers to this city are coming from countries and cities that have stronger public transportation strategies as well as don't or can't afford to own a private automobile.

My first and foremost demand of the city is to eliminate excessive use of private vehicles in general and to limit the congestion seen every morning and evening on roads going to and from the downtown. Having more people living and working downtown would help. A more expensive parking cost would help. So would free public transit. And the reduction in excessive traffic when in the downtown would also help. And inherent to all of this is to further our goal to be 100% renewable by 2050.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

[As an aside to this discussion, it should be noted that prior to today, residential taxpayers paid 40% of the overall property taxes and 60% was paid by commercial property owners. Today it is the opposite, putting much of the increasing tax burden on the residential taxpayer.]



CR26-125: Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots

Good afternoon Mayor Bachynski and Members of Regina City Council,

I write in response to CR26-125: Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots. I support the decision made at Executive to vote against the recommendation by staff (Option 1) to conduct a Transportation Study and Strategy. To my understanding voting yes to this recommendation would shut down discussion on the surface parking lot property subclass. This is not to suggest that a study of this kind isn't warranted given that the last one dates back to 2014. This should be debated and discussed to determine the benefits and feasibility of this study, but it seems to shift away from the question of taxation of surface parking lots. Option 2 as presented does not produce the desired effects given that there is no mechanism to increase revenue (or direct the taxation offset to a particular geography). Instead, I encourage members of Council to strategize around alternative options as noted below.

In 2025, Regina City Council approved a motion directing staff to examine the feasibility of creating a new property tax subclass for surface parking lots in the City Centre. The rationale behind the motion was to better understand whether changing the tax structure might encourage landowners to redevelop the land. Standalone surface parking lots contribute lower property taxes compared to other commercial uses. They also pay less towards our wastewater utility to my understanding as consumption is metered and without a use other than parking, there is nothing to meter. The directive as presented in 2025 wasn't intended to measure the hardship of a new property subclass on landowners (or even their tenants) or to debate the value/necessity of parking more broadly. Yet, this was a significant part of the discussion last week at Executive. The motion was intended to measure whether a new property subclass might encourage development in a City Centre where a significant portion of the land use (9%) is surface parking (with a Downtown that boasts an even higher level at 33% surface parking).

Beyond a well-framed and well-researched environmental scan of what other jurisdictions are doing with their surface parking lots, stakeholder engagement on this issue was limited. Engagement was directed towards land owners and developers of City Centre land (with a Be Heard page that drew marginal response). Many of those consulted directly owned parking lots. Other stakeholders directly represented business owners and property owners. Asking landowners of standalone surface parking lots whether a tax increase is feasible produced the exact response that we would expect.

If the argument according to the stakeholders consulted for not implementing the subclass relates to "site contamination, market and financial constraints and the continued need for parking," it is clear that there is no intention of shifting these lots, particularly when we consider they have remained in this state for decades. Only four surface parking sites as indicated were developed

since 2019. To this end, status quo doesn't seem to be working to achieve the outcome that is desired in our City Centre. Transportation patterns and land use go hand in hand.

Part of the pivot by City staff for a Transportation Study and Strategy seems to respond to the significant governance obstacle produced by provincial legislation. In short, the establishment of a property subclass for surface parking lots in the City Centre would not result in increased revenue for the City, but instead would create a reduction in taxes shared across commercial property owners city-wide. If revenue from the new property tax subclass could be directly leveraged to fund incentives for downtown vibrancy/incentives/public realm standards, I believe we'd be having a very different conversation.

To this end, I respectfully ask members of Council to explore the following two options:

1. Draft a motion to engage in conversations with the province to request an exception in the property subclass for surface parking lots in the City Centre. The current regulations do not allow for collection of increased funds through a property subclass which could then be reallocated for City Centre specific investments/incentives. This was one of the recommendations that came out of the 2018 Underutilized Land Study ("the study recommended that the City advocate for legislative amendments to enable a more precise and deliberate approach to encourage redevelopment of underutilized lands" – pg. 7 of the current report).
2. Pursue regulatory tools. Look into the creation of licensing for surface parking lots, requiring land owners to invest in standard upgrading (including for example stormwater runoff filtering) and design standards (lighting, landscaping) to encourage pedestrian safety and vibrancy at the public realm. Landowners that don't comply could then be fined, offering a revenue stream that could be reallocated into incentives for land use development. Schedule A as part of the discussion on this item already outlines design standards and changes to zoning bylaw regulations. On the latter, I would be careful to ward against any new lots being created as this is opened up.

