

May 31, 2013

Alissa Mahood, MCIP, RPP
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Mahood:

**Re: Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan
783878 Ontario Ltd. (Bucci Homes)
228 McNeilly Road, 244 McNeilly Road and 1069 Highway No. 8
City of Hamilton (Former City of Stoney Creek)**

Please be advised that we act on behalf of the owner of three (3) properties within the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan ("FWSP"). The three (3) properties ("subject lands") are approximately 4.3 hectares (10.5 acres) in size and are located immediately east of McNeilly Road, south of the proposed east-west Collector Road.

Our client purchased the subject lands in 2007 and has followed the FWSP process to date. The Secondary Plan that is being recommended for adoption (proposed Official Plan Amendment to the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, being Appendix "A" to Report PED13099/PW13040) designates significant portions of the three properties "Neighbourhood Park". The proposed "Neighbourhood Park" designation comes as a surprise and raises a number of concerns.

At Public Information Centre #3, held on June 9, 2009, three Land Use Concepts were presented. The projected population was 16,573 for Concept "A", 17,985 for Concept "B" and 20,877 for Concept "C". A new Community Park was shown west of the established built-up area (Winona Urban Community). The existing Winona Park was shown as a 6.10 hectare Neighbourhood Park with a new Neighbourhood Park proposed in the west section of the FWSP area. The Land Use Concepts did not show a "Neighbourhood Park" designation on the subject lands.

At Public Information Centre #4, held on June 24, 2010, a draft FWSP Land Use Map was presented which showed two areas designated "Neighbourhood Park". The subject lands were shown as "Low Density Residential 2".

The final FWSP has a projected population of approximately 15,700 residents, less than each of the three (3) earlier concept plans. However, we understand that a Recreation Needs Assessment was prepared by City staff in March of 2013 and it identified the need for an additional Community Park. We are not clear, however, as to why two (2) additional Neighbourhood Parks are also now proposed.

It is our understanding that the development of the final FWSP was not based on one of the three concept plans but the concepts guided the development of a preferred Land Use Plan. The FWSP Summary Report states:

"The development of the Plan involved the consideration of technical information, planning principles and comments received from the Public, City staff, agencies and stakeholders in addition to the comments received on the three draft concepts."

The owner advises that he was not informed of the re-distribution/addition of Neighbourhood Parkland and is surprised that a significant portion of the subject lands are not developable for residential units.

The FWSP Summary Report does not provide much detail on the new Neighbourhood Park proposed on the subject lands. One (1) of the two (2) Neighbourhood Parks proposed for the east section of the FWSP area is located adjacent to the southern boundary of the new school on Lewis Road (2.4 hectares of surplus lands associated with the former school) and this park is in close proximity to the subject lands. In regard to the second park (on the subject lands), the FWSP Summary Report states: "A second park is also proposed between McNeilly Road and Collector Road 'E' to adequately service the future residents that will be living in the area." We question the need for a second Neighbourhood Park within the area west of the existing Winona Urban Community and in such close proximity to the other Neighbourhood Park. Does the projected population west of the existing Winona Urban Community warrant two (2) Neighbourhood Parks?

It is our opinion that the public consultation of the chosen park sites has been inadequate; that the distribution of parkland is inequitable; and the parkland is situated on the periphery of the neighbourhood it is intended to serve as opposed to being centrally located. We also opine that two neighbourhood parks in such close proximity are inefficient. Based on our concerns, we respectfully request that such distribution be re-examined prior to the adoption of the FWSP.

We respectfully request a copy of any decisions and/or Council resolutions regarding this matter.

Yours truly,
WELLINGS PLANNING CONSULTANTS INC.

Nancy Frieday

for

Glenn J. Wellings, MCIP, RPP

Copy: City of Hamilton Planning Committee
R. Bucci, Bucci Homes