

**APPENDIX B**

**Temporary Downtown Surface Parking Lot Consultation  
Consolidated Feedback**

---

**Purpose of Engagement**

To seek feedback from stakeholders to inform the report and the preparation of a temporary downtown surface parking lot policy to provide to Regina Planning Commission and City Council for consideration in January 2021.

**Feedback Sought**

- Level of support for allowing temporary downtown surface parking lots
- Potential temporary parking lot requirements, such as lighting, maintenance, fencing, landscaping, drainage, surface coverage, etc.
- Preferences for duration of a temporary parking lot
- Other considerations for developing a temporary downtown surface parking lot policy and parameters for that policy

Survey: 245 responses

Focus Group: 6 participants (4 via MS Teams; 2 written submissions)

This summary captures common comments collected and share the range of responses. It is not intended to be comprehensive of all comments.

	<b>Areas of Inquiry</b>	<b>Focus Group Responses</b>	<b>Survey Responses</b>	<b>Other (e.g. Direct Calls)</b>
1	What is the level of importance and/or concern associated with allowing temporary surface parking lots in the downtown?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Temporary Parking is very important to vibrancy and attracting/maintaining attractiveness for office space. It helps bring people downtown.</li> <li>- Parking is a factor for deciding whether to locate downtown.</li> <li>- Issue isn't parking lots, but whether there is readily available and affordable parking.</li> <li>- Fundamental question is whether it is better to have a vacant or a parking lot.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 80% of respondents identified having concerns with allowing new surface parking lots</li> <li>- Comments included:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o More parking lots can hurt downtown's vibrancy</li> <li>o No more parking is needed (or wanted) – reiterated through survey</li> <li>o Implications are unclear</li> <li>o Depends on the location of the lots</li> <li>o Parking can help attract future tenants</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approval of new lots should be location or use specific (i.e. not approved for everyone everywhere)</li> <li>- Parking lots are unsafe for seniors</li> <li>- Need more heated/covered parking</li> <li>- Existing parking lot owner concerned with current</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No evidence that not allowing surface parking results in development.</li> <li>- Location of parking is important – its value is linked to the location of demand.</li> <li>- City leadership and investment on parking is needed to address downtown parking issues.</li> <li>- Rising property taxes have had an impact on the viability of surface parking lots.</li> <li>- All parking lots are temporary; the duration is determined by the market.</li> <li>- Other cities recognize that parking lots are not temporary and focus efforts to build vitality in other ways.</li> </ul>		<p>usage due to pandemic and impact on business if future lots are approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strongly wants security/lighting/landscaping features if approved</li> <li>- Looking to build downtown. Surface parking lots make it harder to attract investment dollars</li> <li>- Creating flexibility to allow temporary relief to existing property owners to allow them options to generate income</li> </ul>
2	<p>If temporary surface parking lots downtown were allowed, what should be considered in determining the term of that approval?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The longer the better for predictability</li> <li>- Application-specific, depending on business use – for example many office leases are 5 years and the availability of parking should survive the terms of the lease.</li> <li>- Risks of shorter term may not result in improving the site – stability increases chance of investment in required improvements.</li> <li>- Prefer 5 years (and even better would be for it to be renewable if proponent can demonstrate mthe market does not support new development)</li> <li>- Generally, do not support less than 3 years</li> <li>- Need to consider term of approval with requirements/investments – creating a term end date results in an economic constraint on the lot’s viability.</li> <li>- Unlikely that paving and/or landscaping could be paid back in less than 5 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant preference noted for a year or less or not allowed at all.</li> <li>- Other comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Depends on the location and marketability.</li> <li>o Pick a term and make it renewable.</li> <li>o Link to future development</li> <li>o No time limit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frustrated by lack of interest in downtown land investment</li> <li>- More parking will bring more people downtown, and support the businesses there (day and night) - doesn't agree with RDNP 'Walk to Work' direction</li> <li>- If restriction is lifted and surface parking lots are allowed, support for requirements to do it right (i.e. lighting, asphalt surface, etc.)</li> <li>- Not allowing parking on existing surface lots means that no income can be</li> </ul>

