



## **Staff Report**

---

### DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ON DAVEY GLEN PARK AND CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SERVICES

Honorable Mayor, Council Members, Honorable Chair and Commissioners:

#### **Summary**

Staff is requesting authorization to move forward with acquiring the services of a landscape architect to prepare design and construction documents for Davey Glen park. The one acre site was set aside for a park as part of the nearby condo development and will meet a critical need for park space in the Central neighborhood. This item came previously before the City Council on March 11, 2008, at which time the Council asked staff to conduct a survey of the neighborhood to evaluate the desire for a park at the site. The results indicated that about two-thirds of the residents want the site to be a park- either a passive or active park. For this reason, along with previous planning, the Parks and Recreation Department is recommending that the City proceed with design and construction of a park at the site.

#### **Background**

The 1992 Park and Open Space Master Plan identified the need for local parks within Central neighborhood. The neighborhood is underserved, with one elementary school and two mini-parks. The City of Belmont acquired a one acre parcel on Davey Glen Road during a housing development project on Davey Glen Road. The one acre parcel was dedicated as a future park site. In April 2006, the City Council ranked the Davey Glen Park development project as one of their highest priorities. The current FY 2008 adopted budget identifies funding for design and construction of a neighborhood park.

The Parks and Recreation Commission held a special meeting on November 3, 2007 on-site to receive feedback from the community on the proposed development of a park. The meeting was attended by approximately 35 people who voiced their thoughts and concerns over the proposed park site. Attendees expressed interest in the following ideas for the site:

- Remain undeveloped/ Open Space
- Passive Park , benches and picnic tables

- Wildlife in the area a concern
- Neighborhood Park with play structure
- Community garden
- Type of fencing
- Additional maintenance for city staff
- Potential fire hazards
- Develop interpretive trail or exhibits
- Labyrinth

Subsequent to the meeting, there was concern voiced from residents and Commissioners that the entire neighborhood may not have been represented at the meeting. In particular, residents began commenting at Parks and Recreation Commission meetings and sending letters concerning the proposed park. The Commission reached consensus that professional services of a Landscape Architect are necessary to develop conceptual drawings of potential site improvements and alternatives. In February 2008, the Park and Recreation Commission voted to recommend to City Council that staff contract with a landscape architect to provide design services and to assist in the continued community outreach process. On March 11, 2008, City Council considered a resolution approving the contract with the landscape architect but asked that staff conduct a survey of nearby residents to evaluate the interest in development of a park and the type of park that may be appropriate.

**Discussion**

In summer 2008, Parks and Recreation staff created and mailed a survey to 850 local area residents and 401 surveys were returned (47%). The results are included in the table below and indicate that there is a fairly even split among the neighborhood concerning the proposed park at the Davey Glen site. However, the results also indicate that about two-thirds of the local residents want the site developed as a park- either a passive or active park. For this reason, along with previous planning, the Parks and Recreation Department is recommending that the City proceed with design and construction of a park at the site.

Questions Asked in Survey	Response	% of Respondents
Remain Open Space (no development)	143	36%
Passive Park (pathways, benches, landscaping)	129	32%
Active Park (play structure, picnic tables, other uses)	119	30%
No preferences	10	2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **General Plan/Vision Statement**

- We choose to make our home among these beautiful hills, trees, parks, views, and open spaces.
- Our wooded residential areas are diverse, peaceful and well maintained.
- Our natural surroundings inspire us to play, create, and contemplate.
- Our playgrounds and athletic fields are of high quality and in high gear.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Funding source is identified as Fund 341, Planned Park Fund, in adopted Fiscal Year 2008 budget. A total of \$450,000 is available for design and construction, from which \$100,000 was estimated for design in fiscal year 2008 and \$350,000 for construction in fiscal year 2009. The Professional Services Agreement will not exceed \$60,000 and funding will come from the Planned Park Fund 341. Park development will also result in an additional maintenance cost on the Parks and Recreation Department. An estimate of maintenance cost cannot be provided at this time because the design is not known.

