

Memorandum

Community Services

Subject:	Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan – Community Park Size Review
From:	Bryan Ozorio, Director of City Wide Services, Recreation Division
То:	Steve Robichaud, Director Planning
Date:	December 17, 2013

On December 11, 2013 the Recreation Division received a request from the Planning to review the proposed Community Park in the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan and to provide a summary of the issues related a reduction in park size.

Staff in the Recreation Division has completed a high level summary of issues related to any significant size reduction of the proposed Community Park:

1. Frontage/Connectivity

Vehicular Access

The proposed Community Park is currently bounded by three road frontages, Barton Street, proposed Collector Road A and proposed Collector Road B. As this park will accommodate more intensive recreation amenities that will service the greater Lower Stoney Creek Community, vehicular access is important. Any reduction in size of this park will likely result in lost road frontage. Planning staff will need to consider vehicular access, with input from Public Works staff, on how to ensure that the future Community Park would not be negatively impacted by lost frontage/access to the future park.

Active Transportation

Recreation Planning support the proposed Barton Street Pedestrian Promenade that currently fronts onto the Community Park (Barton Street). Should a reduction in the park size for the lands located along this frontage be considered, active transportation (walkers/cyclists) access should be maintained. The existing integration of the community parkland fronting onto this trail system is ideal. However, if changes are considered for the Community Parkland along the Barton Street frontage, a new policy and trail should be considered to ensure the critical active transportation access to the proposed Community Park.

2. Compromised urban design opportunities

Should the Community Park frontage along Barton Street be considered for a reduction in Community Parkland, an opportunity to develop the future recreation centre with a community presence on the Barton Street Arterial Road will be lost. Recreation staff recognize that Planning staff maintain the expertise regarding urban design but note that the implementation of the future Recreation amenities will be compromised.

3. Reduced opportunity for Hub flexibility

At the time that the proposed Community Park is ready to be implemented, there may be additional municipal or other partnership interests that request inclusion. A reduction in the size of the park will reduce the flexibility of future partnered development on the site.

4. Reduced Opportunity for recreation amenities

Previous comments from Recreation Planning (dated March 5, 2013) note the short term and long term recreation needs for community type amenities within the Lower Stoney Creek District, including:

Short Term	Long Term
2 Soccer pitches	2.5 soccer pitches
1 Soccer Artificial turf pitch	1 Recreation Centre
Tennis Courts (number tbd)	1 Senior Centre
Basketball/multi-use (to address service gap)(Number tbd)	1 Youth Centre (tbd)

1 Community Level Skate Park

Neighbourhood Level Skate Park (number tbd)

Recreation has not yet completed the detailed recreation feasibility study that would determine specifically which recreation amenities would be located within the proposed Community Park. This work will be completed in the near future to identify short term and current programming issues, but the longer term work is more appropriately completed nearer to project implementation.

The specific implications of a reduced Community Park from a 10 ha parcel to a smaller size are unclear, but generally, the result would be less land to accommodate the needed recreation amenities. Based on the needs identified, this would likely be a reduced number of soccer fields, which are the most land intensive outdoor recreation amenity identified (.9ha area for a senior field).

Conclusion

Community Parkland is difficult to retroactively plan and implement. The costs and land acquisition opportunities to provide a Community Park with intensive recreation facilities after development are generally prohibitive. In addition, several recreation facilities such as skateboard parks and lighted fields have neighbourhood compatibility issues and are difficult to implement after residential uses are built. Recreation staff advise that a reduction in the Community Park size may result in a reduced ability to accommodate the long term recreation demands as identified in the Outdoor Study. To ensure a Community Park that is able to accommodate the intensive recreation needs of the growing community, Recreation would not support a reduction a community park smaller than then the 7 ha minimum size identified within the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Should the Community Park be reduced in size, the result will be a reduced recreation amenity program on the site.

Brvan Ozorio

Director City Wide Services

C.C Gillian Hendry, Acting-GM, Community and Emergency Services Joe-Anne Priel, Acting- GM, Planning and Economic Development Jack Brown, Recreation Division Mary Jo Harris, Recreation Division Michelle Sergi, Community Planning Alissa Mahood, Community Planning