

Community Meeting #4 Meeting Minutes

Date: April 17th, 2018

Location: Stedman Elementary School



These meeting minutes summarize the community meeting held on April 17th, 2018 with the Greater Park Hill community.

Welcome and Introductions

- Steve Charbonneau welcomed the community on behalf of Denver Parks and Recreation (DPR) and reiterated the purpose of this process and meeting. Given the importance of the park location discussion, the focus of the fourth meeting was a discussion of the “knowns” associated with the east and west sites, identification of the opportunities and challenges, and factors which are most important to consider when making a recommendation regarding park location. This information will be provided to DPR leadership to inform the site selection process.

Preferred Options Update

- Gordon Robertson updated the group on input solicited via the online survey and design takeaways. Input received will guide development of a refined concept.
- Design Concept Survey Response Summary:
 - 173 survey responses
 - Concept 1
 - Pros – variety of activities for all ages, green space, adventure play
 - Cons – no water feature, more open space
 - Concept 2
 - Pros – water play, child-focused space, wall as alley buffer/mural
 - Cons – paving, limited activities for adults
 - Concept 3
 - Pros – amphitheater flex space, grassy open space, community gathering, Fairfax bump outs
 - Cons – lacks defined play, small gathering spaces
- Summary of input that will be reflected in development of the preferred alternative:
 - More play! Swings, slides, etc...
 - A Park for All Age Groups
 - Prefer more grass/landscaping to hardscape
 - Trees and Shade

- Safe and Secure Alley Edge
 - Reflect the Culture of the Neighborhood
 - Water feature- low flow
- Meeting attendees posed the following questions:
 - Q. Has the developer indicated funding that would be available for the park?**

A. Yes, \$650K to \$675K.
 - Q. As there is a potential for the park to be on the east or west side of the park, will there be a future meeting to share the refined concept on the selected site?**

A. Yes. The refined concept will be shared with the community and illustrated on the selected site. The public will be invited to provide feedback.
 - Q. If the park is on the east side, there will be parking on the west side of Fairfax. If the park is built on the west side, will there be parking on the east side of Fairfax?**

A. No. If the park is built on the west side of Fairfax, the east site will be redesigned and likely be residential.
 - Q. If the park is developed on the west side of Fairfax, will the development include retail and restaurants?**

A. No, the west site would be redesigned as residential.
 - Q. The community initiated a park visioning/design process in the fall. What will happen to this work/feedback received?**

A. DPR appreciates the feedback gathered by the community-led process and has the report summarizing the process and findings. DPR is not starting this process from scratch and this work will be incorporated into the DPR-led public process.
 - Q. Does DPR support the land swap?**

A. At this point, DPR has no recommendation. This community process must be completed before DPR will make a recommendation regarding the proposed swap.

Park Location Activity

- Meeting attendees were provided with a summary of the “knowns” associated with each site (see page 3) and were asked to identify the opportunities and challenges for each site. A summary of the responses is included on pages 4 and 5. Of the 57 completed handouts, 35 individuals indicated a preference for the east location and 18 individuals indicated a preference for the west location.
- Attendees then worked as a larger group to identify the factors that are most important to consider when making a decision regarding park location.

FAIRFAX PARK SITE SELECTION

The “Knowns”

Regardless of location, DPR will own the park and be responsible for design, construction and maintenance. DPR will designate as a public park following construction.

	West Site	East Site
Acquisition	Purchased from Xcel in 2015 for \$50K	Land would be acquired through equal exchange
Council approval	No further action	Requires council approval
PROCESS	Environmental evaluation	Unknown. Environmental evaluation and wall demolition needed. Next steps: TBD.
	Design timeline	DPR 2019
	Construction timeline	2020-2022 (pending funding availability)
CONTEXT	Adjacent development	Residential and commercial
	Max height of adjacent bldgs	2-story

What are the Opportunities and Challenges of Each Site?

Which opportunities or challenges associated with each site are most important to the site selection process?