### **Public Contact**

- Public posting of agendas for one City Council meeting and two Parks and Recreation Commission Meetings
- Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on-site on November 3, 2007
- 500 foot teleminder notice of September 2008 Commission meeting
- 850 surveys sent to neighborhood

### **Recommendation**

The Parks and Recreation Department is recommending that the services of a Landscape Architect be obtained to provide design options and construction details for the proposed park project. Staff is recommending the City Council authorize the City Manager to execute a professional services agreement not to exceed the amount of \$60,000 for Landscape Architect services.

### **Alternatives**

1. Take no action
2. Refer to staff for more information
3. Make other recommendation

**Attachments**

- A. Resolution
- B. Minutes of November 3, 2007 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting
- C. Excerpt of Minutes of March 11, 2008 City Council meeting
- D. Excerpt of Minutes of June 4, 2008 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting
- E. Excerpt of Minutes of September 3, 2008 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jonathan Gervais  
Parks and Recreation Department Director

---

Jack R. Crist  
City Manager

**Staff Contact:**

Jonathan Gervais- Parks and Recreation Department Director  
(650) 595-7441  
jgervais@belmont.gov

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELMONT  
APPROVING A PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECT SERVICES FOR DAVEY GLEN PARK FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO  
EXCEED \$60,000**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Belmont has budgeted \$100,000 in FY 07-08 for design and construction plans for Davey Glen Park; and,

**WHEREAS**, the City of Belmont has solicited proposals from qualified Landscape Architects to provide professional Landscape Architectural services; three consultants submitted proposals for consideration; and

**WHEREAS**, the Professional Services Agreement will not exceed the amount of \$60,000 and funding will come from the Planned Park Fund 341; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the City Council of the City of Belmont directs the City Manager to execute a professional services agreement with a Landscape Architect for design and construction plans for Davey Glen Park.

\* \* \* \* \*

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Belmont at a special meeting thereof held on November 5, 2008 by the following vote:

AYES, COUNCILMEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

NOES, COUNCILMEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

ABSTAIN, COUNCILMEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

ABSENT, COUNCILMEMBERS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
CLERK of the City of Belmont

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR of the City of Belmont

**City of Belmont  
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING      NOVEMBER 3, 2007  
MINUTES**

The special meeting of the Belmont Parks & Recreation Commission of November 3, 2007 was called to order @ 10:40 a.m. at Davey Glen Park

**I.                   ROLL CALL**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:      Shjeflo, Gervais, King, Cheechov, Andrews, Lyon, Harris, Bortoli

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:      Moissiy

STAFF PRESENT:                      Interim Co-Director of Parks & Recreation (ICDPR)  
Ourtiague, Interim Co-Director of Parks & Recreation  
Brunson, City Manager Crist and Secretary Saggau

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:      Councilmembers Mathewson and Warden,  
Planning Commissioners Frautschi and Wozniak,  
and City Treasurer Violet

**II.                   SPECIAL MEETING BUSINESS**

A.      Park Development Input

C Gervais thanked everyone for attending and explained the Commission was there to hear to listen what the residents would like to see done at Davey Glen Park. He noted this would not be the only time for public input on the development of this park; it will be discussed at Park & Recreation Commission meetings and City Council meetings. C Gervais asked if anyone does not feel comfortable talking in an open forum to please communicate to the Commission by email, phone or correspondence.

C Gervais asked everyone in attendance to introduce themselves. The Commissioners thanked everyone for attending and encouraged residents to give their input on this project.

Residents in Attendance included:

Annie Nichols Waterman and Bill Waterman – spoke in preference of open space and wondered if a park would affect property values.

Mary & Gene Lee (Mr. Lee was the resident that donated the land for the park)

Mr. Lee stated his intent when he donated the property to the City was to keep it as open space not as a park. He expressed concerns with traffic, fire hazard and other potential liability issues.

At the request of C Gervais, Mr. Lee gave a history of his ownership of the property. Mr. Lee stated he purchased approximately 10 acres over 20 years for planned development. Originally he wanted to develop 144 units, and then he tried to develop 85 units but eventually was able to develop 32 units. He noted the property used to be owned by the Davey family of Davey Tree Company.

