

# SIERRA/LINEBERRY DRIVE PARK MASTER PLAN

## Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) Meeting #2

February 4, 2014

6:30-8:30 p.m.

Carolina Pines Community Center

2305 Lake Wheeler Road

Raleigh, NC 27603

### Meeting Overview:

The purpose of the meeting was to review and adopt the draft charter, draft a vision for the park, and brainstorm outcome measures. The meeting built upon the fundamentals of the initial CPC meeting, reviewed and adopted the draft charter, examined homework assignment 'park visits', discussed public comment, and reviewed results from public workshop #1. There were two group exercises that looked at community values and vision statement and began to identify outcome measures.

### Attendees:

CPC Members: Ms. Barbara Benny, Ms. Martha Crowley, Mr. Jason Hibbets, Mr. Keith Lukowski, Ms. Lisa Marshall, Ms. Trina Moore, Ms. Mary Belle Pate, Ms. Shawna Schnorr, Ms. Amy Simes, and Ms. Gracey Vaughn

*Absent: Mr. Brian Ayres, Ms. Lisa Barr, Dr. Mohamed Bourham, Mr. Reid Huntley, Mr. Colin Lowry, Mr. Johnny Tillett, and Ms. Lori Winkelstein*

City of Raleigh (COR): Ms. Shawsheen Baker, Mr. Ivan Dickey, Mr. Matthew Keough, and Ms. DaleTiska

Planning Communities (PC): Ms. Kara Peach and Ms. Ann Steedly

Surface678 (S678): Mr. Charles Bradley, Mr. Eric Davis, and Mr. Jeff Israel

### Welcome and Introductions/Housekeeping:

Due to weather concerns, the start of the meeting was delayed until 6:45. The city thanked everyone for their efforts to attend over the past month, especially those who could make it out. The start time was established as 6:45, with a goal of having a majority of the CPC present for any formal approval processes. Matthew Keough (COR) welcomed participants and briefly introduced the evening, preparing the group for visioning with a goal of the values and vision being transferable in terms of outcome measures. He briefly introduced work areas within draft charter especially when it comes to integration of public comment. He welcomed the addition of two new CPC members, Mr. Keough led a round of introductions of city staff, consultants and CPC attendees.

*Review of meeting minutes of CPC #1*

Kara Peach (PC) presented and reviewed CPC #1 meeting meetings. After time to review, the minutes were put to the floor for discussion. No comments were received and the minutes were approved.

### ***Review and Finalize Draft Charter***

Ms. Peach reviewed the draft charter process including introduction at CPC #1, review times and updated drafts between meetings. Ms. Peach noted that the primary issue that arose during review of the draft charter during CPC #1 was concerns for diversity of representation of the CPC and that this had been addressed following CPC #1 with the addition of the (2) new CPC members by way of a Park Board recommendation and then approval by the City Council. Additionally, other minor edits were included in updates to the draft charter. The most up to date draft was displayed on the screen and key issues were reviewed, including: conduct, attendance, meeting preparations, community representation, public comment, and facilitator roles. The floor was opened for group discussion and the following updates to the charter were made in the section regarding how the CPC would receive public comments:

- Oral comments at CPC meetings will be accepted
- 3-5 minute time limit per person suggested, 5 minute limit finalized
- Electronic correspondence noted as an alternative and preference to oral comments, group discussion confirmed both will be received
- Limit total public comment period during each CPC meeting to 15 minutes
- Requests to speak to be received in advance, though speakers will be allowed if time is available within the 15 minutes
- Order of comment is on a first come first served basis
- Open to all members of the public
- Incorporate time for public comments into each agenda

After discussion and review, the draft charter was presented and consensus was received. The final charter will be available electronically after the meeting and hard copy at CPC meeting #3.

### **CPC Homework Results and Discuss Public Input**

Jeff Israel (S678) provided a brief presentation of area parks and amenities suggested to the CPC for touring. All the parks were displayed at the same scale to provide the CPC members perspective on the size of the property at Sierra/Lineberry Drive. This will also assist the CPC in future planning activities.

Mr. Israel then opened the floor to the CPC members to briefly discuss what parks they visited, what they liked, and what would be good fits for Sierra/Lineberry. Comments were as follows:

- Peach Road: A CPC member thought that the equipment at the park was appealing to both older and younger people, which is something they would like to see at Sierra/Lineberry. Another CPC member noted that the scale was very appropriate for the surrounding neighborhood and enjoyed the preservation of the wetlands.
- Fred Fletcher: A CPC member felt that the park had something for everyone and was scaled nicely to fit the neighborhood. The CPC member also liked the trails and natural areas.

