

List of Delegations

Wednesday, November 18, 2026
1:00 PM

Henry Baker Hall, Main Floor, City Hall

City Council
List of Delegations
Wednesday, November 18, 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.

CM26-14 Supplemental Report - Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots

COMMUNICATIONS

CP26-77 Mitch Molnar, Mitchel Developments Ltd., Regina, SK

CP26-78 Vanessa Mathews, Regina, SK

CR26-125 Review of Standalone Surface Parking Lots

COMMUNICATION

CP26-79 Reid Pedersen, Mertz MJ Holdings Inc., Regina, SK

CR26-135 Playgrounds

DELEGATION

DE26-111 Connie Buchan, Regent Park Community Association, Regina, SK

Support for Administration's Recommendations Regarding Standalone Surface Parking Lots (CM26-14)

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing in support of the recommendations contained in the supplemental report regarding the review of standalone surface parking lots (CM26-14).

The supplemental report clearly outlines the challenges associated with establishing a new property tax subclass or implementing a licensing regime for existing standalone surface parking lots. As Administration notes, current provincial legislation does not support the use of a subclass to generate dedicated revenues for specific initiatives, and any changes to taxation powers would require a lengthy and uncertain provincial legislative process. Similarly, licensing frameworks are generally intended to regulate business operations rather than compel significant site design or public realm improvements on existing properties.

Downtown surface parking lots continue to serve an important function for businesses, employees, customers, visitors, and events in Regina's City Centre. While there is broad support for improving the downtown environment, these objectives are more likely to be achieved through cooperation and partnership between the City, property owners, and the downtown business community rather than through regulatory measures that may be difficult to implement, administer, and enforce.

I encourage Council to support a collaborative approach that balances the operational needs of downtown businesses with the City's goals for a safer, more attractive, and vibrant downtown. Working together to identify practical improvements will produce better outcomes than pursuing complex taxation or licensing mechanisms that may ultimately prove ineffective.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mitch Molnar
Mitchel Developments Ltd.
Regina, Saskatchewan

Good afternoon Mayor Bachynski and Members of Regina City Council,

I have a couple of comments in response to the supplemental report provided by Administration on item CM26-14.

1. **Discussions with province**
   The objective to have dedicated revenue through a SSPL property subclass that could then be redirected back into investments in the City Centre isn't "to impose an additional financial burden on SSPLs beyond what is allowed under current subclass provisions" (quoted in supplemental report). The directive from the October 28, 2026, Council meeting was to learn about past conversations between Administration and the province regarding exceptions to property subclasses. Framing this query as requesting an "additional financial burden on SSPLs" uses language that undermines the intention of retaining increased revenues for targeted investment (as opposed to reducing taxation amongst commercial property owners across the entire city).

2. **Licensing of SSPLs**
   While I appreciate that there are limited examples of business licensing across Canadian cities to compel upgrades to SSPLs (and I understand the need for multiple measures), I don't see this as a reason to not pursue licensing as part of a broader set of tools. Regina could become a leader in advancing a path forward. Looking to Winnipeg, the variable licensing structure would allow some advancement on the landscaping and safety standards.

Surface parking lots are one of the lowest common denominators of land use. They should be taxed at a higher level to compensate for their limited value to the City and its residents. There should be licensing to encourage and direct landscaping upgrades and safety standards.

-I ask that Council consider a formal motion directing Administration to continue conversations with the province regarding a property subclass exception for SSPLs, allowing the City to direct the increased revenue back to the City Centre.
-In the short term, I ask that Council moves forward with the implementation of the tax increase (irrespective of the challenges herein) as this is being identified as the only possible solution outside of a two-year study.
-I ask that Council directs Administration to create a variable business license for SSPLs (either in the City Centre or across the City if necessary) to encourage upgrades and landscaping (design standards and standard upgrading).

Sincerely,

Vanessa Mathews

Ward 3

TO: City of Regina Mayor and City Councillors

FROM: Reid Pedersen

RE: CR26-125

DATE: November 16, 2026

Your Worship and City Councillors,

I share this submission in regard to CR26-125. Our company owns just over 200,000 square feet of office space in downtown Regina as well as a 10,000 square foot building in the Warehouse District (occupied by the City of Regina). We are directly affected by the outcome of this discussion and see the impacts of the downtown parking topic daily.

I had a recent conversation with a City staff person that motivated me to provide this communication. In referencing this topic, they remarked, “oh, that’s such a complicated topic”. That somewhat stunned me. It simply isn’t complicated, unless you’re debating this in isolation completely removed from how this works at street level in downtown Regina.

First, the conversation has to separate casual parking for visitors, shoppers, etc. and contracted parking for people working downtown. This topic is about contracted parking almost exclusively.

I would ask Council tread very carefully on the path forged from (in my estimation) an incredibly flawed premise. I think City staff tasked with work on this project did an excellent job hearing out stakeholders, putting their recommendations forward and framing this conversation in a much better light.