Mary Lee pointed out the need to delineate the private property border.

Trudi Bodel expressed concern with the speed of traffic on Davey Glen Road and that it would be dangerous to cross the street to go to the park. She was also concerned about disturbing the deer and other wildlife that are in the open space area.

ICDPR Ourtiague thanked everyone for attending today. He presented a display that outlines the park area and the protected scenic greenway on the parcel.

Mr. Lee noted that he had installed a fence on the property which outlined the property lines but the City had required him to remove it.

Sam Lee said he was concerned about the deer that live in the area and if park noise would affect the deer. He enjoys current state of park.

Stanley Wong said he liked the way the area is now and would like to keep it as it is.

Richard & Gloria Meriwether spoke in favor of keeping it as is. They expressed concern with youths not being visible in park area and expressed concern with fire hazard.

Pat Callagy stated he would like to keep it natural for the deer. He expressed concern with potential homeless people, drug use, and potential fire danger.

Hildegard Brown stated she is a 30-year resident on Davey Glen road. She would like to keep park it as it is. She also expressed concern with people dumping garbage in the Davey Glen open space area. She suggested putting a No Parking sign on Davey Glen Road.

Mr. Lee explained he has an agreement with the City and he is not allowed to make any improvements or do anything to the property.

Sheila Durham stated she is a 30 year resident and would like the site kept natural. She concurred that there is a lot of furniture and garbage dumped in the area. She would not like to see a fence installed.

City Manager Jack Crist complimented the Park & Recreation Commission on holding this meeting to hear what the residents would like done at this site.

ICDPR Brunson thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Wesley Zang stated he was the person that objected to the fence that was installed because it interfered with the deer's pathway. He said he is indifferent to whether or not a fence is installed again. He wanted to find out who has jurisdiction of the area that is not included in the park because he has concerns with safety and preserving the open space area.

John Cahalan was present to listen to what was discussed at the meeting.

David Long, president of Neighborhood Association was present. He said he was there so that he could communicate with the neighborhood what occurs at this meeting.

Cynthia & Paul Soares said they would like to keep the trees and leave the park as it is.

George Kranen said this site would make a beautiful picnic area and he would like to see a children's play area there too. He suggested the landscaping be native so that it would not require much irrigation and also be deer resistant.

Christine Wozniak, Planning Commissioner and City Council candidate, stated she is a big advocate of open space and parks in Belmont. She was there to listen to what the residents wanted to be done with the park site.

Hilgard Boromand said he was a 20-year resident and was concerned that the trees remain. He also expressed concern with security.

Rick Frautschi said he envisioned that this area would be more passive use. He is an advocate of community gardens and suggested this area be considered. He also liked the idea of incorporating a play structure. He recalled that the fence that was taken down was because Mr. Lee was not given permission to install it and neighbors complained about it.

There was discussion on if a fence would be a good idea in that location. One neighbor noted that some trees have been topped off in that area by other residents wanting to preserve their views.

David Braunstein, City Council Candidate, stated he was there to listen to the neighborhood residents. He noted he was involved in the library project which included an adjoining park.

Dave Warden, City Councilmember, stated he has been on the City Council for eight years and on the Planning Commission during the beginning of this development project. He noted one of the reasons the City wanted to get title of this property was so that the City would have control over what happens to the

site. He said maybe it would be kept open space and it could be turned it to a park at another time. The city leaders, working with the neighborhood, can decide what they would like to do with the park. He agreed that initially it could be left as open space and noted most of the people that would use the park would be the residents that live near it. He commended the Park & Recreation Commission for having this meeting and hearing what the neighborhood wants.

Hongye Sun said she likes the present state of the park but agreed that it needs to be cleaned up.

Phil Mathewson, City Councilmember, stated he was involved in the process of obtaining the park. He envisioned something passive at the site to start with and maybe cleaning up the area and adding some picnic tables. He noted there may be some noise concerns from neighbors if a play structure were installed. He said for a starting point he saw the park the same but with a little more maintenance; although he noted there is concern about the city's ability to maintain one more park.

