

# COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2 SUMMARY

## CITY OF SAN BRUNO EARL/GLENVIEW PARK MASTER PLAN

March 21, 2016 | 7:00 pm – 9:00pm

---

### WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND FORMAT

The second Community Workshop for the Earl/Glenview Park Master Plan was held March 21, 2016 at the American Legion in San Bruno. The workshop was the second in a series of three workshops being hosted by the City to ensure the park master plan reflects the needs and interests of the community. Approximately 25 community members attended the interactive workshop.

The workshop opened with remarks from Joan Chaplick of the consulting design firm, MIG. Joan emphasized that the City is seeking input from neighbors about the design of the park and she reviewed the meeting agenda, project schedule and results of Workshop #1. Joan introduced City staff Kerry Burns, the Community Development Director who leads the project and Connie Jackson, the City Manager. Joan also recognized three Parks and Recreation Commissioners who were in attendance, including Lucy Zamattia, Lorry Greenberg and Laura Davis. Following this, Joan introduced Matthew Gaber, landscape architect from MIG who presented design concepts and principles that reflected the priorities and desired activities identified by the participants at Workshop #1. Matthew then introduced the small group exercise where workshop participants would work collaboratively to create design concepts for the park planning area.



## WORKSHOP DESIGN ACTIVITY

There were four groups each led by a MIG facilitator. The objective of the small group exercise was for each group to produce one preferred park design concept. The groups were tasked with creating a park design that responded to the site constraints and the issues and concerns that were identified in Workshop #1. Each group had a tabletop-size map of the park planning area. The groups were asked to create their preferred park design using color-coded pieces of paper that represented programmatic elements including: play, solitude, social/community space and dog park. These were the programmatic elements prioritized by community members in Workshop #1. The groups were not required to use all of the elements or pieces in their park design and they were invited to change the shape and size of the programmatic pieces. Workshop participants could also draw trails or pathways on their site plan. As the groups discussed the design of their park planning areas, facilitators recorded key points from the discussion on flip charts. (See Attachment A for the flip chart transcriptions.)

## KEY FINDINGS

Although each group's park design was unique there were many commonalities among the designs. (See Attachment B for pictures of the site designs.) Below are notable themes that emerged from the small group discussions and designs.

### **Play**

All four groups increased the area dedicated to play on the site and all groups located play on the large park site. The groups' designs illustrate the desire for substantial connected play spaces. The play spaces also included areas dedicated to different age groups so that separate areas were provided for younger and older youth. All but one of the group's play spaces are situated on the north side of the large site, away from the slope. The group that placed their play area on the slope suggested integrating play experiences into the hillside. It was suggested that a slide or active play element could be integrated into the slope.

### **Socializing**

Social areas were considered an important element of the park and all four groups' park designs included a significant area devoted to socializing with their neighbors. It was suggested that some of the social space be positioned so people could watch their children while they played. Each group positioned and sized their socializing spaces differently but all of the groups dispersed them throughout the site.

### **Solitude**

In Workshop #1, there was general agreement that the park should include a dedicated calm and quiet space that commemorates the tragedy experienced by the neighborhood in 2010. This priority was reconfirmed in Workshop #2 with all of the groups including an element of solitude in their site designs. Two of the groups in Workshop #2 positioned the

solitude element on the south side of the large park site on the slope of the site. It was noted that the design should include five benches, one for each of the families who lost members during the event.

## **Dog Parks**

During Workshop #1, most participants expressed a strong interest in having a dog park. Upon further discussion during workshop #2, most participants clarified that they were seeking to have an area in the park where dogs on leash would be allowed as opposed to having an established, gated dog park with related amenities. Two of the groups identified areas where leashed dogs could be allowed and care was taken to keep dogs away from the active play areas. Current park rules limit the presence of dogs in parks, however, the park could be eligible for an exception that allows leashed dogs in designated areas.

## **Trails**

Three of the groups included paths/trails in their design concepts. The paths/trails were discussed as being multiuse and providing connectivity between the various elements of the park.

## **CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS**

The design concepts created by Workshop #2 participants will inform three site design alternatives created by MIG which will be presented at the third workshop to be held in May.



## ATTACHMENT A

Following is a list of discussion items transcribed from the small groups' conversations related to their park designs.

### Play

- 4 square
- Pitch back wall
- Climbing Wall
- Pee-Wee Golf
- Active sports on the smaller site
- Paving for skating/hopscotch on smaller park site
- Double play area
- Slide on slope
- Climbing Wall integrated into space
- Exploratorium domes
- Viewing stand/benches for parents
- Do older and younger kids play together? Are there different types of structures?

### Socializing

- Break Up Socializing Space → Informal Spaces
- For teens

### Solitude

- Five Benches
- Water feature on large site
- Memorial/Commemoration on smaller site

### Dog Park

- No Dog Park
- Do not label park as Dog Park, but give open space that is "dog-friendly"
- Dog Park area (Not a Park)
  - o Consider super concrete
  - o Slide Option

### Path

- Multi-use (for walkers, bikers and dog walking)
- Exercise equipment a long path (i.e. parkour)

### Interaction between site elements

- Barrier between Play + Street + Dogs
- Need for Buffer between adjacent homes and street
  - o Buffer suggestions: trees, social space, structure
- Connections between Play + Social space / Perimeter trail/loop
- Earl = Adult Oriented
- Claremont = Family Oriented

### **Other Elements**

- Drinking Fountains
- Wind Barrier
- Traffic Calming/Speed bumps/ Stop Signs for crossings
- Improved Landscape Treatments
- Opportunity for community art piece

## ATTACHMENT B

The following page includes photos the four park design concepts developed by each of the small groups at the workshop.