Thank-you for your consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vanessa Mathews', with a stylized, flowing script.

Vanessa Mathews
Associate Professor
Geography & Environmental Studies
University of Regina
Resident of Ward 3

Submission to City Council Regarding Item CR26-125: Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots

Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing to express my support for Administration's report, **CR26-125: Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots**, and to encourage Council to carefully recognize the important role that standalone parking facilities play in supporting Regina's office sector, commercial activity, and municipal tax base.

As Council considers this matter, it is important to acknowledge that standalone surface parking lots are not simply vacant parcels of land. Many of these properties operate as essential infrastructure serving office buildings, professional services, commercial establishments, and thousands of employees and visitors who rely on convenient access to workplaces and businesses every day.

For many office tenants and employers, especially in Regina's downtown and commercial districts, the availability of nearby parking remains a significant consideration when making location decisions. While the City continues to support a variety of transportation options, the reality is that a large portion of Regina's workforce travels by personal vehicle. Surface parking lots provide an affordable and practical means of accommodating this demand.

The availability of parking directly supports the viability of existing office buildings. Employers need convenient access for employees, clients, contractors, and visitors. Professional firms, government offices, medical services, and many businesses depend on nearby parking to maintain operations and remain competitive. Limiting the availability of these facilities could create challenges for businesses that already face increasing operating costs and changing workplace dynamics.

It is also important to recognize the substantial tax contribution that standalone parking properties already provide. These sites are privately owned commercial properties that generate property tax revenues for the City while requiring relatively limited municipal services compared to many other forms of development. Property owners continue to maintain these sites, invest in their operation, and contribute to the municipal tax base year after year.

In addition to the current property taxes paid directly by parking lot operators, these facilities support the economic activity of the surrounding buildings and businesses. Office towers, commercial tenants, restaurants, retailers, and service providers all benefit from accessible parking

options. The continued success of these businesses helps sustain employment, commercial occupancy, and sustain existing property tax revenues throughout the city's downtown.

The discussion surrounding standalone surface parking lots should therefore focus not only on their physical land use but also on the critical function they serve within Regina's broader economic ecosystem. Parking is a service that supports existing investment. Many office buildings were developed with the understanding that surrounding parking infrastructure would continue to be available to employees and visitors. Policies affecting these properties should recognize that relationship and avoid creating unintended consequences for businesses that rely on them.

Downtown Regina is currently navigating a highly competitive environment for attracting and retaining employers, professional services, and private investment. Maintaining a balance between long-term planning objectives and the operational needs of existing businesses is essential. Parking facilities remain an important component of that balance.

Administration's report provides Council with an opportunity to review these properties through a practical lens that reflects current market realities. Any future policy direction should recognize the ongoing demand for vehicle access, the needs of the business community, and the meaningful tax revenue generated by these properties. Decisions regarding standalone parking lots should ensure that businesses and property owners are not disadvantaged while continuing to support economic activity throughout the city.

As Council deliberates on Item CR26-125, I encourage members to recognize the important contribution that standalone parking lots make to Regina's economy. These properties support employment, help sustain office occupancy, provide necessary parking services to residents and visitors, and contribute significant commercial property tax revenues that help fund municipal services.

For these reasons, I support Administration's report and encourage Council to ensure that any future policy framework continues to recognize the value of standalone surface parking lots as an important component of Regina's commercial and economic infrastructure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitch Molnar

Mitchell Developments Ltd

Regina, Saskatchewan

EX26-112 (Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots)

Dear Regina City Council:

I am writing in regards to EX26-112 (Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots). In my opinion Executive was right to vote down the recommendations as presented. I suggest the following:

1. Adopt Option 2: Establish the City Centre SSPL property tax subclass described in this report and set the mill rate factor for the subclass to 4.5 times the standard commercial and industrial mill rate factor effective for 2028.
2. Consider other proposals in Option 1, along with the Market Housing Grant Incentive, as distinct policy recommendations in a separate vote. This requires some procedural wrangling, but it's feasible.

Disincentivize underutilized land; incentivize development that aligns with City and Council priorities.

What Administration presented was a report that seemed determined to fail - and with it the subclass proposal they were tasked with researching. Lumping the parking matter in with a broader transit analysis is not only beyond the scope of what was requested, it is a deflection. Council has been backed into a corner. You won't get the report until 2028. Then it will be 2 years, at best, to implement, which is unlikely given the cost and complexity (and aversion to transit).

Please note that some of the work Admin is promising by 2028 was supposed to be done almost a decade ago. It wasn't (see page 8 of 9).

Below is a more comprehensive reasoning for my suggestions.