John Violet, City Treasurer, and nearby resident for 35 years agreed with keeping it a nice passive, open space area.

C Lyon excused himself from the meeting at 11:15 after expressing appreciation for the residents input at this meeting.

A resident asked if funding has been approved for this park. ICDPR Ourtiague explained the City Council approved funds this fiscal year for the development of plans for the development of this park. The construction would be budgeted in the 2008-09 Fiscal Year.

C Gervais noted that the City is in the process of updating the Park & Open Space Master Plan and that that item will be on the Park & Recreation Commission's agenda for December 5. There will also be a Tree Lighting Ceremony at 6:30 in Twin Pines Park prior to the meeting. He noted this meeting would be a good opportunity for residents to give input.

C Cheechov encouraged residents to attend this meeting and give their input. C Shjeflo also encouraged those attending to attend the Park & Recreation Commission meeting because there may be some people that would like to see more development in the this park that may attend.

Norman Luttrell stated he was there to see what was going on at this meeting.

C King noted a resident of 300 Davey Glen suggested putting in a labyrinth in the park.

C Gervais noted he did not see any children present and asked if that was a reflection of the neighborhood. It was noted that the neighborhood children use the nearby school playground.

C Harris questioned if anyone currently uses the park space. It was noted that there may be some dog walkers but most people do not know it is a city park site.

C Gervais asked if there were any thoughts on developing trails in the park. There was some concern that trail users would venture onto private property.

George Kranen suggested the Commission hold another meeting and send notices to parents with children so that the children have a chance to voice their opinion.

C Bortoli recalled past concerns with neighbors on the installation of new play equipment in neighborhoods and that this would create a lot of traffic and safety concerns. After the projects were approved and installed none of the concerns became an issue. He stated that he thought this would be a good place for a couple picnic tables.

C Andrews stated he did not think a park would scare the deer away; C Harris agreed.

Mary Lee raised the question if a sign would be posted identifying the park.

Mr. Boromond stated that more than 200 of the people that live in the condominiums need a green and quiet space. C Gervais requested that Mr. Boromond ask the condominium association to give their input.

David Long noted it would be helpful if the property borders for the park were marked so it is easier for everyone to visualize the park site. He noted some barriers should be created to define the private property.

Mr. Long recalled that the project at College View Park created a neighborhood feud when neighbors did not agree on the improvements. He noted that this has been a very constructive meeting but that there may come a day when parents with children have different ideas for this site. He noted it is important that everyone consider this and folks should try to avoid creating a rift in their neighborhood.

C Shjeflo stated he attended these meetings and recalled there were a few neighbors that were very opposed to the playground improvements at College View Park. None of their concerns ever happened.

C Gervais noted that there may never be any requests for a play structure.

David Hoffman stated he was there to hear what the neighborhood wants there and noted that the park borders should be marked.

C Gervais asked if there were any thoughts on a community garden at the site. It was noted that it would require irrigation and a fence to keep the deer out. Rick Frautschi stated that people could check out the community garden at Barrett Community Center and noted that there is always a waiting list for a garden plot. David Hoffman added that his wife has a plot at the community garden and the

waiting list is no longer that long due to the requirements on maintaining these plots.

C Gervais reminded everyone of the upcoming Park & Recreation Commission meeting on December 5 and that the Park & Open Space Master Plan Update would be on the agenda. He noted that this issue will be discussed again and there will be more opportunities for residents to give their thoughts and opinion.

Mr. Lee commented that there is major opposition to anything being done at this site and that the majority does not want anything done.