- Eliza Pool: A CPC member noted that the park has a soccer field (multipurpose field), a shelter, and water fountain. She also noted that a community garden was discussed during planning but it has not been implemented but noted that there are also a lot of planted trees, which is appealing. The member also noted that the scale was appropriate and a good comparison to Sierra/Lineberry.
- Isabella Cannon: A CPC member felt that the park did not offer so much play space or space for adult recreation but did feel it was very serene and very nice. He noted that the rock climbing boulder is very successful with children. It was also noted that there was an area that looked like a weedy area\* that could have been a rain garden.
  - \*[this area is a 'no-mow' zone to aid in storm water management, these areas tend not to be aesthetically pleasing during the winter months, this should be taken into consideration as the CPC develops concepts for the park]
  - COR staff noted that the weedy area noted by the CPC member is actually a native wildflower meadow, or a 'no mow zone', but the interpretive sign is no longer there.
  - The area also may be getting smaller, due to City staff mowing. A CPC member mentioned putting rocks around this type of area to prevent this if implemented at Sierra/Lineberry.
- Parks in Garner and Prairie Ridge: One CPC member visited both parks and noted that these parks both had natural play spaces that the kids really seemed to enjoy. It was noted this kind of feature fits well at Prairie Ridge, a very large location.
- *Other notes about parks:*
  - One CPC member drove around several parks on two different Saturdays and noted that the basketball courts were always very active.
  - It was mentioned that water fountains\* could be important if the park has a lot of active sports.
    - \*[Water fountains are winterized and do not provide water during the winter months]
  - One CPC member went to the property on Sierra/Lineberry during an entomology class to collect insects, and noted that there are several species living on the property that should be considered. He noted that the park could provide educational opportunities to have people understand how important insects are to our natural world.
  - Another CPC member agreed and noted the woodsy area at Peach Road is nice and a planted area should be considered, especially something that would feed the bees as a resource which is dwindling.
  - A CPC member also noted interest in trails that go around the perimeter of the park rather than cut through the middle. At Fletcher and Pollard Park the loop trail system works well as well as the connection to the greenway.

*Presentation of Public Workshop #1, November 19, 2013:*

Mr. Israel presented a graphic representation of Workshop Activity # 1: “Identify Issues and Site Characteristics.” Mr. Israel reviewed the graphic and highlighted points that were made at the activity. One CPC member noted that Fred Fletcher and Pullen Park had a trail system that connected to the greenway and supports that a workshop participant drew a trail system. Another CPC member noted that it would be a benefit to mark the trail in some type of circuit that showcases distances walked.

Mr. Israel presented a graphic of the results of Workshop Activity #2: “Images that Represent ‘Your Vision’ for the Park.” The images were listed in the order of polling dots received, from highest to lowest. Images that received no dots were not represented on the results. The top three (3) images were Natural Play Structure, Structured Play, and Natural Setting. Mr. Israel cautioned the CPC not to discount the images that got slightly fewer dots, as there may be themes among the images that the CPC may be able to pull out.

Mr. Israel then opened the floor to the CPC and asked them to comment on the public comments received in the Public Workshop. Responses to the comments were as follows:

- Responses to comments regarding parking;
  - There is on-street parking on both sides of Sierra, and it is never full
  - This park should be walkable, not a destination park, so parking should not be needed
- Providing a walkable neighborhood:
  - There is a very good network of sidewalks throughout the area so people should be able to walk to the park
  - Think about putting signs throughout the neighborhoods to point to the park, indicating how far a walk it is to the park from that location
  - CPC member is interested in learning about City of Raleigh Sidewalk enhancement plans (COR to follow-up on the member’s comment).
    - COR acknowledged that there is a sidewalk improvement plan and will be happy to share with the CPC
- Identifying the target park users:
  - Neighbors and families with kids have noted to the CPC members they are interested in a playground
  - Some CPC members have heard that members of the community feel adults and teens are able to ride their bikes (or drive) to Carolina Pines for recreation so the Sierra/Lineberry Park should be attractive to young children and those with strollers who can’t as readily cross Lake Wheeler Road.
  - Create a park that has events for people and community
- Responses to comments regarding amenities:
  - A walking trail was attractive to a lot of public workshop attendees. One request was to build a track that went around the perimeter of the park so parents and other caregivers can do their exercise while watching their children play in the middle. Also make a sign noting how long the trail is/how many laps is a mile.

- Many have mentioned a community garden but one CPC member noted that this type of amenity only draws a specific crowd with limited activity and is concerned that it would not be appealing to a large enough audience for this park.

### **Exercise 1: Vision Statement:**

Planning Communities staff provided a recap and overview of vision statements and how they function with the development of a park. Ann Steedly mentioned several 2 questions for the vision statement to address ; 1) What does the CPC want the park to look like?, and 2) Describe the overall vision for the park in terms of identification and framing the decision making process. Two examples of COR vision statements were shared - Isabella Cannon Park and John Chavis Memorial Park. The CPC reviewed the vision statements for both parks. Ms. Steedly illustrated how each statement was articulated into park design. Examples being; plantings, interpretive signage, connection to downtown, various activities, refurbishment of the carousel at John Chavis Memorial Park, hosting downtown events, and area youth focus.

