

**Semi-Monthly Planning Meeting
Tuesday, October 10, 2017**

**PRELIMINARY STAFF REPORT
2016-17 MASTER PLAN AMENDMENTS RECONSIDERATION**

Date: September 29, 2017
To: City Planning Commission

Prepared by: City Planning Staff

CHAPTER 7: Parks, Open Space and Recreation

Reconsideration: Chapter 7, Item a. (This reconsideration is a combination of previous requests including Text 07-01 – Arts Council of New Orleans and Text 07-06 Councilmember Cantrell – NOLA Parks for All)

What was the text amendment that is proposed for modification?

Consider modifying the recommendation on page 3, regarding Goal 12, “Policies for Decision Makers” 12.B., to delete the existing language and modify to provide ““Enhance community input for design, maintenance, improvements, and particularly use changes, for all lands considered any type of parks or open space. Ensure a thorough public engagement process, and consider including extra restrictions for the transfer from open to recreational space.”

What is the existing language recommended by the City Planning Commission?

“12.B. Continue to use a system to incorporate community input in all parks, open/green spaces and recreation design, maintenance and improvements.”

Have any issues been raised relative to the potential impacts of the CPC’s original recommendation? Does the Council motion include a text modification or were any issues raised that may change or modify the analysis and recommendation? If not, would any further modification be warranted to address the issues?

The staff discerned three issues from the motion: 1) public input is lacking in the design, maintenance, improvements and use changes that occur in parks, open/spaces and recreation, 2) there is an absence of a thorough public engagement process, and 3) there is a need for extra restrictions when land use transitions from open space to recreation.

1). In reference to the first issue, the City Planning Commission’s recommendation for 12.B intends to incorporate community input in the design maintenance, and improvements in parks, open space, and recreation. In addition, the City Planning Commission’s recommendation for 7.A which states “Establish expanded maintenance criteria for parks open/green spaces and recreation sites in partnership with citizen parks groups” also intends to include community input when addressing maintenance in open/green spaces and recreation. However, process and specific use allowances are more appropriately addressed through the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

2) In reference to the second issue, the City Planning Commission's Recommended Action for 12.B.1 further stipulates that the Neighborhood Participation Plan process be integrated to accomplish both 12.B and 12.C. 12.B.1 states "1. Integrate systems with the Neighborhood Participation Plan" and 12.C.1 states "Update the plan every 10 years, conduct an amendment process every five years which includes a full public participation element." The staff believes that the recommended City Planning Commission's language found in 12.B.1 and 12.C.1 accomplishes the request of the City Council's reconsideration that states "Ensure a thorough public engagement process" and no text change is recommended for this part of the reconsideration of 12.B.

3) In reference to the third concern that there is a need for extra restrictions when land transitions from open to recreational space, any restrictions in reference to uses should be addressed in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and uses may require a community participation component if designated as a conditional use. In addition, the use of parks would be addressed in the parks planning process. As stated in 12.C.1, this planning process would take place every 10 years with an amendment process taking place every five years. Both process would include a full public participation element. Therefore, no additional language is recommended concerning this issue in reference to 12.B.

Staff Recommendation: Modify Approval

12.B. **Enhance** and ~~Continue to use and to~~ incorporate community input **for design, maintenance, and improvements for** in all parks, open/green spaces and recreation **planning processes.** ~~design, maintenance and improvements~~

Reasons for Recommendation:

1. The City Council's recommendation further clarified the existing City Planning Commission's recommendation as it pertains to the incorporation of community input.
2. Considering the first part of the second sentence, "Ensure a thorough public engagement process", the Recommendation Actions sections of 12.B.1 and 12.B.2 states that the Neighborhood Participation Plan should be utilized and a full public participation plan should be included in the development of master plans, respectively.
3. When considering the second part of the second sentence, "and consider including extra restrictions for the transfer from open to recreational space", land use issues are addressed in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the use of parks would be addressed in the parks planning process, which is addressed in 12.C.1.

Reconsideration: Chapter 7, Item b. (Text 07-03 Urban Conservancy)

Consider modifying the recommendation on page 3, regarding Goal 12, “Policies for Decision Makers” 12.C., to delete the existing language and modify to provide "Prepare and update city wide parks, green/open space and recreation master plan". Additionally, consider adding additional language or an additional subpart within Goal 12, and to correlating page 41, to provide that "Regional parks shall prepare and update master plans regularly." and contemplate regional park qualifications and master plan submission information.

What is the existing language recommended by the City Planning Commission?

12.C. Prepare and update a full city wide parks, green/open space and recreation master plan and regional park master plans regularly.

Have any issues been raised relative to the potential impacts of the CPC’s original recommendation? Does the Council motion include a text modification or were any issues raised that may change or modify the analysis and recommendation? If not, would any further modification be warranted to address the issues?