Summary:

I have a great deal of respect for the members of Administration tasked with assembling this report, but I question their approach. A spend-thrift and divided Council was asked for a substantial sum of money to advance (or reject) a number of policy recommendations that were supposed to be put into action years ago, or that already exist in a number of policy papers and reports.

A subclass might work... so let's kill it:

Administration rejects the subclass proposal but not before stating that it might work.

“However, over time and in conjunction with improved market conditions, implementing the subclass at the highest possible rate could potentially encourage property owners to discontinue the use of SSPLs and pursue redevelopment opportunities. A higher subclass rate would also likely have a greater influence on land use decisions and redevelopment activity than a lower rate.”

Good! This is the point. There’s evidence to support such an approach *as one tool in a toolbox aimed at revitalizing downtown and downtown adjacent communities.*

Weak reasons for opposing:

The reasons for opposing the subclass proposal are weak, at best. Admin relies on prairie cities – examples of inner-city failure – and business lobbying in other communities to protect the status quo. Worse yet, the report relies on anecdotes and patterns, not evidence. The report also suggests that a subclass *might* stall development. What development? Saskatchewan’s richest corporations and families are profiting from a status quo that benefits themselves at the expense of the public good. There’s no incentive to take a risk in the downtown when parking revenue is too lucrative. We know this to be true.

“Proceeding with the subclass would be inconsistent with jurisdictional best practices (Appendix B) in prairie cities and stakeholder feedback received during engagement (Appendix C). Additionally, it could be perceived as making the City Centre less attractive for existing businesses, employers and future investment, particularly if the subclass results in reduced parking availability or higher parking costs for City Centre residents, employees, customers, and visitors.”

Previous Councils and Administrations have done a lot to incentive intensification. Political risks were made with contentious policies to streamline the development permitting process, to remove barriers to infill and multi-unit developments, offered financial incentives, and deployed federal dollars to make all of this happen. Increasing taxes on underutilized land uses is not a barrier to development. We can’t accept anecdotes from business owners as fact and evidence. They are opinions, at best.

Convenient Stakeholders:

“Stakeholders” in the report appear to mean businesses (parking lot management firms are included, I’m sure), developers, and property owners who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. It’s a status quo that has been harming the downtown for generations, as Administration concedes in their report. Of course this group would oppose the proposed subclass policy. Were residents of the downtown or adjacent communities consulted? Were community associations consulted? Were professional planners? The report indicates “no”.

Accessibility concerns are exploited:

“Participants indicated that a reduction in parking supply as a result of the SSPL property tax subclass could create barriers for individuals with mobility or accessibility challenges, who may find it more difficult to access destinations from parking locations further away,

particularly during the winter months. Should this occur, it may be contrary to the Accessibility Plan goals of “identifying, removing and preventing barriers to participation in civic life” and “strengthening access to community spaces, services and opportunities.” (Page 4)

That’s absurd. We need to raze the downtown and create more surface parking lots to advance accessibility goals? Who did you consult? What did you tell them? How many people participated? Or was this the usual policy by anecdote? This is an awful exploitation of the disability community to satisfy Impark and property owners.

Let’s repeat history – and continue with the mistakes:

The report talks about how inner cities have been on the decline since the 1950s. Regina suffered from this blight a bit later, but it happened. Guess how? City policies that encouraged and facilitated sprawl and increased dependence on the automobile. Put another way: City Councillors allowed this problem to fester. It’s up to you to change course. Will you? Other cities are moving ahead. This report defends decades of failed policies. Why?

“An analysis of historical aerial imagery and property records indicates that the conversion of developed properties to SSPLs occurred gradually beginning in the 1950s, as areas within the City Centre transitioned from predominantly residential neighbourhoods to larger office and commercial developments, particularly those associated with government administration and corporate functions, as illustrated by the aerial imagery in Appendix D.

Subclasses change the economics of land uses. That’s a good thing:

I looked over the *Cities Act* and your oaths as Councillors. I couldn’t find anything that mandated you to keep parking cheap. So why the concern over increasing parking rates, which is the point?

“The scenario for a paved parking lot shows that if the full impact of the property tax subclass was equally distributed among parking stall users, estimated monthly parking rate increases could range from \$18 to \$122.”

Good. You’ve demonstrated that the policy has an effect. In Administration’s own calculations, a bus pass is now more economical than a parking stall. Congratulations on identifying a problem and a solution – and thus feeding into transit options.

