



## **POPS Advisory Committee Meeting Summary**

November 11, 2016

6:30pm-9:30pm

### **In attendance:**

#### **POPS Advisory Committee**

- Caroline Haynes, Park and Recreation Commission
- Heather Cocozza, Sports Commission
- Claire O’Dea, E2C2
- Carrie Johnson, At Large
- Leo Sarli, Arlington Commission for the Arts
- William Gillen, APS
- Elizabeth Gearin, Park and Recreation Commission
- Jane Rudolph, Department of Parks and Recreation
- Jim Feaster, NCAC
- Toby Smith, At Large
- Jane Siegel, Planning Commission
- Dean Amel, Urban Forestry Commission

### **Absent:**

- Janet Kopenhaver, Arlington Commission for the Arts
- Lisa Grandle, Department of Parks and Recreation

### **Department of Parks and Recreation Staff:**

- Erik Beach
- Bethany Heim
- Irena Lazic
- Lyndell Core
- Kurt Louis
- Laura Lazour

### **Public:**

- Bill Ross, Park and Recreation Commission



## **Summary**

On November 9, 2016, WRT facilitated a meeting with the POPS Advisory Committee to get feedback on the actions and action steps to support Strategic Direction 1: Public Spaces. WRT began by reviewing the structure of the final plan document and the topics covered by the seven other Strategic Directions. WRT also listed the public feedback received during the process that is relevant to SD1 and helped shape the actions and action steps within it. After the discussion of Strategic Direction 1, the committee returned to a discussion from the previous meeting about the definition of “unprogrammed spaces.”

### **SD 1: Public Spaces**

The language of Strategic Direction 1 was discussed, with members agreeing to revise the statement to speak about access to high quality public spaces, rather than experiences, and to enumerate the many values of public space.

#### **1.1**

For the language of Action 1.1, two alternatives were offered for how to target the addition of public space. Members agreed that it would be wise to allow for flexibility rather than requiring the County to adhere to a specific acreage each year. Several members expressed the need to clarify that all the additions should not come from only one method, but rather a mix of methods (private development, County land purchases, etc.).

It was also suggested that actions related to acquiring land along Four Mile Run be elevated as a priority for the plan and for the County’s strategy moving forward.

#### **1.2**

For the development of framework plans for each park in the County, it was emphasized that a process for such development needs to be created, and that the process must rely on community input.

In discussing strategies that would realign and concentrate certain recreational or community activities into more efficient recreation centers and community centers, it was emphasized that these actions will still take place under the guidance of the Level of Service analysis and it would not mean that spaces for certain activities would be eliminated or made less available across the County.

#### **1.3**

Members agreed that the relationship of Action 1.3 to the Level of Service analysis should be made more explicit. Further, some members felt the plan’s reliance on the Level of Service for decision-making should be elevated and called out in multiple ways throughout the document. Several members also urged for clarification of how this plan will relate to the prioritization of Capital Improvement Plan investments.

#### **1.4**

While the actions to allow more widespread sale and consumption of alcohol in public spaces was supported, it was pointed out that there may be circumstances when the County would want to permit people to bring their own alcoholic beverages (to a special event, for example).



### **1.7**

A committee member pointed out that attempts to achieve universal access in public spaces can sometimes result in the over-reliance on impervious surfaces. It was suggested that the ratio of impervious to pervious surfaces be kept to a certain standard.

### **1.8**

For temporary spaces like pop-up gardens, it was suggested that the County could partner with Business Improvement Districts as well as the Cultural Affairs Department to carry these out in a more streamlined way. Members also recognized the need to clarify the temporary nature of these spaces from the outset in order to avoid disappointment when they go away. In general, temporary public space is a topic where the County wishes to be bold and creative in its approach.

### **Unprogrammed Spaces**

The committee agreed to include as “unprogrammed spaces” all remaining public spaces that are not primarily something else (i.e. a baseball field) and that are grassy and only programmed up to 25% of the time.