

Park, Trails & Open Space Committee
Wednesday, May 15, 2019
6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Cottonwood Heights City Offices

Attendees: Erin Davis, Kristy Morrison, Greg Hilbig, Greg Reid, Jennifer Follstad Shah, Bruce Jorgensen, Matthew Dominesey, Ronna Cohen, Roger Kehr, Ben Hill, Sarah Ricketts, Melissa Fields, Mayor Peterson, Tim Hallbeck, Andrew Hulka, Matt Taylor

Not Present: Fritz Kollmann, Christine Mikell, Michael Johnson, Carl D (Dave) McFerren,

Discussion:

Ferguson Canyon Signage

- Tim Hallbeck – found the images that were previously used on the Ferguson Canyon signs, had them reprinted, doing an experiment to see if the material holds up and if citizens notice them
- Went to various trails to check out other signs – plastic eroding away (need new covering, not new sign)
- Melissa Fields: Are you planning to fund new signs himself? If these signs work out and more people notice, he’s happy to take care of it, wants to figure out what material works best
- Mayor Peterson: suggestion to meet with rec center at the sight to see if it fits
- Tim intends to share feedback on the materials and the content in 3 months once he knows how they fare through weather
- Bruce: suggestion to develop consistent signage throughout the city, get to the point that we get graphic designer to design concept for our signs, then present to city council – no plans to do this but that’s the direction we want to go
- Erin Davis: thinks it’s great when someone sees a need in our community and takes initiative to go to bat for the issue
- Tim will talk to Ben Hill about implementation

PTOS Master Plan presentation by Matt Taylor

- Matt ran thru maps, reviewed plan goals, tree inventory, wayfinding/signage
- Finished stage 1: gathering conditions, starting analysis
- Matt presented several different maps, wants us to look closer to provide feedback
- 6 types of open space
 - o Public/developed (parks)
 - o Public/undeveloped (vacant properties or open space potential owned by city or other entities)
 - o Public/limited (probably tied up, might have potential but hard to work with ex. Water processing plant)

- Private is orange-ish colored (developed and undeveloped),
 - Private/limited (mostly developed)
- 2nd map – IDs informal trails that we don't have on our master plans, some just foot paths, some aren't that accessible but they are inventoried
- Platted Open Space Easements & Trails
- Pedestrian shed analysis – circle in which a pedestrian can access a location
- City's bikes and trails master plan – shows where we already have formal plans adopted and where we can make connections
 - Matt asked us to help ID gaps or opportunities, what is missing? How can we enhance what we've done?
- NRPA handout
 - What are our goals? Are they in line with NRPA? Should we pursue higher or lesser standard?
 - 10 acres per 1000 persons – CH is only 42 or 51% of NRPA standards (depending on whether we include schools or not)
 - How does our proximity to the mtns play into our percentages?
 - Would like to know more of the pedestrian connections that we know/use that they may have missed
 - Should schools be incorporated into our standards? Matt Taylor wants feedback from us
- Spent time in small groups / on our own providing feedback and making notes on all the maps
- Timeline: move as quickly as we can, next meeting he wants us to rank goals/objectives, from there we will evaluate alternatives and weigh against goals, draft plan by the fall/early winter
- Bruce: How does Cottonwood Heights stack up against neighboring city's/county? Matt Taylor will look into it

Sub-committee Reports

- Ben Hill re: Antczak Master Plan – still fine tuning the two concepts down to one; people really liked the walking paths and connectivity
- Melissa Fields for Mike Johnson: drafted RFP to get consulting company to determine in-neighborhood access to BST, should be posted in next week or so
- Mayor Peterson: Have we talked about width and surface for BST? Looking at 3-4ft wide
- Erin Davis re: Crestwood – communicated with Wayne Johnson and he's not responding, have not connected, Erin will keep pursuing

Dog Park Site Selection

Andrew Hulka – tried to add some negative characteristic fields to his analysis, added sub-committee rankings, continual work in progress

- Bumped Crestwood up to the top
- Tied for second is Antczak, Mill Hollow, Swamp Lot, Golden Hills
- Roger wants to change weighting of land value – that put cemetery up to second place
- Suggestion that we change weighting of public/city weight