I got a fever, and the only cure is more subsidies:

Administrative revealed some important problems that warrant reflection. Subclass revenues offer pathways, not silver bullet solutions. That’s fair. Stakeholders again repeat their support for a status quo that benefits them greatly. If you are concerned about parking, put your money where your mouth is and build another parkade to facilitate these needs. To suggest that no one will work downtown without dirt fields is ludicrous. People avoid downtown because it’s largely empty space. By the way, these parking lots sit vacant more often than they are filled.

“Stakeholders identified several barriers to redevelopment, as summarized in Appendix C, including site contamination, market and financial constraints and the continued need for parking to support residential tenants, customers, employees and broader business attraction and workforce retention efforts.”

Predictably, in their opposition to higher taxes on parking lots, stakeholders caught wind of public money and want in. Councils and the City have done almost everything these stakeholders asked for to encourage downtown development. And what happened? Very little. Now they want public dollars to fund projects unknown. This substantiates the need for a subclass: it's too lucrative to have Impark manage your property, so they won't build unless the economics change. That means subsidies, but for what? Harvard Development wanted federal money to build a plaza / temporary use space on a site once occupied by a building that conveniently burned down at the hands of a skilled arsonist. Did they come forward with a proposal to build residential before or after the fire? No, they talked about a hotel if the taxpayer built them a downtown arena as part of the Catalyst initiatives. Aside from Namirand's housing proposal, I don't recall seeing anything of substance appear before Council (except Capital Point).

That said, the Market Housing Grant Incentive pilot being proposed in the report is worth consideration as one tool in the revitalization agenda, alongside tax mechanisms. Create disincentives for surface parking lots *and* offer support for change.

Parking, parking everywhere but never a place to park (for the police):

Here the RPS is being used as an excuse for not proceeding:

“Five of the six lots are currently used by the Regina Police Service (RPS) for employee parking. RPS has indicated that parking remains an operational requirement, as the collective agreement for in-scope employees includes provisions related to parking and there is currently a significant waitlist for parking spaces. In addition, due to the nature of police operations and the prevalence of non-standard work schedules (e.g. nights, weekends and on-call shifts), many employees have limited ability to rely on alternative modes of transportation.”

This is absurd. Taxpayers support “free” parking for the RPS at an expense of roughly \$600,000 a year. I've been at the bargaining table when this was discussed. Instruct your Board of Police Commissioner delegates to end this taxable benefit once and for all through negotiations. Let the RPS fight it out in arbitration. The City would be better off building a public parking lot for everyone to use; the RPS can negotiate a sharing agreement. But at the end of the day, the RPS should pay for their own parking like all municipal employees.

Let's making parking pretty... or not:

Schedule B talks about aesthetic improvements and redevelopment options. Looks cool. I was given a promise before the pandemic that these policy options would be worked on. Nothing happened. What *could* be an option is renewable energy development features (solar panels) that might be used to offset subclass tax expenses. Not making parking lots in Regina look like crap

shouldn't be a hard decision. Just implement the design features and move on. Don't let property owners sucker you in to paying for it.

The status quo hurts:

Our approach to dealing with downtown surface parking lots is hurting taxpayers and the community. Stop giving in to stakeholders who profit from the status quo. If you want to advance a targeted transit and housing development plan, go for it *alongside a dedicated surface parking lot sub-class as part of a comprehensive solution.*

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Stevens
Former City Councillor
Ward 3 Resident

Main speaking points:

- In favour

- if had been in place, Bell data centre conversations would have been different

- cross jurisdiction projects create confusion and mixed messaging for citizens and stakeholders holders

- the impacts do not change because of a line we draw on a map.

- city council must have a say in any upcoming projects.

- council not being included originally has led to playing "catch up", and perhaps put us at a disadvantage.

- must pass to save time and money going forward.

Maureen Huot

Written Submission to Regina City Council

Subject: Integrating Pedestrian Safety, Winter Maintenance, and Accessible Community Mailbox Routes into Regina's Emerging Pedestrian Safety Motion

Submitted to: Regina City Council

Submitted by: Meghan South

Date: October 26, 2026

Purpose of Submission

I respectfully request that Regina City Council consider integrating accessibility, winter pedestrian safety, and access to essential services into the pedestrian safety motion currently under discussion.

The City has taken steps to improve pedestrian infrastructure, expand sidewalk snow removal, and improve streets. These initiatives provide an opportunity to develop a coordinated approach that considers how residents navigate their communities throughout the year, particularly during Saskatchewan's winter months.

This submission also raises an emerging issue requiring municipal attention: Canada Post's planned transition from door-to-door delivery to community mailboxes.