One of the residents stated that she thought the immediate neighbors to the site should get priority and their comments should be listened to carefully.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Grace Saggau, Secretary  
November 3, 2007

## Excerpt of Minutes of March 11, 2008 City Council Meeting Attachment C

### **Discussion and Direction on Davey Glen Park and Consideration of Resolution Approving Landscape Architect Services**

Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague provided the background regarding the acquisition of this one-acre site during the approval process of the Davey Glen Road townhouse development. He noted it has remained open space since its acquisition. The site is challenging due to topography, it is heavily wooded, there is wildlife present, it is difficult to see from the street, and is close to homes. Concerns were expressed at a community meeting held in November, and recommendations included doing nothing or developing the site for passive use. There was no support for a large developed park site, and no one has come forward requesting park development.

Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague noted that the proposed professional services agreement would procure a landscape architect to develop some schematic options, and the scope of services can be directed.

**Walt Shjeflo**, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, noted that 50 years ago there were no parks in Belmont and now there are several. He noted that all of the park developments that have been addressed by the Commission since he became a member have had some controversy. He noted there were no children present during the community meeting for this proposed park site. He supports passive development. He commented that supporters will eventually come forward, and that the most vocal are usually against something.

**David Long**, President, Central Neighborhood Association, supports some form of development of the Davey Glen Park site. He cannot disagree with those who do not support doing much at the site. The outreach performed by the City on this issue has been good. The General Plan indicates that the Central Neighborhood is under-parked. Although the existing Patricia Wharton Park was improved, there is still a need for more park space, but not all open space should become park space. He recommends putting the decision on hold for 90 days in order to perform more outreach. He suggested that an alternate site could potentially be located within the Central neighborhood.

Councilmember Wozniak stated that most people have expressed the desire that nothing be done with this site. The City Council has received a number of emails in support of developing the Semeria Park site, and her first response is to focus on that site instead. She concurs that it may be appropriate to leave Davey Glen as open space and to reallocate the dollars to Semeria. She does not support spending any additional money on Davey Glen without more feedback.

Councilmember Feierbach noted that there may be alternate sites in the Central neighborhood, but that the money allocated for Davey Glen should remain in that neighborhood.

Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague noted that costs for any amount of park development can be high. He also noted that the Planned Park funds will continue to grow.

Councilmember Dickenson expressed support for a 30-day extension, and supports an allocation of funds for development of the Semeria Park.

**David Long** responded that time would be needed for the neighborhood association to compile a newsletter and perform outreach, and 30 days would not likely be enough time.

Councilmember Braunstein concurred that Semeria Park is a worthwhile project to pursue, but that the Central neighborhood has needs. Both areas need to be addressed.

In response to Mayor Lieberman, Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague clarified that the City fought to acquire the site for a future park. Because of budget constraints at that time, there was no support for additional park development due to the additional maintenance requirements, and the proposed park development was put on hold.

Mayor Lieberman stated that he would like to have a higher percentage of response than what has been received so far. He suggested that additional outreach be performed before conceptual drawings are made. Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague responded that the turnout was high for the site meeting, and no additional response has been received since.

Councilmember Wozniak expressed concerns regarding the cost for additional outreach, and was unclear what questions would be posed in the outreach.

Mayor Lieberman clarified that he was not advocating for park development, but stated he would like to make a decision based on solid information.

Co-Interim Parks and Recreation Director Ourtiague described the outreach that was performed for the November site meeting.

**Judy King**, Belmont resident, expressed her support for Mr. Long's recommendation, and suggested that the Central Neighborhood Association perform the outreach.

Councilmember Dickenson stated that the adjacent property owners do not want an intensified use of the site. He supports giving the Central Neighborhood Association time to do outreach, and that no City dollars be spent in the meantime.

Council concurred to have the Central Neighborhood Association and City staff work together on additional outreach.

**Excerpt of Minutes of June 4, 2008 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting**  
**Attachment D**

**B. Davey Glen Park Survey**

ICDPR Ourtiague reviewed the Davey Glen Park Proposal was brought to the City Council but they were not certain that enough outreach was completed to assess the desires of the community. Staff was directed to work with Central Neighborhood Association President David Long and a survey was prepared to ask the residents what they want at Davey Glen Park. Included in the packet was this survey for the Commission to review and make suggestions for revisions. A map of the area that would receive the survey was presented showing the area of 800+ residents that would receive this survey.

