RE: 4471.00 – HUCKS ROAD COMMUNITY PARK

Conference: Croft Community School
Date: February 24, 2016
Purpose: Public Meeting

ATTENDEES:
LEE JONES – MECKLENBURG COUNTY PARK AND RECREATION (MCPR)
KEVIN BRICKMAN – MCPR
BRIAN BENNETT – MCPR
SUE FREYLER – COLEJENEST & STONE (CJS)
MARSHALL GILES – CJS
JORDAN NOBLIN – CJS
GINNY YOUNG – CJS
SEE ATTACHED SIGN-IN SHEET FOR COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Minutes:
I. Introduction
   a. Project Information:
      i. The current site for the proposed Hucks Rd Community Park is
         approximately 32 acres. The site is located in northern Mecklenburg
         County on the south side of Hucks Rd directly across from Clark’s
         Creek Nature Preserve. Croft Community Elementary School
         neighbor’s the site’s eastern boundary. Davis Ridge neighborhood is
         adjacent to the site’s western and southern boundaries. Most of the
         site is open field, though wooded areas and natural tree line exists
         along the eastern, western and southern boundaries which acts as a
         buffer to adjacent residential neighborhoods. The site is relatively
         flat throughout, but has some significant topographic changes in the
         wooded areas along the site’s wooded perimeter.
   b. Meeting Introduction
      i. Lee Jones introduced the project team and the project to community
         members. He talked about what would happen over the course of
         the meeting, and let the attendees know the purpose of the meeting
         was for them to voice their thoughts and opinions.

II. Presentation
   a. The project site was introduced to the community. Guiding information
      and park elements that were provided from MCPR to CJS were to be used in
      order to create a community park that provides both passive and active
      facilities as determined to be most important to the public as based on most
      recent MCPR 10-Year Comprehensive Master Plan. Additional information
      presented to them included: park location, definition of a community park,
      analysis of the site, opportunities and constraints of the site, potential park
      elements, and the preliminary concept plan for the park. The preliminary
      concept was explained in depth, with an explanation for each park element,
      and the preliminary location of that element in the park. Community members
      were asked to do two things:
         i. Community members were asked to review the preliminary concept
            and make comments about aspects of the design that they
            liked/disliked. Attendees made comments both on comment sheets,
            and also on post-its directly on the concept plan.
ii. Community members were also asked to place colored dots on the (5) elements they liked best, thereby prioritizing which elements were most important to them. Community members and members of the project team engaged in discussion about the concept, and answered any questions that community members had.

III. Questions

a. A brief question and answer segment followed the presentation. The community members asked the following questions about the park. Questions included:

i. Won’t the through road cause potential safety problems?  
   Yes it is possible, that is why we are not recommending it to CDOT.

ii. Would the design be rearranged if the connection road does happen? (like moving playground further from road)  
   If CDOT requires us to build the public street, we would need to provide further separation of the park amenities from the road. We would look at fencing along the road frontage to keep kids from entering the road.

iii. Are all of the park elements listed included in the budget?  
   That is our goal, once a final cost estimate is completed, we will know what can all be afforded. We may need to eliminate some shelters or make the play elements smaller to keep it within budget.

iv. What is the budget for this project?  
   $3,780,000 which includes design/permitting costs.

v. Would the spray ground be monitored by a MCPR employee?  
   Yes.

vi. Would the community garden water supply be paid for by the MCPR?  
   Yes.

vii. Will all of these materials (at the presentation) be available online?  
   Yes, it will be under the Capital Projects tab on www.parkandrec.com

viii. Who would pay for the through road?  
   MCPR, but CDOT would maintain it if we are required to build it.

ix. If CDOT requires the through road, are they going to help pay for it to allow for money allocated to the park to actually be spent on the park, and not on the road  
   No, CDOT would take over maintenance of the road.

x. Would the through road be closed to vehicular traffic at night?  
   No, it would be a public street that would be open 24/7.

xi. Are all the park elements shown going to be included in the final design?  
   Based on the final cost estimate, see item iii above.

xii. How do we (community members) make sure that the elements that we want to be in the park are included in the final design?  
   The highest ranking park elements based on the quantity of colored dots will be priority to construct in the final design. Actual sizes and quantities may vary to keep the project in budget.
IV. Meeting Adjourned

a. The site plans with sticky notes, the precedent boards with different color dots, and comment sheets completed by those in attendance were collected.

b. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:30 PM.

V. Results of Breakout Session

a. Preferred Park Elements (based on number of dots given to each elements)

![Bar chart showing preferred park elements based on number of dots given to each.

- Springground: 35
- Playground: 15
- Basketball: 19
- Soccer: 19
- Shelter: 38
- Trails: 43
- Disc Golf: 27
- Community Garden: 21
- Lawn/Meadow: 12
- Other/Dog Park: 1
- Other/Tennis: 1
- Other/Basketball: 1
- Other/Fitness Trail: 1

b. Other Written Comments from the Proposed Site Plan (on sticky notes)

i. There were (17) separate comments that were opposed to the idea of building a vehicular road through the site (These comments stated: “No Road”, “No Road Please”, “Road at the back of the park is a bad idea”, “No Road to Davis Ridge”, etc.). In addition, when the vehicular connection was initially identified and explained, there were many audible comments from people who were opposed to the idea.

ii. “How would the park be physically separated from the residential property that is right next to it?”

iii. “Shelters need to be visible.”

iv. “Enclosed dog park”

v. “Radiator pond @ 485 McCray & Thomas Craven Rd.”

vi. “A through road would be a poor idea!”

c. Other Written Comments Provided on Comment Sheets to MCPR

i. “There are several basketball courts existing next to the school. Please consider tennis courts at the park instead of basketball.”

ii. “Like the fitzone. Should also consider active playground equipment for special needs children (i.e. wheelchair)”
iii. “I love the park as it is now – beautiful. A wonderful gift to the community – IF it stays NATURAL that would be great!”
iv. “I am not for putting a car road from Davis Ridge. It will be a short cut for getting onto Hucks Road and dangerous for families. Will there be a gate? Closed and locked at night? I’d like a fitness trail with equipment added to a main trail.”

v. “Will there be a gate? Closed and locked at night?”

vi. “I’d like a fitness trail with equipment added to a main trail.”

vii. “Great meeting, thank you for all your hard work! Shelter (?), community garden yes! Thanks great meeting, well informative thanks”