MEETING MINUTES

Date of Report: April 25, 2018

Subject: Pine Valley Neighborhood Park
Bloc Design Project: 00532.00

Date of Meeting: April 19, 2018
Location: Pine Valley Community Center

Meeting Attendees:
James Williams (Mecklenburg County - PR)
Brian Bennett (Mecklenburg County - AFM)
Peter Cook (Mecklenburg County - PR O&M)
Alex Rohleder (Mecklenburg County - PR O&M)
Kevin Gorman (Bloc Design)
Emily Buehrer (Bloc Design)

Remarks: A community meeting was held to present the schematic design and scope for the neighborhood park to the community attendees and get their input. Below is a list of the comments and concerns that were mentioned during the presentation of the project and during the breakout session.

1. There were complaints about flooding issues on lots south of the park. Specifically, around 2332 Long Leaf, 9504 Grey Leaf, and Lodgepole Pl. Concern that new park will create more issues.
   a. We can review existing storm drainage structures and their conditions and look for feasible remedies. May look to try and bring a City Stormwater Representative to next meeting.
   b. The County prioritizes protection of existing trees and vegetation within park projects, which prohibits a mass grading solution to drainage issues.

2. Will the park be fenced? There were concerns about only having one entrance access to the park and users walking through residents' yards to access instead of walking around to the main entrance. Residents indicated that people jump over existing private fencing to cut through site.
   a. The County does not typically fence Neighborhood Park projects.
   b. We could look at optional secondary access points with footpaths, which may be created naturally anyway.
   c. Could look at barrier planting groups and mixes to try and deter people from jumping fences.
   d. Residents encouraged to call CMPD to deter trespass on private property.

3. There was concern about safety in the park and use after dark. Can motion sensor lights be installed?
   a. Major component of proposed project is the limbing up of trees, and removal of invasive understory vegetation throughout wooded edge to increase visibility into the park.
   b. Increased park use will provide an increased sense of safety, as well as neighborhood surveillance. Lighting is not typically installed in neighborhood parks, as it could invite unwanted use after hours. Park is open from dawn to dusk, so residents & guests should not be using the facility after daylight hours.
c. The park will scheduled observations by park rangers and maintenance staff on a regular basis. CMPD to patrol the park as needed.
d. Maintenance crews will regularly visit the park as well.

4. Where is the playground equipment for the children?
   a. We were under the assumption that this was not desired based on info from previous public meetings. Will need to re-evaluate based on community input.

5. The neighborhood is in need of a better basketball court or softball field. Can this be added?
   a. Programmed sports facilities, such as basketball and softball are not currently included in the program for the park. City Zoning regulations require these facilities to have parking which this site will not accommodate.
   b. The proposed design maintains an open field in the center of the walking loop to accommodate informal pick-up games of baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball, and other activities requiring a relatively flat open space.

6. Can there be a track facility instead of sidewalk with the playground in the middle?
   a. The sidewalk loop currently shown is 1/8th of a mile; 8 revolutions make 1 mile.

7. The mix of adult fitness and children's playground equipment at the Marion Diehl facility is very nice, could we have something like that here?
   a. The project team will use this facility as a precedent for design and recommendation/selection of play & exercise equipment.

8. Can we have a shelter and grill area for picnics?
   a. We can look at adding a charcoal grill and picnic area. There are security concerns over the provision of a shelter or similar structures that may encourage undesired activities within the park.

9. Can we have a community garden?
   a. We can look at adding a community garden, but the neighborhood would have to organize a garden volunteer group, elect a Garden Captain, and organize enough interest before we would look to add one. The community would be in charge of maintaining the gardens. If we would need to supply water, then we would need to get that permitted. The currently proposed project includes minor improvements that would not require permitting.

10. Desired playground items requested from children in attendance include; slides, monkey bars, seesaw, swings, and small springer animals. A “bike track” was also requested.

11. Can we have a drinking fountain?
    a. We can look into adding a drinking fountain.
    b. Adding a drinking fountain would be another item that would require permitting, which would delay the overall project schedule.

12. Can the community name the park?
    a. It was explained that there is a County process the neighborhood association can go through to formally request a change in the park name.

(End of Meeting Minutes)