3	<p>If they were allowed, what standards or safety measures should be required for temporary surface parking lots?</p> <p>Should contributions to the DDRA be required?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to 2014 Parking Study</li> <li>- Link to the term of the parking lot (lesser term = fewer requirements).</li> <li>- Electrification and lighting very important for usability and safety</li> <li>- Transparency is key – in this case, standards should be known up-front.</li> <li>- Important to consider landscaping to buffer (using CPTED), and sidewalk benches.</li> <li>- Standards should be flexible (e.g. paving may not be of value for all locations)</li> <li>- Identify “minimum” requirements</li> <li>- How does this fit into the cost/benefit analysis</li> <li>- Don’t make it too restrictive</li> <li>- Requirements expected to align with City standards for its infrastructure</li> <li>- This is part of a larger discussion – what is the end goal being worked towards: vibrancy, stimulate activity?</li> <li>- Consider in context of requirements for existing parking lots</li> </ul> <p>Requirements specific to the Downtown Deferred Revenue Account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally, not supportive of new fees – look at the big picture of revenue earned from downtown property – property taxes, allocation to Downtown BID; consider reallocating these fees to this account before considering new fees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirements most identified as the top three: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Lighting</li> <li>o Future site development plan</li> <li>o Landscaping</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Additional comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Security</li> <li>o Snow removal (maintenance)</li> <li>o Appropriate drainage</li> <li>o A demonstrated need/business plan</li> <li>o Minimal teardown</li> <li>o Few requirements to ensure temporary</li> <li>o Safe entry and exiting for cars and pedestrians along sidewalks</li> <li>o Fully accessible</li> <li>o Public art and amenities</li> <li>o Electrified stalls</li> <li>o Minimum/maximum stall widths</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>generated on them even though taxes are still being charged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests surveying those who work/visit downtown to determine the need for more parking</li> <li>- Feels surface parking meets different needs than parkades</li> <li>- Increased police presence</li> <li>- Financial incentives should be available to open up surface parking lot to other users after office hours</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to understand economic aspect of the lot to determine the amount to allocate to DDRA.</li> <li>- More fees feels like another way to disincentivize use of an infill lot.</li> <li>- Could support an up- front charge to ensure revenue for decommissioning if property owners walk away</li> <li>- Could reduce competitiveness of downtown for office location and/or reduces the investment in improvements for lots</li> <li>- Recognize ongoing contributions of developers to downtown improvement projects.</li> <li>- City should decide to invest in the downtown or if downtown taxes should fund other areas of the city.</li> </ul>		
4	<p>(merge with 1)? Do you feel that allowing for more surface parking will alleviate parking challenges and encourage or promote future development of a site?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides better ability to invest in these properties while figuring out long term development of site when the market provides the opportunity.</li> <li>- Any income is better than none.</li> <li>- The end goal of all lots is to build on it; making an income on it can help encourage the process along as downtown development horizons require a long-term perspective.</li> <li>- Provide stability</li> <li>- Incentive to demolish less safe properties while development plans are in progress</li> <li>- Believe parking needs will continue even with improvements to transit</li> <li>- Temporary stalls also serve the potential function as staging areas for building</li> <li>- Inconsistency generates uncertainty</li> <li>- Generally, parking lots are not intended to be “parking forever”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All downtown users (e.g. tenants, staff, customers, residents, visitors) were noted as potentially benefitting from more parking options.</li> <li>- 64% identified that there is no parking shortage.</li> <li>- Other comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Parking shortages are location-specific</li> <li>o Consider other ways to address parking shortages (e.g. parking permits)</li> <li>o Incentivize other modes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If a parking lot is not possible on a site, it will likely site vacant, with minimal maintenance – likely less appealing than a used parking lot.</li> <li>- Makes lots more appealing for developers assembling land.</li> <li>- Encourages developers to assemble land for larger developments as parking revenues can cover holding costs until the market provides the opportunity.</li> </ul>		
5	What else should be considered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability of downtown parking has a direct impact on the amount of downtown tenants</li> <li>- Don't look at in isolation – many moving parts that need to be considered together – logistics, aesthetics of vacant versus parking lots, safety, other development incentives</li> <li>- Parking lot is better than empty as far as attracting people downtown</li> <li>- The City should act on its studies and existing plans with meaningful policy and investments.</li> <li>- Parking is an issue in the downtown and it will continue to be until Regina grows to where transit becomes viable.</li> <li>- All downtown surface parking lots are temporary and will develop as the market grows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 183 respondents (75% of all respondents)</li> <li>- Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Desire for City to invest in other modes</li> <li>o Maintenance of lot should include surrounding sidewalks</li> <li>o Consider impact of Covid on current parking demand</li> <li>o Consider a per stall downtown business improvement fee</li> <li>o Develop larger long-term strategy for parking in the downtown (e.g. link with railyard development)</li> <li>o Increase security and patrol of downtown</li> <li>o Making parking easier (e.g. pay stations)</li> <li>o Conduct further studies to determine need</li> <li>o Develop attractive destination strategy for downtown to encourage more visitors and future residents</li> <li>o Focus on other downtown amenities (e.g. improving sidewalks, building ramps, etc)</li> <li>o Concern that allowing temporary parking lots will result in permanent parking lots</li> <li>o Parking encourages more car usage.</li> <li>o City should create a revenue sharing</li> <li>o Preference for parking lot over vacant lot</li> <li>o Consider incentives to encourage development and/or other activity on vacant sites while they wait to be developed</li> <li>o Consider traffic flow in and out</li> <li>o Desire for a vibrant attractive downtown</li> <li>o Prioritize downtown development</li> <li>o Fair approach that applies to everyone</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	