ICDPR Ourtiague stated he contacted a surveyor to place landmarks to designate the boundaries of the one-acre park site just prior to the survey being mailed out.

C King requested that a tree instead of a house be placed on a flyer. She also requested that a couple addresses be shown on the map and that it show El Camino's location.

C King requested that question #3 on the survey the word "neighborhood" be changed to "active" park to clarify the type of park. There was agreement from other Commissioners that should be changed.

C Moissiy requested "**Park** & Recreation Commission" be changed to **Parks** & Recreation Commission" on the survey. She also suggested that for the email address it be noted that their email will not be used for other purposes than this issue.

C Gervais stated that youths seemed to be missing at the park site meeting. He questioned how the word is getting out to those folks and suggested using the web site to get their input. He proposed letting people respond to the survey on the website. C Cheechov questioned if that would be a problem and if people that want a park developed at Semeria Park might complete the survey to keep Davey Glen Park as open space. C Warden noted on-line surveys need to be done correctly and this is not easy to do. He agreed with the idea but it needs to be done right and is not sure that the City's IT Department can do this.

C Gervais suggested taking this to Central School and doing presentations to reach the youths that were not reached last time.

C Bortoli said there would be a different set of responses now and noted at the on-site meeting virtually nobody wanted anything there but ever since then the Commission has heard from those with desires to have something there. C Bortoli said the youth can be reached by mailing to the residents. C Gervais said he thought the same demographics

would respond as they are used to opening mail and this survey would not capture the youth as they do not communicate through those patterns.

ICDPR Ourtiague explained staff received direction from the City Council to prepare a “neutral” survey so not to influence the responses.

C Shjeflo said he thought this survey is a waste of time and energy as it will not give any useful results and it would be difficult to interpret the responses. He questioned if slightly more people don't want a park than do want it would that mean the community does not want a park and it should not be improved? He thinks this will be another piece of information that we will wonder what do with. He recalled at the first meeting not one person there had children and they did not want a park. Since that meeting others have approached the City in favor of a park. C Gervais & C Shjeflo agreed “let's just build a park”.

C Warden said he did not think the City would want to spend a half million dollars on a park if most people do not want it. He thought the problem is there are two completely disparate points. Most of the 40 people at the meeting said they do not want anything but passive open space and 15 people have come forward since they want a play structures there. He noted there is direction for the City Council to do this survey and this is representative government. The people that take the time to fill out the surveys will be more represented. And he thought if more people want a passive park rather than an active park than maybe the park will not have a huge play structure. He thought the City can see what they get from the survey and if it is conclusive this could be useful.

C Shjeflo questioned if  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the residents do not want the park improved, similar to what happened with the opposition at College View Park, what has the Commission learned from this.

C Gervais wondered how long the City should wait to proceed with this project. He thought the City could have a landscape architect draw up some plans for a more developed park, a less developed park and a real passive park and brought those forward as potential designs.

ICDPR Ourtiague clarified that the City Council is also concerned about forcing a park into this area if it was not really desired and want to know if there is support for it. They thought the one time meeting at the site was not sufficient for them to be able to make a decision to hire a landscape architect for \$60,000 when a mailer could be sent out for a fraction of that.

C King asked if the any city staff has met with the immediate neighbors. She said if they are vehemently opposed to having a park she would base a lot of her opinion on what those residents want at this site. She noted there was always a park at College View and it was just improved which is hugely different from putting in a new park. ICDPR Ourtiague said he met with them prior to the on-site meeting and the City has received some correspondence from them and their concerns about the park development.

C Shjeflo commented that there would never be any park in this town if the sentiment prevailed because every time a park was developed there has been some opposition. He said the Commission has to get by that hurdle in a sensitive way.

C Cheechov requested the survey be revised so that following the first question the next line should read "If yes, indicate your preference of the three listed below" and eliminate open space as a choice.

C Warden suggested the question could state "how do you feel the site should be developed (if at all)" and list the options.