- Hillrise, rising to the top with changes (lot behind La Petite/La Cocina)
- What about the land west of Ferguson? Waiting to put overflow parking for Ferguson but also need to figure out what's happening with Wasatch Master Plan
- Andy will upload his presentation – wants our feedback
- Ben Hill: Because we are so land locked, can we have pockets of smaller dog parks – more and smaller, rather than one large dog park? Andy doesn't recommend going less than an acre, the smaller examples are fenced off within existing parks, stand alone park should probably be 2-4 acres would be ideal,
- What about separate parks for small dogs versus bigger dogs? Think a lot of people want this, harder to do with smaller parks
- Feedback from PTOS Committee on each of the top potential sites:
 - o Cemetery (2 parcels)
 - Privately owned, owners have plans for the future, city could offer to fence off land and provide liability insurance, cemetery were unhappy with people walking dogs through the cemetery and letting dogs run around up there;
 - What if we close off access from the cemetery?
 - Roger: how would we officially approach them? Committee takes a position then Melissa passes on to Christine, Christine take to mayor/council, timing is good, might be more open to talking now;
 - Think this is worth revisiting; this plot is about 20 acres;
 - Can we tie the property diagonal for parking and better access?
 - o Antczak Park:
 - Because of the school and neighbors, not a good spot for a dog park;
 - We are almost done with a great plan,
 - Let's take this off the list of potential sites REMOVED;
 - Sarah R. voiced concerns about adding an off lease dog park to any location that has already developed as a family / children play area
 - o Golden Hills:
 - That's the only park for the surrounding neighborhood, don't want to take away from the current use;
 - What about church property across the street? Church made it seem highly unlikely (neither lease nor sale);
 - Not enough parking (we'd have to add parking – or people park in swamp lot and walk across?)
 - o Member of Community: Has the city done any utilization studies of our parks? Her observation is Golden Hills isn't used as much; if people aren't using it as playground, let's make it a dog park; think we should look at Summit County's dog parks for ideas; those people follow the rules;
 - Once we get down to a top few sites, we could do a utilization rate
 - Would the size of Golden Hills mean take away the playground to add parking for dog park?
 - Member of Community: People have dogs off leash because we don't have a space for them; space near IMC you have to have to pay for a tag to get in, space is closed once a week for clean up

- Hillrise Apt (vacant parcel behind La Petite / La Cocina):
 - 3.13 acres, privately owned, zoned for commercial use, incentive for owners to develop something, centrally located
 - Approached them 3-4 years ago basically was told thanks but no thanks;
 - Staff tried to reach out in the past month, they didn't show to meeting;
 - General consensus that this is a good spot;
- Crestwood Park:
 - Very large, lots of open space, polarizing site – many like it for a dog park, many don't;
 - Where would we put it? Would it be fenced off? Whole park is 50+ acres, maybe 10 or so for dog park?
 - One reason against dog park is because there are no major roads leading there – don't want to funnel traffic through those small neighborhood roads;
 - Concerns about erosion of creek beds and e.coli contamination; environmental concerns;
 - Ronna – any possibility of Cottonwood Heights to lease 1.5 acres with dog tags, double entry, fenced off, away from the water/creek?
 - Pick a more visible area to decrease bad behavior; need to consider enforcement;
- Mill Hollow Park:
 - Owned by the county, has an agreement with residents to be maintained as passive park so no formal sports/programs,
 - Pavilion is second most rented in Cottonwood Heights
 - Great parking, could part of the space be fenced off for off-leash? A dog park programs the space but only for dogs, if we did a fenced dog park, we could lock it up at night;
- Swamp Lot:
 - 2.5 acres, scored highly,
 - Issues: current parking, called swamp lot for a reason;
 - Would need to be redesigned so it didn't affect water/drainage;
 - Ideal park'n'ride, not best time to ask for less parking from ski resorts
- Old Mill Property:
 - flood zone, historic nature, steep slopes, privately owned;
- No money currently allocated for a dog park but it's a high priority on surveys/planning; Once we have a recommendation for a site, we can figure out the money
- **Please fill out the Survey Monkey with your top 3 and bottom 3 choices for a dog park.**

Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 19th at 6:00 p.m.

Summer Meeting Schedule:

June 19th

July 17th

August 21st