*Exercise 1:* The CPC was then asked to answer the question ‘What does a successful park look like at Sierra Lineberry?’ The CPC was reminded of the community values they defined in CPC #1 and provided with sample concept vision statements. The CPC was divided into groups of two (2) to three (3) and each group was then given a hardcopy handout with the one or more of the community values and concept statements highlighted. They were asked to rework, or recreate, sentences for the vision statement as they felt it relates specifically to Sierra/Lineberry Drive Park. After they deliberated, each group was asked to share the reworked sentence(s). Ms. Peach recorded the responses in the working document for the vision statement.. All comments were typed into the Draft Vision Statement document as bullets and a consensus check was initiated to gauge how the CPC felt about the direction of the vision sentences. The consensus check was positive and results of the vision statement activity will be circulated to the CPC after the meeting for further refinement. CPC members were encouraged to take creative licenses if they felt they would like to craft an entire vision statement integrating all of the concepts. Additional work and iterations will be completed electronically between meetings, with the goal of presenting a draft for consensus at CPC #3.

## **Exercise 2: Outcome Measures:**

Ms. Peach highlighted that the purpose of developing outcome measures is to quantify the community values and evaluate the vision statement established by the CPC. The outcomes come from exploring issues, understanding the values they represent, and developing goals and objectives to achieve them.

*Exercise 2:* The group was asked to briefly brainstorm individually some measures that can be applied to the community values from CPC #1. Then in small groups, similar to exercise 1, they refined the concepts and picked the top five (5) to ten (10) and wrote those on note cards. Next, each group placed the notecards on a purple sticky wall under the community values defined at CPC #1. Group discussion was encouraged and some note cards were reorganized based on discussion. The community values and note card placement are as follows:

### *Connectivity, Gathering, Social, Cohesion:*

- Number of community events a year
- Number of neighborhoods represented by users
- Number of people who visit
- Number of community gatherings

### *Fun:*

- Percent of land space given to recreational/active plan
- Fun = variety of activities(divided by) number of people participating

### *Ownership, Pride, Responsibility:*

- Number of people who walked in
- Number of park clean-ups
- Number of hosting private events
- Observed caretaking
- Reported problems
- Cleanliness of area

### *Environmental Stewardship:*

- Number of plants/mature left on site
- Percent of land planted or in natural state
- Species diversity
- Percent plants native to the area
- Number of interpretive signs

### *Wellbeing, Multipurpose, Multifunctional:*

- Percent of area that is multifunctional/use
- Number of footage for different purpose categories
- Number of activities available
- Percent devoted to activity, pro-environment/natural space, other plans

- Crime statistics or collisions
- Continual safety audit

*Accessibility for all:*

- Percent of area that is usable by people of all abilities
- Follows ADA guidelines
- Variety of access points
- Includes: trail, other adult fitness area, adult recreation, adolescent activity, children's activity

*Inclusive:*

- Variety of age groups using the park

**The exercise will continue at CPC #3.**

**Next Steps/Closing Remarks**

After the exercise, there was a general discussion focused on the development process. The CPC requested that they receive examples of concept, schematic, and construction documents in order to gain a fuller understanding of the park planning process in its entirety. The City will provide more details at the following CPC meeting. Some specific discussion points were as follows;

- *What will we see in terms of concepts for Sierra/Lineberry?*
  - COR: The project team will provide concepts and more detailed information at following CPC meetings.
- *How does the agenda get created and how can we contribute?*
  - COR: The CPC will be more involved over time with setting the agenda including raising specific subjects for resolution.
- *Since the park is small in scale, what types of amenities will we not see?*
  - COR: The City will provide this information to the CPC.
- *Can we clear the land so it is useable now?*
  - COR: Mr. Dickey suggested that schematic design and initial construction documents are typically in place before any site activity is fully appropriate and authorized by the City.
- *What will the park cost and how can we fund it? How does the master plan get implemented?*
  - COR: There are no dedicated funds at this time for implementation of the Sierra/Lineberry Park Plan. The City Council has shown an overall commitment to this project, however, by sitting aside the funding for the planning process. There is on-going Council consideration of setting aside additional capital improvement funding for park site development. Citizen committees, like this CPC, are encouraged to engage in the Council their budget process and deliberations over capital priorities.
- *Can we be provided with examples that represent what a master plan, schematic designs, and construction documents look like?*
  - COR: The City will provide these examples to the CPC.

Ivan Dickey (COR) spoke to several of these questions and will continue to provide operational expertise to the committee. Over time the CPC's role is to be stewards of this eventual park plan.

---

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Next CPC meeting will be held on March 4, 2014, 6-8pm, at Peach Road Neighborhood Park, 911 Ileagnes Road.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Israel