C Rafi agreed if the answer was no that open space could be eliminated from the choices. And he suggested a Neighborhood Park (or Active Park) could have small play structure.

C Moissiy requested that the survey be sized to fit on one piece of paper. ICDPR Ourtiague said it would and will be designed two-sided and will be made to fold into a mailer.

ICDPR Ourtiague reviewed the survey will be revised to state "How to you feel this site should be developed" with the four options and remove the yes or no question on the top. The survey results may be completed in time to report back at the August Commission meeting.

**Excerpt of Minutes of September 3, 2008  
Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting**

**Attachment E**

**C. Davey Glen – Survey Results and Next Steps**

PRD Gervais summarized the Staff Report and utilized a power point presentation to display photos of the site and further describe the project. Staff recommendation was that they move forward with hiring a landscape architect, asking for two alternatives – one slightly more passive than the other – with the idea that a more active park would not be precluded in the future. If the Commission concurred, he suggested that they focus on an agenda for a joint meeting on September 30<sup>th</sup>, after which they would hire a landscape architect, develop the two alternatives, hold a public meeting probably on site, return to the P&R Commission, Planning Commission, and Council. Construction would start in the spring of 2010.

Referring to the survey results, C Cheechov commented that she concluded that 68% of the respondents leaned toward open space or a passive park, while 62% leaned toward a passive or active park, and asked for clarification of staff's intent. PRD Gervais responded that he did not believe the community wanted a full active park with concrete and a play area, but would ask for proposals where one alternative would have more "built" environment than the other.

On advice of counsel, C Bortoli stated that it is not necessary for speakers to give their name and address unless they want some sort of a direct response. In addition, he asked that speakers try to keep their comments to three minutes or less, and if they concur with other speakers' comments, they should so state and add any additional comments.

Eric Reed, resident of Central Neighborhood and Belmont Planning Commissioner, thanked the Commission for conducting the survey, and spoke in support of a park at the Davey Glen site. He felt that the neighborhood is very under-parked and noted that park-in-lieu fees often accompany Planned Developments. He quoted some of the survey comments that he thought were a bit selfish, and stated that he believed parks make neighborhoods better and the neighborhood does not have enough places for people to go. He stated the data speaks for itself – that people want some form of a park at Davey Glen. He said he would be very happy with a park that is a majority passive but that has a small play structure.

Michelle Ladcani, long-time Belmont and Central Neighborhood resident, stated that though she is three streets away from the park she did not receive the survey so she does not think it is indicative of who might use the park. She added that there is no park within a safe walking distance of her home and she supports the project.

Resident Paul O'Leary commented that the response to the survey was very impressive, but thought that some of the respondents were misinformed regarding the trees. He

encouraged the building of an active park in such a way that it would be friendly to the neighbors and suggested a slide area that takes advantage of the topography.

Commissioners commented as follows:

C Cheechov:

- If a meeting is held at the park, there should be a large posting of the meeting time and date on the site. Some people evidently did not know about the previous meeting that was held at the park.

C Andrews:

- Asked how far the lower bench area is from the nearby house. Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of placing playground equipment in that area.

C King:

- Indicated support for a creative passive park.
- Suggested benches and a table with an embedded game board which had been discussed previously, or perhaps the architect could come up with something new.
- Urged caution about creating a hidden night-time hangout.
- Thought that by going with a passive park this would split the difference of the survey results.

C Shjeflo:

- Noted it was a good survey and was surprised at the number of responses. He indicated that the number of responses of those who wanted Davey Glen to remain open space likely represented the majority of those with that viewpoint, whereas those wanting an active park or a passive park may not have taken the time to respond to the survey.
- Should ask the landscape architect to come up with an active park and a passive park designs to give them something to choose between.
- Liked the previous comment about a slide and hoped that they would come up with something different that would take advantage of the topography.
- A trail system would be a useful thing to look at.
- A dog park is another possibility the architect could be asked to consider.
- If the park is designed properly, there will not be problems about teenage drinking. Mothers with kids are a great neighborhood protection system.
- If they lay out the alternatives and let people look at them, they will come up with something to be proud of.