With contracted parking, it’s not about surface parking lots. It’s about, first retaining, and secondly attracting more business and employees to the downtown. It’s about full, viable downtown properties which, whether we like it or not, require a place for most people to put their vehicles during the day.

Yes, we have tenants who use transit, some cycle and some walk. We have a medical/professional building though. Endocrinologists, eye surgeons and heart specialists don’t take transit. They also don’t sign leases to work in buildings that don’t provide they, and their staff, with parking. Period.

I can hate surface parking lots with every fibre of my being. For whatever reason, perhaps perceived impediments to theoretical development of which there is no demand, City staff and Council can also dislike surface parking lots. It doesn't change what's happening at street level in downtown Regina. We've sat with architects and contractors to plan and price a downtown parking structure. The gap from the capital cost to build and what's attainable from tenants is astronomical and far beyond unattainable.

I take potential tenants, considering offices downtown, through a restored 110 year old Heritage building and have those very real conversations with them. I also discuss lease renewals with professionals who have to tell potential new staff they don't have access to a parking spot for them. They leave eventually and move out of downtown.

Topics like this turn that building into a real life Jenga game as you pull one more piece out and see if it will collapse, a la Burns Hanley, Credit Foncier, etc. That path is incredibly easy to be on.

We don't object to discussion of reasonable aesthetic improvements to existing and future surface lots. The idea of shaping policy though based upon the premise these lots are inherently bad, stifling potential development or in some way inhibiting growth or vibrancy for downtown Regina is incredibly misplaced.

Unless Council wants to establish a framework whereby only those who own parking structures can participate in downtown real estate development, I'd suggest a careful path forward. The downtown real estate market in nearly all municipalities is incredibly fragile. I believe some people advocating for punitive measures on surface parking lots aren't aware of the adverse unintended consequences they may touch off. I know though that there are others who are aware and from an ideological standpoint, simply don't care.

Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts, and please, tread carefully.

Sincerely,

Reid Pedersen
Managing Partner, Mertz MJ Holdings Inc
(306) 530-6258

Council – November 18, 2026 Re: Playgrounds

Hello again Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for this opportunity to present to you today.

I want to use my time today to talk about the difference between Option 1 that City Administration has put together and is recommending and Option 4, also listed on the materials they shared with Council.

Economic times are tough for Regina citizens, for citizens in many cities and for cities themselves. Several of you ran on the "Being Fiscally Responsible' ticket in the last civic election and that is part of the reason you are here today. There is an expectation for all elected officials to be fiscally responsible with the electorate's money, isn't there? Regina wants improvements but everything is costing more and more. We all know that. Option 4 provides a way we can have nice things and be more fiscally responsible than the other options put forward by City Administration.

Having 152 playgrounds that need updating and only the funds to do approximately 2 a year, is not a workable or reasonable plan. Please refer to Appendix B – Service Level Options, data pulled together by City Administration. Option 4 allows groups like Community Associations, to help in a way that is affordable for them and will meet the needs of their neighbourhoods.

Option 4 calls for 6 Destination Playgrounds down from the 9 listed in the other options. 6 quadrants in a city Regina's size can work. Each quadrant would have a Destination Playground. 40 Neighbourhood Level playgrounds with Poured-in-Place Rubber Surfacing but not things like washrooms and off-street parking, will be spread throughout the City. Option 4 creates another level of playground that groups like ours can afford to build and will still meet CSA Z614-20 and ASTM F1951 (the American version of CSA) current guidelines. We will be able to use Engineered Wood Fibre, still considered a wheel-chair accessible product, in place of the much more expensive rubber surfacing. There would be 66 of these 'Local Level' playgrounds that would be of a size and make up to easily service local residents.

To give you an example; the playground we are trying to update in McNaughton Park has a current price tag $300,000 to live up to the Neighbourhood Level requirements. If you were to allow for the “Local Level” playgrounds outlined in Option 4, we could build what we need, meet CSA Guidelines and the other requirements of the City for inclusivity for $150,000 or less, half the cost, and likely be able to complete the project in 12 – 18 months instead of 5 -10 more years.

Options 4 allows for the rate at which playgrounds are built or updated to go from 50 years to perhaps 6 years with community groups taking on smaller projects for their immediate spaces which still meet CSA Guidelines for safety, accessibility and inclusion. That is the standard in most cities, not the higher, much more expensive level Regina has adopted.

Not only is Option 4 cheaper for community groups, it is cheaper for the City by $1.1 Million dollars in Annualize Life Cycle Costs. AND it does not increase the funding gap like Option 1 does. All of these figures are found in Appendix B – Service Level Options.

If you want modern, safe, inclusive, fun, interesting AND affordable playgrounds for Regina children and families, Option 4 provides that. That’s what WE want. Find a way to let us help.

Submitted by:

Connie Buchan, Regent Park Community Association, Regina, SK