



MEETING REPORT

MEETING DATE: December 15, 2010

STAFF ATTENDING:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Mitra Pedoeem | M-NCPPC Park Development Division (PDD) Chief |
| Patricia McManus | M-NCPPC PDD Design Section Supervisor |
| Ching-Fang Chen | M-NCPPC PDD Landscape Architect |
| Brian Woodward | M-NCPPC Southern Region Chief |
| Mohammed Turay | M-NCPPC Park Manager |
| Lanshing Hwang | Symbiosis, Inc., Consultant |
| Matthew Ernest | A. Morton Thomas & Associates, Inc. Consultant |
| Steve Torgerson | A. Morton Thomas & Associates, Inc. Consultant |

PROJECT: Woodside Urban Park-Facility Planning

SUBJECT: Community Meeting #2

AGENDA

- Introduction - Patricia McManus
- Background, history and site analysis – Ching-Fang Chen
- Concerns of existing park and community preferences
- Concept Alternatives A, B and C - Ching-Fang Chen
- Circulation Study – Steve Torgerson
- Question session - Patricia McManus
- Summary - Patricia McManus

STAFF PRESENTATION

The concept alternatives for the redevelopment of the Woodside Urban Park were presented. The concepts aimed to respond to the concerns of existing park and preferences brought up at the 1st Community Meeting and to realize the vision of a successful 21st Century urban park. The plans seek to address urban connectivity, experiential complexity, environmental sustainability, economic efficiency and cultural vibrancy.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION

There were 7 adults and 2 children attended the meeting, the majority of whom live in the surrounding neighborhood. Specific comments and suggestions are summarized below.

1. Community members present were concerned about the proposed removal of the tennis court, although a few attendees were open to the idea of the proposed conversion of the tennis area to another use.

2. The community expressed concerns about the “temporary” Skate Spot staying while the tennis courts are being removed. The community members stated that “they took one for the team” when they agreed to allow the skate park to be installed within their community when other communities objected it.
3. The community members stated that the tennis courts are used by all ages, while the skate spot accommodates a limited age group. The community member also expressed interest in where the persons that use the skate park are coming from. The community members stated they have seen skaters using the tennis court.
4. M-NCPPC conveyed the design intent of providing well-used and multi-functional spaces throughout the park. MNCPPC provided diagrams indicating the number of tennis facilities in the surrounding area. Currently, there are 3 courts within ½ mile radius from the park, 9 courts within 1 mile radius and 39 within 2 mile radius. The Park Planning Division confirmed that the 2005 PROS Plan does not show any unmet needs for tennis in the Silver Spring Area. The proposed transformation of the tennis area intended to reclaim the wasted space of the steep slope for play, encourage park usage, promote integration of the topography and accommodate stormwater management required by the Environmental Site Design regulation without losing park open space.
5. A community member expressed hesitation of using the tennis court at the Ellsworth Urban Park which is half mile from Woodside.
6. The community members proposed options of relocating the tennis court to the open space behind the Montgomery County Health and Human Services building and the area fronting Georgia Avenue near the basketball court.
7. M-NCPPC explained the reason why the proposed concept did not incorporate the entire block. The Montgomery County Department of General Services (MCDGS) is working on a facility planning for the Montgomery County Health and Human Services building. MCDGS expressed to park staff that under no circumstance should the facility planning of Woodside place encumbrance on the use of the County property prior to final determination of the future use.
8. A community member was concerned about the creation of a “ceremonial” entrance at the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Spring Street. He felt that with all options, the amount of “paved” area was too much.
9. Several of the community members have expressed concerns over the amount of open space in the design schemes as it relates to the removal of the tennis courts.
10. The community members expressed appreciation and enjoyment of the renovated playground.
11. The community members favored the concept of a community garden, walking trail and inclusion of fitness equipment for adults along the trail.
12. The community members supported the preservation of the tree canopy. They also liked the proposed visibility improvement from the street and the consolidated central open space for flexible uses.

13. The concept element of a concession was discussed. M-NCPPC conveyed the intent of establishing economic framework as part of the facility plan effort. A well designed vending station will allow opportunity for business partnership to sustain funding for park operation and maintenance. The overall plan aim to work well with or without a concession.
14. The community was concerned about “low spots” in the design that may create areas unsafe and non-visible areas within the park. MNCPPC responded that the majority of the low spots were being used as stormwater management facilities.
15. Some community members requested clarification of the stormwater management approach for treatment of the sidewalks and plaza areas within the park, while the surrounding roads were untreated. AMT provided a brief summary of the stormwater management regulations and requirements.
16. The MNCPPC had discussed the accessibility issue for the sidewalk along Spring Street as it relates to the width of the sidewalk, as well as the potential for improved bicycle access or lanes on Spring Street. A community member had suggested the possibility of installing a single parking meter device that would allow for the elimination of the existing meters directly adjacent to the parking stalls.
17. The community expressed concern about the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Spring Street. AMT/MNCPPC provided an overview of the traffic/pedestrian analysis for that area. AMT/MNCPPC explained that any improvements to the intersection will require review and approval from the Maryland State Highway Administration.
18. There were questions about who the park will serve. M-NCPPC conveyed the Master Plan guidance that the park is to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods as well as local businesses, mixed use communities and visitors to the area.
19. While the community expressed concerns with the removal of the tennis court, they were pleased overall with the quality of the design concepts presented.

Summary

Due to the concerns with removal of the tennis court, it was discussed that a survey of the local community may be conducted to determine more specifics about park usage. M-NCPPC agreed to develop a design alternative that retains the tennis court and to solicit additional public comment on the alternatives.