C Andrews:

- Park is much bigger than he thought it was when they were up there.
- He agreed they should look at all of the kinds of things suggested by C Shjeflo for the residents of that community.

C. Sullivan:

- Parks definitely create neighborhoods and if they are designed well and people are in them it drives out negative elements. This was proven in Oakland where a trail system was built in area where people were concerned about crime but when the community used the trails it changed people's views on this open space.
- Concern about trees – agreed that trees are great but in balance with other uses could be done well. Trimming of trees and clearing of brush will allow for site lines to be safer.
- Stulsaft Park in Redwood City has a slide that takes advantage of an existing hillside and uses a rubberized material.

C Warden:

- Did not agree with C. Shjeflo's viewpoint concerning non-respondents' intent; did not want to second guess and say that everybody who did return the survey wants a park or does not want a park. His guess is that they did not care enough. He noted that the 47% who want a park is a very substantial representation. He questioned if the 143 who said to do nothing may be interested in a more passive park, and if the 119 who want an active park may be okay with a more passive park. Since two-thirds of the people want some type of park he thought they should at least build something like paths, trails, and benches and should landscape to make it nice. He did not know exactly what they should build and needed more feedback.

C Shjeflo concurred and restated that he felt they should ask a landscape architect for all of the alternatives and then have another meeting to allow people to talk about what they like and don't like.

C Cheechov:

Landscaping in the drawings should be basically natural as opposed to fully manicured.

C Moissiy:

- Agreed that the middle ground seems to work out because a lot of people are fearful that it will be rowdy and loud or that they won't be able to appreciate the natural beauty.
- Flowers would soon become food for the deer. Should work with the trees instead of against them because a lot of people talked about wanting trees.

C King:

- Did not agree with asking for two ideas for a passive park and an active park, would only agree with two ideas for a passive park.
- Did not want to see a giant play structure or a small one.
- Suggested the possibility of a tree swing or something.

C Rafi:

- Agreed with C Warden that it should be kept natural but at the same time there are a large group of people who want something. Pathways and benches should make both sides happy.

C Bortoli:

- The statistics from the survey show that at least 2/3 of the people want no more than a passive park and 2/3 of the people want something. Believed that the “no development” people are probably concerned that as soon as they put any kind of a park in that property, everybody in California is going to want to use it. His experience has been that that is not what happens. He thought it would be okay to have a picnic table or two. If they get a design for a true passive park with just pathways, benches, and landscaping and a design for an active park it would not mean that they could not move a picnic table in and maybe a small play structure that seems to fit. It is easier to deal with something that is already on paper rather than starting with a blank piece of paper, and plans would be useful at a neighborhood meeting on site.
- Recommended that they move forward to hiring a landscape architect.

C Warden:

- Suggested getting one good plan with optional features. If they get two plans they will end up going back for a third. Preferred that the architect listen to comments and try to come up with a compromise with features that could be added or deleted. He thought that would be more cost effective and straightforward and might even take less time.

Discussion ensued with the suggestion that a base plan with overlays might be a way to build consensus and give the neighborhood a chance to look at the alternatives.

C Bortoli raised the question about staffing to maintain the park. PM Ourtiague and PRD Gervais concurred that park maintenance, especially with pocket parks, is a challenge and may require additional resources to maintain a new park.

C Bortoli suggested that whether or not this project can be absorbed into the current workload should be discussed when the project is taken to Council.

Eric Reed asked for and received permission to address the Commission again. He wanted the Commission to consider that there were four kindergarten classes at Central School the previous year so that there are a lot of little kids in the neighborhood who would use the park and benefit from it. He felt that they could look at a small play structure in the lower right-hand corner of the park without disturbing the neighbors on Davey Glen.

***C King moved, amended by C Warden and seconded by C Shjeflo, that the Commission recommend to City Council at the upcoming joint meeting that the services of a landscape architect be retained to create a master plan for the site with which they can be creative, starting with a passive park as a base plan and including overlays. Motion passed unanimously.***