

## Manager's Report January 26, 2015

### **Town Hall Energy Report**

The Town will receive a cash incentive from Efficiency Vermont of \$2,837.50 for the insulation and air sealing performed during November of 2014. Annual savings is estimated at \$2,804.79. Air sealing reduction was determined to be 12.6%.

### **Community Center First Phase Repair Update**

Daniels Construction was the low bidder, \$15,757, for the first phase of the repair. Work is scheduled to begin the week of January 26<sup>th</sup>. The final phase is expect to go out to bid soon and after the engineer finishes the bid documents.

### **Uninspected/Unregistered Vehicle Violation Notices**

At the last meeting there was a request for the specific locations that were issued notices. They are 1. 42 North Main Street 2. 707 Skitchewaig Trail. 3. The old cider mill off County Road. 4. 44 Common Street.

### **EV Go Charging Station Update**

The Town will incur no charging vehicles costs. There are two different ways a vehicle owner can pay for charging. They are:

1. Non-membership. There is a one time set up fee of \$4.95 and the cost is \$2.00 per hour to charge the vehicle. So travelers originating from any location can use the charger. All fees are paid via a phone.
2. Membership. There is a \$5.95 monthly membership fee and the cost is \$1.00 per hour to charge the vehicle. This maybe more economical for people living in the area and the membership allows users throughout EVgo network. Stations are planned to be installed in WRJ, Rutland, Waterbury and other location in southern VT. All fees are paid via a phone.

### **Steampunk Festival**

I agreed to permit the Steampunk Festival organizers to place the Town of Springfield on their literature as a sponsor. There is no financial obligation on the Town's part to get this designation.

### **21 Cottage Avenue Pocket Park Discussion**

The Planning Commission has agreed to develop pocket park creation criteria. After the criteria is finished the discussion can continue. This has been discussed with the spokesperson for the neighborhood group seeking the park and the group is agreeable to this process.

### **These are the draft minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting.**

After some further discussion, Chuck Gregory made the MOTION: the Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Selectmen to cooperate with the neighbors of this proposed pocket park to explore the possibility of developing this parcel, 21 Cottage Avenue, into a pocket park. The motion was seconded by Judith Stern.

Discussion: Richard Filion commented that there needs to be criteria for the Board of Selectmen to base their decision on. Wilbur Horton responded that if the Selectboard wants

**Parks:**

**Erie Co. PA**

<https://www.erieco.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/933>

**Fort Worth, TX**

<http://fortworthtexas.gov/uploadedFiles/PACS/Parks/Dedication.pdf>

**Melissa, TX**

[http://www.cityofmelissa.com/document/Melissa\\_Parks\\_and\\_Recreation\\_Master\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.cityofmelissa.com/document/Melissa_Parks_and_Recreation_Master_Plan.pdf)

**Pocket Parks:**

**Pocket Parks – Alexandria VA**

<http://dockets.alexandriava.gov/fy05/031205ph/di6.pdf>

**Baltimore, MD - Preserving Community-Managed Open Spaces:  
Criteria and Process**

[http://baltimoregreenspace.org/downloads/CMOSguide\\_000.pdf](http://baltimoregreenspace.org/downloads/CMOSguide_000.pdf)

**Bill Kern's Summary of the info contained in websites above**

A summary of the concerns over pocket parks expressed in each of the planning documents of the cities referred to in the attachments would be:

- Preservation of important natural or historic features or resources; or needs of the neighborhood. If the latter, proximity of the proposed park to other similar facilities.
- Proposed purpose. Is it compatible with the abutting properties?
- Suitability of the parcel for the purpose proposed.
- Cost of procuring the parcel.
- Cost of developing the parcel for the purpose proposed.
- Cost of maintaining the facility.
- Cost of securing the facility and managing it for the purposes proposed.
- The commitment of the neighborhood to the use and maintenance of the park, including financial support.
- And tied to all of the above the ownership of the park. Most of the documents cited require that the pocket park be owned by an entity other than the municipality.

In all the cited documents financing the parks is discussed, with the majority requiring no cost to the municipality for maintenance and operation, and in some no municipal cost to acquire, that is, only required with new development at the developers cost.

A concern not explicit in most of the cited documents is the loss of tax base. However, it is noted in one of the cited studies that the assessed value of parcels in the neighborhood should increase, thus raising the tax payments in the neighborhood and offsetting the loss of taxes attributable to the park parcel.

Does the Town want a Parks Policy?

Is there a need for such a policy for town parks, or are the current Parks and Rec Department recommendations through the budget process sufficient for the Town?

Is there is need for a plan or policy because the demand for pocket parks in other neighborhoods is bubbling up and the Town needs a policy to guide the Town in resolving the demands?