From: Rick Breznik [mailto:rbrez@sympatico.ca]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 6:22 AM
To: Whitehead, Terry; Samson, Art; Pearson, Maria; Morelli, Bernie; Mitchell, Dave; Merulla, Sam; McHattie, Brian; McCarthy, Margaret; Kelly, Bill; Jackson, Tom; Dilanni, Larry; Collins, Chad; Bruckler, Phil; Bratina, Bob; Braden, Dave
Cc: Dianne Cornish; NMacIntyre@thespec.com; amtennier@sympatico.ca; woodb@burlington.ca; dennisonj@burlington.ca; allenp@burlington.ca; Arend Kersten; Michael Staresinic; tmmcmeakin.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org; taylorj@burlington.ca; Steve Oliver; sleppard@lura.ca; Tanner, Mary Lou; Mayor@burlington.ca; Liz Nield; Kirkopoulos, Michael; Judi Partridge; hjjohn@cogeco.ca; Frank.rochi@nbpcd.com; fmarchiori@cogeco.ca; francesca.millescamps@ene.gov.on.ca; adreschel@thespec.com; don.mclean@cogeco.ca; cravenr@burlington.ca; Bill Shields; bielak@sympatico.ca; Barbara ryter; Al Seferiades; afroggett@cogeco.ca; loweheid@burlington.ca; damelioc@burlington.ca; reyla@cogeco.ca; Bedioui, Ida; Meredith Macleod
Subject: Burlington’s review of the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Study

Dear Hamilton Councillors:

On April 18th 2006, we were at the Burlington Community Development Committee meeting to listen to their discussions on the same Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation study that was recently reviewed by the City of Hamilton’s Public Works Committee and City Council.

The review of the issues and how they were handled by Burlington’s Staff allowed a different perspective to their Councillors. It reflected the residential concerns and gave "OPTIONS" to their Councillors to consider. In Hamilton’s case - your staff presented "NO" options to you.

We would ask that you take a minute and read the attachment to this e-mail.

We further ask that you consider our request to re-visit your decision, so that our concerns can be presented to you as OPTIONS, as should have been required by your staff in the first place.

We look forward to each of your replies.

Thank you

Rick Breznik (of the Waterdown Hunter Park Survey Group)
C.C.:
Steve Oliver and Al Seferiades (of the Waterdown Parkside Drive Association)
Mike Staresinic (of the Waterdown Road Association)
OPTIONS – Understanding Hamilton’s lack of fair and equal input into the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Study.

From the April 18th, 2006 Community Development Committee meeting in Burlington on the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan, it was obvious that Burlington Staff and Councillors understand that there is no one perfect or obvious solution to a problem.

The Consultant Dillon used their technical experience to create one recommendation for the Waterdown Aldershot Master Transportation Plan. But unlike Hamilton’s City Staff action of only backing and presenting the Consultants one recommendation to their Councillors to consider, Burlington’s City Staff listed five options. Without going into the detail of each option, the Consultants recommendation was only one of the five presented options. The Burlington Staff’s own recommendation was a different option than the Consultants. Another option was one fully supported by the majority of residents on Waterdown Road. The Burlington Staff basically “opened the door” for residential input into the study by technically reviewing their input, and giving a non-bias breakdown of the pro’s and con’s of each and presented them to their Councillors. What the Burlington’s Staff effort did, was to allow their Councillors to understand the background of the study, the issues on each solution and how their residents are really affected.

It was obvious from the very blunt questions Burlington Councillors asked the Presenters / residents at the meeting, that Councillors did their homework. They followed this up with similar technical questions to their Staff. Their questions and the answers clearly indicated that the facts presented by the Consultants in their study could be used and compared in different ways to prove a point.

Although the final decision of Burlington Community Development Committee was postponed for the gathering of more information, the Councillors discussions and initial comments were definitely not in favour of the Consultants one recommendation nor even their Staffs recommendation. The final decision will probably be a combination of their resident’s recommendations and their Staff’s recommendation with further improvements and suggestions that they, the Burlington Councillors came up with themselves, based on their research. Whatever the outcome, the whole process shows democracy at it’s best!

As a resident of Waterdown, within Flamborough, under the control of Hamilton, I have to question why our residential input was not respected and dealt with in the same professional manner as demonstrated in Burlington.

The major reason goes back to June 2005. This is when Hamilton’s Planning Staff presented their one final transportation recommendation (the same Consultant’s recommendation) to Council, for approval to proceed with the Secondary Planning for Waterdown. Hamilton Councillors warned their Staff that if they proceed with the Secondary Planning based on their recommended route, should anything change based on input from the public in the final Public
meetings, they may have to re-work any secondary planning completed to that time.
In September 2005, the Hamilton Staff’s presented their same June 2005 recommendations to the public along with their Draft Phase 2 report that contained their background information. Since that time, the Staff has been questioned and challenged by the affected residents to consider alternative and options. I will commend your staff for the time they offered to spend with residents to discuss the issues. However, instead of working towards defining options with the residents, as Burlington Staff did, all of Hamilton’s Staff communications were to “justify” and stand behind their one recommendation. It now becomes obvious why they did this. They had already started their Secondary Planning. Any changes to their one recommendation would mean possibly re-working their secondary planning also.

If Hamilton Councillors really want to enforce what they advised their Staff back in June 2005, that public input could have an effect on the final recommendation, (and any Secondary Planning work they have already initiated), they need to revisit their decision of supporting their staff’s recommendation on the Phase 2 study. They need to approach the project similar to Burlington’s Staff procedure:
1) Advise Staff to work with the ideas and options generated by the local residents.
2) Based on this input, create options, with their pro’s and con’s for the Councillors to understand.
3) Allow residents to speak towards them on these options.

As residents of Waterdown, we all know change and growth will occur. But without allowing true community input that is seriously considered and presented to Councillors as options, we remain un-represented.

Hamilton Councillors, please open this up for discussion. Let’s work with Burlington Councillors, their Staff, plus their respective residence to present other options for consideration. It’s never too late to consider and represent your residences’ concerns.

Thank you.
Rick Breznik
905-689-3938