

Attachment I- June 28 COSAC Meeting Minutes

Citizens' Open Space Advisory Committee (COSAC V)
Executive Conference Room, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah
June 28, 2016

I. Meeting Called to Order at 8:33

II. Roll Call

a. Commission Members

- i. Andy Beerman
- ii. Jan Wilking
- iii. Kate Sattelmeier
- iv. Meisha Ross
- v. Brooke Hontz
- vi. Cara Goodman
- vii. Rhonda Sideris
- viii. Marian Crosby
- ix. Wendy Fisher
- x. Bronson Calder
- xi. Charlie Sturgis joined at 8:55 am
- xii. Rick Shand joined at 8:40 am

b. Staff

- i. Elizabeth Fregulia
- ii. Heinrich Deters
- iii. Mark Harrington joined at 8:43 am

c. Members of the Public & Press

- i. Ed Parigian
- ii. Sharon Christensen
- iii. John Staffsholtz
- iv. Diane Bernhardt
- v. Sid Embry joined at 9:00 am
- vi. Lynn Ware Peek joined at 8:42 am

III. Approval of Minutes of

Ms. Hontz made a motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Wilking seconded.

Minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Staff & Board Communications and Disclosures

a. Recreation Master Plan Meeting this Wednesday at the high school.

They will be presenting the final draft and will be taking input at this meeting. Visit the website for more information.

b. Off-Leash Dog Issues

- i. Mr. Parigian (present at the meeting) was on the task force.
- ii. Main Takeaways: Stone Ridge and PRI are adjacent to—but not within—city limits. All of the Round Valley city-owned land is off-leash. The city is in the process of making these areas permanent off-leash areas and are installing signage, etc. The Council also directed staff to designate no-dog trails; Mr. Deters will move forward on this. Mr. Beerman thanked Mr. Deters, Mr. Parigian, and Mr. Sturgis—as well as the entire task force—for their hard work. He said they “provided great recommendations, diffused passions, and got down to real issues.”

c. Future Commission Meetings

- i. Next COSAC meeting is scheduled for July 26. Mr. Deters asked if the commission should still hold it. It was determined that we should.
- ii. The August 23rd meeting is still TBD.

V. Public Input (for any items that do not appear on the agenda)

There was no public input.

VI. New Business

Assigning Permanent Protections to Library Field

Mr. Deters began by providing general background on the topic. He said that the commission began discussing this December 15th. He framed staff report as such: he provided background on how the parcel was acquired in 1986. He asked COSAC to utilize the matrix that we've adopted to determine which, if any, additional protections should be assigned to the parcel. The matrix does not include any tangential concerns or land-use suggestions such as housing. Should this process move forward with housing, Council would then consider those at that time. Pertinent questions are in the staff report. Mr. Deters said he also received an email from Jennifer Glynn who said she couldn't make meeting but wanted to express her support for put on an easement.

Timeline:

1. The city acquired Carl Winters school in 1986 (the school was falling apart). PCSD was looking for new location and wanted to de-accession the building from its portfolio.
2. 1988-1991: The city was determining whether to sell or develop the parcel (the economy not good at this point).
3. In 1991, the library was located in Miner's Hospital. Council adopted a resolution to move the library to the Carl Winters Building. This was a real turning point for the building: it became a community center. The city developed a few MPDs: they made a cognizant decision to zone the field as recreational open space. Jim Toturra headed this up.
4. It was used during the Olympics.
5. In 2014-2015 the building was renovated, including the addition of a coffee shop. The subdivision plats were all moved into one: the library and field were tied together. They were required to do this through Planning and Engineering. They cleaned up the plats during the expansion.
6. When the City Council voted to acquire the building, it was all about preservation. The purchase price was \$1M.

Because the field is zoned as recreational open space (ROS) and the entire area is tied to Planning (MPD) approvals, any changes would need to open this MPD up. If a use was proposed that didn't fit the ROS, they would need to open it up. Council couldn't put affordable housing in the middle of the field without public notice and a lengthy public process.

Mr. Doilney asked why this proposal came before COSAC in the first place. Mr. Beerman responded that said Council expressed reluctance to encumber it; they feel it is well protected. He suggested going through COSAC and have the commission make recommendations. Ms. Sideris asked if there is a way to protect the space without a conservation easement. Mr. Beerman said we were going to look at other examples of protecting urban space. Mr. Deters said he didn't want to dilute the request from community. If you want staff to bring back recommendations, we can do that. But we want to have the conversation via the matrix.