The Council’s reconsideration recommendation would remove “regional park” from 12.C and create a separate Recommended Strategy that would state “Regional parks shall prepare and update master plans regularly”. Considering this recommendation would not add any clarity to what is adequately covered in the existing language of Recommended Strategy for 12.C and is further covered in the Narrative section of Chapter 7 under 12.C and no potential impacts of the CPC’s original recommendation were raised, approval is not recommended.

However, in reviewing the *Who* subsection in 12.C.1, the staff noticed that the Mayor’s Office of Innovation was incorrectly listed. Therefore, the Staff recommends the removal of the Mayor’s Office of Innovation under 12.C.1 in the *Who* subsection throughout Chapter 7.

Staff Recommendation: Modified Approval

RECOMMENDED ACTION

12.C.1

Who: NORDC; Parks & Parkways; Regional Park Administrators; Neighborhood/Community input; ~~Mayor’s Office of Innovation~~

Reason for Recommendation:

1. The recommendations are already adequately covered and no potential impacts of the CPC’s original recommendations were raised.

Reconsideration: Chapter 7, Item c. (Text 07-09 - Mayor's Office)

What was the text amendment that is proposed for modification?

Consider modifying the recommendation on page 4, the "fact sheet" regarding "Parks, Open Space, and Recreation" to update the status of pre-Katrina parks and facilities with the numbers of restored and undeveloped parks and facilities, including an explanation on the differences between neighborhood parks and the multipurpose neighborhood parks.

What is the existing language recommended by the City Planning Commission?

The following text is from the "*fact sheet*"

Major parks include:

14 multi-purpose neighborhood parks including 9 stadiums pre-Katrina

5 stadiums currently restored

83 neighborhood parks and playgrounds pre-Katrina

60+ playgrounds currently restored

64 pocket parks

19 public swimming pools pre-Katrina

7 currently restored

10 recreation centers pre-Katrina

5 currently restored

4 public and 4 private golf-courses

7 historic urban squares"

Have any issues been raised relative to the potential impacts of the CPC's original recommendation? Does the Council motion include a text modification or were any issues raised that may change or modify the analysis and recommendation? If not, would any further modification be warranted to address the issues?

There are two issues raised by this reconsideration. This first issue is whether the number of restored and undeveloped parks and facilities reflect their current numbers and statuses. The second issue is the need for the definitions of a neighborhood park and multipurpose neighborhood park to discern their differences.

No potential impacts have been raised for either issue; but the staff believes the most current data available should be provided in the "*fact sheet*" and that information stating the difference between neighborhood parks and multi-purpose neighborhood parks that provides clarity can be beneficial. Therefore, the staff agrees that further modifications are warranted to address these two issues.

Recommendation: Approval

Major parks include

14 multi-purposeneighborhood parks including 9 stadiums pre-Katrina
~~85~~ stadiums currently restored

83 neighborhood parks and playgrounds pre-Katrina ...
~~7360~~ + playgrounds currently restored

64 pocket parks

19 public swimming pools pre-Katrina
~~167~~ currently restored

10 recreation centers pre-Katrina
~~95~~ currently restored

4 public and 4 private golf-courses

7 historic urban squares

***Neighborhood park – are the primary building block of neighborhood oriented recreation. They are intended for both passive and active forms of recreation. They should be a minimum of 1.3 acres, and ideally 2 to 5 acres.**

***Multi-purposeneighborhood park – function as major recreation facilities with multiple venues for activities such as baseball and football. The are primarily oriented to active programmed recreation and league playing where many teams may be competing at the same time, day or night. The park should be at least 3 acres up to around 30 acres, depending on the facilities needed.**

Reasons for Recommendation:

1. The staff believes the most current data available should be provided in the “*fact sheet*”.
2. Information proving the distinction between neighborhood parks and multi-neighborhood parks would provide clarity.

Reconsideration: Chapter 7, Item d. (Text 07-05 - Sustaining Our Urban Landscape)

What was the text amendment that is proposed for modification?

Consider modifying the recommendation on page 7, regarding Goal 2, “Recommended Strategy” 2A, and correlating references on page 22, to retain the promotion of tree planting on private property.

What is the existing language recommended by the City Planning Commission?

2.A. Promote tree planting on public property.

Have any issues been raised relative to the potential impacts of the CPC’s original recommendation? Does the Council motion include a text modification or were any issues raised that may change or modify the analysis and recommendation? If not, would any further modification be warranted to address the issues?

The issue is that tree planting on private property as a Recommended Strategy was removed from the 2.A Recommended Strategy. However, the topic was relisted as a separate Recommended Strategy, 2.B, which states “Promote tree preservation and planting on private property”. This request is explicitly addressed in the City Planning Commission’s 2.B Recommendation Strategy recommendation; therefore, no changes are recommended.

Recommendation: Retain the CPC’s original recommended text.

Reason for Recommendation:

1. This request is already addressed in the City Planning Commission’s 2.B Recommended Strategy which states “Promote tree preservation and planting on private property.