Background and Rationale

Canada Post announced in September 2026 that approximately 24,000 addresses in Regina are identified for community mailbox conversion in 2027, subject to the corporation's implementation schedule.

While Canada Post is undertaking these changes as part of its modernization and financial sustainability plans, the transition may have implications for residents who experience mobility barriers or rely on walking and public transit to access essential services.

For some residents, reaching a community mailbox may require navigating sidewalks, crossing streets, travelling longer distances, or accessing pedestrian routes affected by snow and ice. These challenges warrant consideration during municipal planning, particularly for people with disabilities, seniors, and residents with limited transportation options.

The purpose of this submission is not to oppose modernization. It is to encourage proactive planning so that changes to essential services can be considered alongside existing municipal commitments to pedestrian safety and accessibility.

Recommendations

I respectfully recommend that Council consider the following measures as the pedestrian safety motion develops.

1. Integrate accessibility into pedestrian safety planning

Consider universal accessibility when reviewing pedestrian infrastructure, including continuous sidewalks, curb ramps, safe crossings, appropriate pedestrian connections, and routes to essential services.

2. Coordinate winter maintenance with essential destinations

Build on the City's existing sidewalk snow removal initiatives by assessing whether pedestrian routes to community mailboxes, public transit stops, healthcare facilities, and other essential destinations are adequately considered in winter maintenance planning.

3. Engage Canada Post on community mailbox locations

Where appropriate, engage Canada Post to discuss planned mailbox locations and opportunities to consider pedestrian access, accessibility, safe street crossings, and winter conditions before sites are finalized.

4. Apply a disability justice and equity lens

Include people with disabilities, seniors, residents with mobility limitations, and people who depend on walking or public transit in consultations about pedestrian infrastructure and access to community mailboxes.

5. Identify infrastructure gaps and practical solutions

Ask Administration to identify opportunities to incorporate improvements into existing street reconstruction, pedestrian connectivity, and winter maintenance programs. Where gaps are identified, report on potential solutions, costs, timelines, and the division of responsibilities between municipal and federal authorities.

6. Establish measurable outcomes

Where feasible, assess progress using measures such as accessible route continuity, identified sidewalk barriers, winter maintenance performance, public feedback, and the resolution of accessibility concerns.

Conclusion

Pedestrian safety extends beyond the roadway. It includes the sidewalks, crossings, and accessible routes that allow residents to participate in community life and access essential services independently and safely.

Regina's ongoing work on street improvements and winter maintenance creates an opportunity to consider these interconnected needs within a single, coordinated policy approach.

As Canada Post prepares to transition Regina addresses to community mailboxes, Council has an opportunity to consider potential accessibility impacts early and identify practical solutions within the City's existing planning framework.

I respectfully ask Council to consider these recommendations during the development of its pedestrian safety motion and to explore opportunities for coordination with Canada Post and other relevant partners.

A proactive, accessible, and coordinated approach can help Regina continue working toward safer neighbourhoods and more equitable access to essential services for residents throughout the year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan South

I'd lived in Regina for five years before I lost my driver's licence for health reasons back in 2012. Until I became a pedestrian myself, I didn't realize how little I understood about our city's pedestrian and cycling routes—or how difficult it can be to navigate Regina without a car.

I'm here to support the Pedestrian and Cyclist Protection Strategy Action Plan.

I believe council needs to look at pedestrian and cycling safety not simply as a transportation issue, but as an issue of access: access to health care, education, employment, and basic safety.

And this needs to be informed by research and by the people who actually experience these systems every day.

For example, Edmonton has researched removing “beg buttons” at busy intersections. When a vehicle gets a green light, pedestrians should reasonably expect that the walk signal will come too. Requiring people to know they must push a button—especially seniors, newcomers, or people unfamiliar with the system—creates unnecessary confusion and risk. Why should pedestrians have to ask for permission to cross when cars are automatically given that signal?

We also need to consider how changing land uses affects pedestrian access. Buildings become offices, clinics, and childcare centres in areas that may never have been designed for people walking to them. My own dentist moved to Pasqua Street 10 years ago, where a sidewalk was only added last year, despite several clinics and a childcare centre nearby.

I would encourage the city to gather input from community organizations, unhoused-serving organizations, daycares, disability organizations, seniors' centres and retirement communities, newcomer organizations. Start with organizations and then expand to people who regularly walk or cycle—including the growing number of e-bike riders. Surveys and focus groups can help us understand where the real barriers are.

This strategy can do more than prevent deaths and injuries. It can help ensure that people who walk, cycle, or rely on transit can actually reach the things they need to live: health care, education, employment, and safety.