Ms. Fisher said there are two things we are considering:

- appropriateness to keep as open space in perpetuity
- best possible tool for preserving

Mr. Doilney said we can put the first question to a vote.

Mr. Calder asked how City Park is designated. The answer is recreational open space. Ms. Crosby asked the difference between three types of designations. Here is how they are each defined:

- Zoning: Planning regulation
- Conservation easement: encumbrance of the property held by the third party
 - There is no real difference between a preservation and conservation easement.

Mr. Doilney asked the commission to express their initial sentiments. Ms. Fisher said the group should make a recommendation.

- Ms. Fisher made a motion that we should recommend to Council to preserve it as open space.
- Ms. Sideris seconded.
- The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Deters said we should go through the matrix to frame future discussions:

- Recreation
- Aesthetic
- Critical Conservation
- Community Character

Ms. Fisher said the use is definitely active recreation.

Ms. Goodman said education is not included in the matrix, so while perhaps the land is not critical to conservation, it could be an opportunity—through signs or planting native trees—to be a monument and an opportunity to educate on the importance of preserving open space. Urban conservation opportunities can be an education tool, especially those disconnected from nature. Ms. Sideris said that this just spelled out community character.

Ms. Fisher said that we should look at other properties' management plans: *"What is the visioning for the future? Is there a conservation plaza element that will allow you to incorporate whatever tool you use?"* One interesting element to consider: will this change the dynamic of the discussion or the use?

Mr. Doilney asked Parigian what he thinks. Mr. Parigian said *"it should be a field of grass."* He said it meets recreation, aesthetics, community character, entryway—everything except critical conservation. But it's also a buffer to all LPA development, as well as Treasure Hill.

John said when you look at the historic context in Old Town, if you do something different, it takes it away from the historic context.

Ms. Embry said she just moved to the city in December, and has met so many people through the field. It makes her feel like she belongs. These accidental meetings create a more cohesive Old Town community.

Mr. Deters summarized the discussion so far:

- recreation—active
- community character
- aesthetics
- historical character (library is on historic registry)
- pressures from LPA Development

He said he will come back at the next meeting and provide tools.

Mr. Harrington said we have run into problems with Coalition Park and first 1000 feet of Rail Trail. He urged the group to think about future flexibility that they want to restrict or prohibit: temporary structures, bounce houses, portable restrooms. *"You may or may not want to consider these issues."* Community garden, raised boxes. Mr. Deters said he will bring this list next month. Most people realize Central Park was always a park—it was a condemned neighborhood, then removed and designated as a park.

Mr. Shand asked, since the space fits into all categories, is there one that carries more weight with Council? Mr. Harrington said we have the ability to designate priority.

Ms. Fisher said, in looking at what is most suited for what's taking place currently, *"Does this space have primarily active recreation value? Then this should be the first priority. But focus on the layers of importance."*

The group should start to vet the laundry list. If it includes a ball field for kids, for example, this restricts other people's ability to gather.

MS. Goodman said, regarding "active recreation," that we would want to focus on passive recreation. Mr. Deters recommended that we leave this level of discussion until next meeting.

Ms. Sattelmeier said the focus is aesthetic: visual relief. This should be the baseline consideration.

Mr. Doilney said there will be plenty of demand for space. What would the public NOT want to see there? Mr. Parigian said, when he talks to people, 95 percent of them want to keep it as-is: passive, not active. The city should take pride in it and can use as a marketing tool—that it's been preserved for eternity *for the people by the people*. People just want to keep it as-is. He said he and his neighbors don't particularly mind having temporary events. They would like to preserve the view, preserve the space, un-programmed. The Sundance tent is up for less than two weeks, which is fine. We should put restrictions on temporary structures.

John said it's very important to have temporary (versus-permanent) structures. He agrees that it should stay the way it is. He has never spoken with anyone who said we should have a ball field. *"It's another post office meeting area."* He would not like to see regular meetings. He also complemented trees that have been put in—having more of them would be the only improvement he would like to see.

VII. Request to Adjourn for Closed Session

Mr. Doilney asked if there were any more comments. Hearing none, he requested a motion to move into closed session to discuss property.

Mr. Wilking made the motion.

Ms. Hontz seconded.

The motion was unanimous.

VIII. Moved to Closed Session 9:13 am.

IX. The meeting was reopened, then immediately adjourned, at 10:00 am.

These minutes were recorded and prepared by Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia, Community Affairs Associate for Park City Municipal Corporation. The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance.