

This is a request to appear before City Council on December 9th & 10th, 2019. I will be discussing the redevelopment of the Regent Par III Golf Course. My name is: Austin Stadnyk
My address is: [REDACTED] My phone number is [REDACTED]



The following is a written summary of what I will be presenting:

My name is Austin Stadnyk I am here tonight on behalf of the Coronation Flood Concern Group to oppose the redevelopment of the Regent Par III Golf Course into a recreation hub. It is important that none of the trees on the land are destroyed.

The engineering firm of Stantec identified coronation as one of the worst flood areas in the city and said it could be considered dangerous. It also said that coronation has the 3rd highest rate of flood insurance claims out of all Regina neighbourhoods. Around the golf course area is a low lying area where people have experienced excessive flood problems over the years.

When there is a rainstorm in Regina ... it is not unusual in the golf course area for water to blow out of the sewers and into the air like geysers

Stantec engineers explained that this happens because the channel has reached capacity and can not store anymore water.

This forces water back through the sewer lines and it blows 10 or 15 feet into the air out of the sewers creating the geyser effect.

In spite of the flood risks and concerns in Coronation ...in 2011 City Council approved the backfilling of the floodplain that adjoins the golf course. Thousands of tons of dirt were brought in to fill the floodplain and then the city allowed buildings to be built at the location.

A senior engineer with the city claimed that rezoning and backfilling the floodplain only caused minimal upstream and downstream impact.

Clearly the community could not afford minimal impact and anything that made it worse ...even minimally was unacceptable

A water engineer in Regina was hired by the city to look at flood proofing in the area

He said he was not asked to consider water retention or the impact backfilling land would have on the rest of the community and so he did not

He agreed that the water would have to go somewhere

The backfilling of the floodplain placed the community at an even greater risk from flooding. Residents in the area saw this as the city's lack of concern for their safety and protection of their property.

In 2017 the globe and mail ran an article on the catastrophic flooding of homes and evacuation of people from areas that had been built on a floodplains.

In 2019 numerous news outlets including CBC identified flooding problems in many Canadian provinces where developers had been allowed to backfill floodplains.

The media has extensively identified this practice as dangerous and outdated and very expensive to taxpayers via government compensation packages and insurance costs

After the floodplain adjoining the golf course was backfilled, the golf course itself became the main and only floodplain in the area and served to help protect homes and people from flood risk.

Tree Canada says one single large tree can lift up to 100 gallons of water out of the ground and discharge it into the air in one day and that trees intercept rainfall and reduce run-off, thereby functioning like retention basins.

The Regina urban forest management strategy report also identified the value of trees in floodproofing Regina neighbourhoods and said:

Trees can significantly reduce stormwater runoff.

Their roots absorb water while their leaves slow the impact of the rainfall reducing the load on storm sewage systems.

The resulting reduction in flood size means less damage to life and property.

The report concludes that the urban forest can reduce storm water runoff from 12 to 17 per cent and for a moderate sized community this results in flood related savings of \$600,000 annually.

If hundreds of trees on the golf course are removed the water has to go somewhere and people and homes in the adjoining area will be at increased risk for flooding.

Because the golf course and the hundreds of trees on that land provide flood protection to the people and the homes in the area and because our floodplain has already been backfilled we feel it is irresponsible of the city to remove any trees from the golf course land and that it contradicts City mandate to protect citizens and property from flooding.

The city should be considering more ways to protect the community from flooding rather than making the problem worse.

We believe that allowing the building of the recreation hub at the golf course would increase flood risk to residents and property in an already dangerous area.

For this reason and others we are opposed to building a recreation hub on the golf course land.