Carla Harris, Regina, SK

Re: MN26-20 Pedestrian and Cyclist Protection Strategy

Submission by: Tamela Friesen

Representing: Self, as a concerned cyclist primarily, and concerned motorist as well.

*Note: this may be a duplicate. The portal crashed when I clicked submit. I received no confirmation in my email.

Submission

Thank you

Thank you for the work you do for the residents of Regina.

Thank you for creating space to hear Regina residents' concerns & ideas.

Thank you for bring safe cycling, wheeling, and walking as something important

Why Hear Me

I started cycling for transportation year round in 1995, surpassing 100,000 km, lifetime, of urban & highway riding.

I took the CanBike safe cycling for transportation class circa 1998.

I took instructor training for the CanBike safe cycling for transportation in 2002.

I've intermittently certified and taught the course since then.

I use the CanBike strategies 8 - 12 rides per week, year round.

I don't want to collide with a cyclist or pedestrian, whether riding by bike or driving my car. I don't want anyone else to either.

Safe Wheeling and Walking deserves more importance and priority than currently given

A substantial number of people use alternative transportation: 1% cycling, 8% wheel assist

We've seen reports of collisions and deaths this fall. Each collision changes the lives of, and traumatizes the humans colliding, their families, and communities, and the drivers.

More people wheeling and walking safely = cleaner air, healthier population, happier (cycling is incredibly fun), I could go on for a very long time.

Add to the motion:

Add: "and key road safety partners including, but not limited to"

Vision zero - safe road users, safe design

Complete Streets - DTAH

Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs (because the Province makes rules for road users).

SGL (because they train 80% of road users. Transit and wheeled users and pedestrians are essentially ignored).

Regina Police Service (because they can serve a more aggressive educational purpose—not a punishment strategy).

Saskatchewan Cycling Association (could be a great venue for delivering cyclist education)

Bike Regina (could be a great venue for delivering cyclist education)

Classes & Programs of Parks, Recreation, and Culture

To the Action Plan parameters add: “The Action Plan should be informed by ... vulnerable road users and subject-matter experts who also wheel”

Add: be able to address wheeled users of means as well as those affected by socio-economic pressures.

Why vote in favour?

We can (and must) do better, even with minimal effort.

Motorist fear, confusion, and ignorance are higher than they need to be.

Every morning between one and four motorists yield their right-of-way to me (stopping to let me cross a road like a pedestrian or stopping the flow of traffic through a green light to invite me to turn left in front of them, for two examples)

When motorists see me on my bike (and I ensure they see me), they often give me comical space and latitude, for example, stopping 3-4 car lengths behind me. I appreciate the space. Also, okay to come a little closer.

We need more education than current: 206 words of threats on the City website and one paragraph in the SGL driver training manual. It's not enough.

Motorists are keen to share the road with cyclists and never want to collide with them.

Wheeled road users demonstrate incompetence. Addressing this might be the best value for the dollar.

Every day I see cyclists dressed in black, riding on sidewalks, riding the wrong way down the road, failing to signal, weaving. With the advent of electric power, they can now do this with frightful speed.

Accessible education for these users is really not consistently available or made known

with any reasonable effort.

The existing bicycling infrastructure, in my assessment,
Is in places where it was not needed (Park Street, Pasqua St, 14th Ave through Cathedral) ...
were there any collisions on any of these roads before? Have their been since?).
More often than not, designed to increase rather than reduce chances of collision. I would
be curious to know before and after statistics on collisions.
Often requires re-educating motorists and cyclists.

I heard, what I hope is, a rumour. The person in charge of cycling infrastructure at the time
was not a bicyclist? In case this is true Would you accept brain surgery from a person
who just read about it? Even if the reading resources were robust? Even if they consulted
subject matter experts who had done brain surgery before?

Thanks again for hearing from me. Please vote in favour of this motion. Also call me if you
want help on this initiative.

Tamela Friesen, Regina, SK

Hello,

Bike Regina Delegation Brief

MN26-20 Pedestrian and Cyclist Protection Strategy

October 28, 2026

Bike Regina is in favour of a Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Action Plan that can be used to enhance and supplement the City's existing Vision Zero road safety strategy.

The goal of Vision Zero is to reduce fatal and life changing injury collisions in Regina by 10% in 5 years with the ultimate goal of eliminating these types of collisions entirely. With appropriate data, planning, policy, design, and funding this is an achievable goal. More than 1,200 cities in 30 countries have managed at least 1 year without road deaths including major urban centres like Helsinki, Finland. According to the Vision Zero page on the City website 15% of all injury and fatal collisions involved a vulnerable road user. It would be more accurate to say that 89% of all fatalities involved a vulnerable road user (Table 1).