West Site		East Site	
Opportunities	Challenges	Opportunities	Challenges

West Site Comment Summary (by individual)			
Opportunities	# of responses	Challenges	# of responses
Appears to be more public/community based space	8	Timeline (Delay)	32
DPR's original intention for park	4	Funding not currently available	25
GPHC could purchase site and develop park	4	Lose commercial development on east side	14
Existing brick wall can define the space	4	No extra parking	9
Park anywhere is good	3	City/Taxpayer expense	6
Community driven	3	Potential remediation of industrial site	6
Could appease naysayers/GPHC	3	Less integrated into adjacent development	5
GPHC strong support	2	Brewery	4
Willing to wait for funding	2	GPHC Wins	2
Leaves one side to community that lives around it	2	Council	2
Doesn't involve developer	1	GPHC will check out	2
Community amenity	1	Additional buildout on eastside	1
Revitalize west side of the street	1	\$\$ for park wouldn't be reinvested in community/affordable housing	1
Not park of a modern style development	1	Discourage future developers in PH	1
Doesn't kick out/alienate low income/diverse residents	1	Proximity to intersection	1
Obvious public park from start	1	Contentious location	1
Next to brewery	1	Uncertainty of developer's plan b	1
Supports business on west side	1	Developer influence	1
Play area	1	Alley bathroom	1
		Community anger	1
		Park will be separate from active storefronts	1
		Could GPHC fund?	1

East Site Comment Summary (by individual)			
Opportunities	# of responses	Challenges	# of responses
Funding exists/City and tax payer cost savings	30	Perception of inclusion, gentrification	14
Timeline (earlier construction)	26	GPHC opposition/anger/misinformation	8
Adjacent businesses	19	Perception that it's a developer windfall	8
Integrated into adjacent development	14	Doesn't feel like a public park	6
West parking lot	6	Neighbors	5
Activates block sooner	3	DPR park not HM park	4
Developer has been willing partner	3	Validates view City is not transparent	3
Neighbor Support	2	Parking	3
No remediation needed	2	Not community organized	2
Community has been engaged	2	Separating park from anger against developer	1
Development residents have their own park	1	NIMBY win	1
Mid block location	1	Contentious location	1
Developer funds maintenance	1	This is not an equal swap	1
DPR can spend \$\$ elsewhere	1	City maintains developer amenity	1
Meet neighbors in social setting	1	HM Capitol Agreement	1
A show of good faith between community and developer	1	Flanked by restaurant patios	1
Win for neighborhood	1	Shouldn't be in a commercial area	1
Across the street from brewery	1	Too dense	1
Affordable rentals	1	Potential conflict between park users and tenants	1
		Fear of change and suspect corruption	1
		GPHC did nothing to survey surrounding neighbors	1
		City council approval	1

Park Location Summary

- Meeting attendees were asked to report out and share the factors that their small group thought were most important to consider when making a decision regarding park location.
 - **Timing.** East side would mean park would be built sooner.
 - **Funding.** Developer could contribute funds to the east side and DPR could spend funds elsewhere.
 - **Community.** Process has divided community. Building a future park as one community is most important. Division among community is sad.
 - **Unity.** East site would give the community the opportunity to work together and demonstrate unity. Larger issues can't be resolved by developer or the city. Community can take park direction into their hands and move forward. West site could be developed in the future and funded by the community (private funds and grants).
 - **Division.** DPR is responsible for division. Land swap is the cause for this division.
 - **Welcome and Open.** East side may not be welcoming. Development may "control" park and be concerned about park users that are not residing in the adjacent residences. Park should be welcome and open to all.
 - **Inclusivity.** Park should be welcome to all regardless of how much time they have lived in the neighborhood.
 - **Gentrification.** Development and park location have implications related to issues of gentrification. The liquor store is perceived as a nuisance while the brewery is viewed as hip. Will "upscale" development residents and business owners benefit the park or will they become aggravated by kids playing, a BBQ, loud music, etc.?
 - **Low income housing.** Longtime residents may get priced out of neighborhood. It is desirable to have affordable units in development. If community is willing to privately fund the park, why not redirect these efforts to subsidize housing in some way?
 - **Retail and Commercial Development.** Amenities such as space for retail, commercial and business are needed in the neighborhood and not having them would be disappointing.
 - **Integration.** Park on the east side would be integrated into the new development and complimented by businesses.
 - **Brewery.** On the west side, the only commercial development would be the brewery that caters to a specific demographic.
 - **Safety.** The block does not feel safe to some. Activating the park sooner rather than later would bring stability to the street/larger neighborhood.