



Dear Clark County Parks Advisory Board,

Some members of the Parks Subcommittee met with Laurie Lebowsky in May to discuss what would be required to designate developed and undeveloped parks and open space properties as soon as they are acquired. According to Laurie, the County attempted to place developed parks under a Comprehensive Plan designation of Public Facilities. The results of this attempt are inconsistent. Taking a small sampling of park properties, there are some undeveloped park land that is designated as a Public Facility and there are some that are designated with Residential.

Our Subcommittee does not believe that the Public Facility designation is correct for lands that are acquired and intended for parks and open space. Per the County's 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan *"Public Facility (PF) This designation is applied to land uses that have already constructed facilities or are for public use. Public schools, government buildings, water towers, sewer treatment plants and other publicly owned uses are included in this designation. The implementing base zone is Public Facility (PF), University (U) and Airport (A)."*

Our Subcommittee believes that developed and undeveloped land that is acquired and intended for parks and open space should be given a designation of Parks/Open Space. Per the County's 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan *"Parks/Open Space (P/OS) These areas provide visual and psychological relief from man-made development in the urban area. Open space also provides opportunities for recreational activity and environmental preservation, maintenance and enhancement. Open space may include, but is not limited to developed parks, trails and greenways, special areas, public and private recreational facilities, critical lands and public gathering spaces. It is implemented with a Public/Open Space (P/OS) and Parks/Wildlife Refuge (P/WL) base zones."*

Our reasoning to have the current and future developed and undeveloped parks and open space lands designated with the Parks/Open Space comprehensive plan designation includes:

1. The County spends significant resources, e.g. time and money, finding and acquiring land for parks and open space. The disposal of lands requires additional research and expenditures -- especially if they are encumbered by the RCO grants, other agreements/ROWs, easements, or return to the original donor. It is fiscally irresponsible to liquidate, sell, or trade these lands after they are acquired.
2. The designation would ensure that an acquired property would eventually be developed or used for the intended purpose, e.g. parks, open space, trails.
3. Once a property is acquired for a park or open space the community has an expectation that the use of that property will not change.
4. The County's Developable Lands Model is not accurate if we are including lands that are intended for parks and open space.
5. Designating these acquired properties with a Parks/Open Space designation would provide additional assurances to residents that are making financial decisions to purchase homes and develop properties in part because of the acquired properties.
6. This would facilitate full disclosure about site-specific intended land use and could possibly allow more flexibility for a lower level of review and engineering in comparison to more complex public facilities (e.g., jail or schools).

We respectfully request that the Parks Advisory Board support this and recommend that Council have County Staff add this item to the next County annual review docket.

Sincerely, Dave Weston – PAB Secretary & Parks Subcommittee Member