Table 1: SGI Collision Statistics for Regina

Year

Total Injury Collisions

VRU Injured

% Injured

Total Fatal Collisions

VRU Deaths

% Fatal

2024

776

113

15%

4

3

75%

2023

888

123

14%

5

5

100%

2022

870

100

11%

3

2

67%
2021
774
80
10%
6
6
100%
4-Year Average
13%

89%

****VRU = Vulnerable Road Users**

If we want to specifically tackle preventable road deaths, then pedestrian and cyclist safety should be our number one mobility priority.

We understand that these collisions are systemic - making it very hard to tackle safety quickly and cheaply. Any number of the 10 collisions with pedestrians and cyclists that occurred in September could have occurred at hundreds of intersections across the City. There often isn't anything unique about these particular intersections - they just reflect a period of road design that accepted collisions as inevitable rather than prioritizing safety, particularly for vulnerable road users.

Fundamentally, each of these 10 collisions were preventable through better road design, vehicle design, safer speeds, etc. Using the Safe Systems approach, we can expand on the existing action items in our Vision Zero plan using a data driven and evidence based approach.

Regina Vision Zero Plan

Completed Actions

Upgraded school zone crosswalks with zebra crossings.

Installed Temporary curb extensions have been at various locations. See Traffic Calming.

Maintained ongoing collaborations with key safety partners, including SGI, CAA, Regina Public Schools, Regina Catholic Schools, the Saskatchewan Health Authority, and the Regina Police Service, to promote safety awareness.

Future Action Items

Develop Safety awareness campaigns, to ensure that all road users, including those using scooters, skateboards, roller blades, etc. can navigate the roads safely.

Install pavements markings to designate bicycle zones.

Develop and expand the Active Transportation Plan and infrastructure.

Pedestrian and cyclist warning signs at high-risk locations.

Develop a school zone and pedestrian safety toolbox, including a Safe and Active School Routes program to help schools, students, and parents plan safe routes to school.

Conduct school zone audits to identify and address safety concerns.

Other strategies

Protected left turn phases

No Right Turn on Red

Leading pedestrian Intervals

More community safety zones with reduced speeds (Pilot Project on 13th very successful)

Ensuring that the Complete Street Design Guide being under development places sufficient priority on VRU

Approving zoning and land use changes that promote integrated mixed use and walkable communities - each neighbourhood should have grocery store, doctor, schools etc that allow people to walk for their daily needs instead of driving as the only option.

separating vulnerable road users (walking, biking, rolling) from vehicles in both space and time.

—

Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) VZ and Safe Systems Primer: <https://www.tac-atc.ca/en/knowledge-centre/technical-resources-search/publications/prm-vzss-e/>

Thank you,

Respectfully,

Janelle Lubkiwski

Bike Regina

Your Worship:

On October 9th, 2026 I emailed Vision Zero at City Hall, and have not got a response to my idea of reducing fatal and majorly injurious collisions by 11 per cent over the next 3 years. The current goal is only 10 per cent, but I think Regina can do 10 per cent better than the original goal.

Since emailing 2 weeks ago, I had an even better idea that I think this motion could help implement. Perhaps we could reduce fatal collisions by 12 per cent? It's unclear what the consequences will be for the Administration or City Councillors if they fail to meet their original 10 per cent goal. Well, other than additionally dead or seriously injured residents on their consciences, when they could have more quickly implemented safer streets using scientifically sound methods that have succeeded in other municipalities.

Sincerely,
John Klein
Regina resident

P.S Included below is the email that I didn't get a timely response to:

Dear Vision Zero,

A dozen people since mid-September have been injured or killed in Regina by drivers. That includes 2 fatalities. Regina is a Vision Zero city the past 3 years with a terrible track record poised to miss our 10% target. If there is evidence to the contrary, I'd love to hear it.

Our goal of reducing these sorts of tragedies by just 10% in 2 more years is too low.

I want to push that to an 11% reduction, which is 10% better! Can you help me get our city to strive for 10 per cent better than our current goal which we're apparently failing to meet? What sorts of things can I help the city with to accomplish that?

Sincerely,
John Klein
Regina
[my phone number]

References:

https://beheard.regina.ca/community-safety-zone/news_feed/project-background

Install pavements markings to designate bicycle zones

-I don't see how paint or signs would have helped the cyclist who died on Albert St. a couple weeks ago. Can barriers be installed to make safe places to cycle where drivers can't easily hit someone? The Transportation Master Plan is calling for more than 8km of this sort of bike lane to be constructed each year, on average. The City's own website is misreporting for several years how much bike infrastructure is being constructed annually.

MN26-20 Pedestrian and Cyclist Protection Strategy

Dear Mayor and Council,

My name is Jim Elliott and I live in Regina.

My wish today is to bring forward some information that although the motion includes some information about the past few years, I feel that it is woefully underestimating the situation.

What further prompted me to bring this letter was that I have had personal experiences this past week and previously.

The recent encounter was with a vehicle at the corner of 17th Avenue and Winnipeg Street, well within the school zone and at the time when students were clearly exiting the area. Thankfully it was what one might hope enough of a scare to the young driver that they may change their behaviour of rolling through an intersection without looking both ways before proceeding something far too often seen today.

The earlier incident was when I was riding my bicycle and was knocked unconscious for about a minute, more serious including a ride in an ambulance and a required 24-hour concussion watch. Because of the incident, a police officer was involved. But when I asked about the charging of the other person in the accident, the officer refused to charge the other person for the accident.

This brings me to my third point. I don't believe that the medical system is adequately recording the accidents happening in the city because people are not reporting nor providing data about the problem when they do arrive at the hospital. It may help but the current data, I believe, is totally inadequate to fully understand the problem and suggest solutions.

Further, I don't see any provision within the motion to talk to the community, whether pedestrians or people-powered or electric cyclists or people with disability scooters or electric wheelchairs. I suspect that you will get a much different picture from their perspective, if asked. We tend to think of ourselves as a car culture and truly only respond to problems if people are seriously injured or die.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

Request for the City to have direct to the public applications for illuminated crosswalks around busy pedestrian areas in the City. Broadway Avenue and 19th Avenue between Winnipeg St. to Park St. contain little pedestrian signage and zero lit pedestrian crosswalks. Both Broadway Avenue and 19th Avenue are busy within the east to west Winnipeg St. to Park St. boundaries as there are multiple access points to Wascana park. There are also multiple schools in the area that make for additional pedestrian/car activity. I find vehicles often do not yield to pedestrians, and pedestrians have no safe illuminated crosswalks to utilize. Wascana park remains fairly active into the evenings, and with our dark winter evenings, this makes it increasingly dangerous.

Meggie Freed, Regina, SK

Dear Mayor and Council,

I feel that the crosswalk could be safer at the corner of Winnipeg Street and 14 Avenue. It is a high traffic intersection and many children use it to access Maple Leaf Pool and to attend nearby schools and libraries. It would be great to see either traffic lights or, at the very least, a signalized crosswalk with flashing beacons.

Currently there is an overhead pedestrian sign, but no flashing beacons. This is not enough, especially considering the amount of children that cross the intersection. Curiously, the intersection at Winnipeg Street and 13th Avenue does have flashing beacons. Why not at 14th then?

Now would be an optimal time to add something as there is construction on the intersection of Winnipeg and 14th.

Added to this is a concern I have about the adherence to the playground speed zone on 14th Avenue where Maple Leaf Pool is located. Many drivers seem to go much faster than the 30 km/h limit. Perhaps adding a radar speed sign would help.

I am writing this just after hearing the news that a pedestrian was hit by a car at the intersection of Dewdney and Lewvan. I'm afraid that my above concerns represent an overall systemic neglect of lower income, urban dense neighbourhoods in Regina. Whenever I travel to more suburban Regina neighbourhoods, I have noticed that radar speed signs and signalized crosswalks are the norm. This should be the same across the city.

Thanks for hearing my concerns. I write this as a resident of the Heritage neighbourhood and a father of two school-aged children who regular use Maple Leaf Pool and need to cross Winnipeg Street everyday to attend St. Augustine School.

P.s. thank you for posting a playground zone along 14th Avenue a couple of years ago. Now please add these other elements to increase the safety.

Josh Campbell

Dear City Council:

My co-operative shares cars amongst its members. One of our co-op vehicles is parked at City Hall Parkade. Members typically take the bus, bike, or walk to use carshare vehicles, so we've an interest in pedestrian and cyclist safety.

We hope you go to greater lengths to improve the safety of people who don't drive, as there have been more than a dozen injuries and 2 deaths inflicted upon pedestrians and cyclists by drivers, in just the last 2 months.

Regina has a goal of reducing fatal and major injury collisions, and a vision of no loss of life or major injury. This motion helps get Regina closer to its goal and vision, so it should pass to save lives.

Sincerely,
John Klein
President
Regina Car Share Co-operative Ltd.