



These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.

Topic	+	-	Notes/Questions
<i>People—Existing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children like to play on the fitness equipment Enjoy the natural feel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children and families are too afraid to use the park due to the free range of dogs. Families are generally uncomfortable at this park and will choose not to come here. The amount of dogs make children feel unsafe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future growth surrounding the park means more dogs and more children will be around.
<i>Extension of park to 20th St</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activate the street Pedestrian-only street Connects to empty retail space Opportunity for a design that complements Living Alley across the street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current street is not well used Empty storefronts Worries about closing down the entirety of 20th street to cars. Difficult circulation patterns in the neighborhood already. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street closure and extension onto 20th St was part of original park plan Consider fire access. Perhaps use of bollards? Likelihood to be able to close down 20th st?
<i>Park path</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One pedestrian-friendly path to serve as circulation around the park and the block Use of permeable paving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplication of external sidewalks and internal park paths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible to take away sidewalk? <u>Keep the exercise spots and walking trail</u> <u>Have running trail all around the park</u>
<i>Pedestrian-scale lighting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see lower, pedestrian-scale lighting around the park for evening use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current street lighting is high up and meant for vehicle traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Investigate self-contained solar lighting</u>
<i>Picnic Area</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing location and use is great 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Place picnic area at opposite end from dog area (e.g. storage area)</u>



These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.

Topic	+	-	Notes/Questions
<i>Plazas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the idea of entry plazas to formalize the entrance of the parks. Would like the entrance to complement the Dogpatch Arts Plaza and Living Alley. Seating for people to buy takeout nearby and sit/eat at the park. Northeast corner needs a path into the park. Perhaps mimic other plaza entrance on a smaller scale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entry at the northeast corner of the park is unwelcoming. Must step over mulch pile to enter the park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>No need for a large plaza; extend the dog area over the plaza area as there will be other plazas nearby</u> <u>No programming</u> <u>Do not duplicate amenities; coordinate with surrounding development</u> <u>“Acknowledge the future Dogpatch Arts Plaza on 19th Street, west of Indiana. Hardscape plaza areas within the park can be minimized due to this extra amenity coming soon to the neighborhood”</u>
<i>Play Areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rocks, boulders for children to climb—natural play elements to complement the natural feel of the park General informal play space for people to play (e.g. throw ball or Frisbee around) Would like the whole place to be playable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not want new children’s play structures, especially plastic and colorful play structures—“McDonald’s” type CPA would be too small. A play structure would also take away from the lawn space for other active play uses. Should not confine children to one area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Keep open areas for Frisbee and ball throwing</u> <u>What does a “natural play area” mean? Will it be paved?</u> <u>Use natural objects or sculpture</u>



These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.

Topic	+	-	Notes/Questions
<i>Adult Fitness Equipment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently used frequently by adults Upgrade the equipment and improve the surfacing—softer and not concrete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete pad—lack of safety surfacing has caused injuries, especially kids who use it as play equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the perimeter paths, especially on the north side of the park.
<i>Topography</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English garden feel—use of topography to reveal natural areas as you walk in More vertical elements on the Southeast corner. Currently has a lot of sun. Like existing vertical elements on the Southwest corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees/plantings lost over time. The feeling of an English garden is lost. 	
<i>Storage</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idea—move storage to a parking space (would need encroachment permit from DPW and/or MTA) 		
<i>Landscape and Vegetation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing nature walkway and paths, large trees, magnolia on south end of park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dying trees Loss of trees/vegetation over time Dog urine affecting tree health <u>Remove some trees on the south side to open up sun spots.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to hire an arborist to confirm poor health of trees in redwood grove <u>“Build Public has a tree survey of the Park. They can provide the tree survey for planning purposes – if needed, contact them.”</u> <u>Maintain the “forest” feel.</u>
<i>Community Garden</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing location and use is great 	Not appropriate for this park—too many dogs in the area	



These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.

Topic	+	-	Notes/Questions
<i>Dogs-- Existing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog owners love being able to let their dogs off-leash. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog urine kills trees • Dogs run free throughout the entire park. • Southwest corner smells bad • Some dog owners refuse to leash their dogs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park currently does not have a designated off-leash dog play area. • Park is advertised as so on Yelp and other dog-friendly websites. • <u>No dogs in Esprit Park</u>
<i>Dog Run - Proposed</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use artificial K9 turf. Can be cleaned/irrigated. • Potentially put on 19th Street. Maybe close down half the street but still allow vehicular access. • Dog fitness equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog run on 20th St may not be appropriate fronting potential retail shops/restaurants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avalon already has a dog run proposed, to be open in 2018 (though not legally agreed upon, it was promised as a community benefit. Currently the site is used for construction staging; will probably be the last element of the project to be constructed.) • Minimum size of 10,000 sf but ideally at least 30,000 sf • <u>More room for dogs, make the dog run area bigger (one big area instead of three small areas by each development</u> • <u>Just split in half for off-leash dogs and half for no dogs</u> • <u>Acknowledge the future dog run being</u>



			<p><u>built on 20th Street stub, west of Indiana. This facility will help to serve the dog needs in the neighborhood as well.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>The dog run area indicated on the diagram from 5/22/2016 seems too small.</u>• <u>The plaza or hardscape shown in the conceptual diagram in the Park off 19th is not necessary. Use this area to expand the off-leash dog area.</u>
--	--	--	---

These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.



These notes are intended to supplement the maps and diagrams that were hand-drawn at the public workshop. Download those maps and diagrams at: sf-Planning.org/CentralWaterfrontPRP

Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 6/14/2016 DNA meeting.

Double-Underlined red text indicates additional comments from the 7/12/2016 GBD Board meeting.

Topic	+	-	Notes/Questions
<i>Separation of Dogs and People- Proposed</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use topography; large berm that isolates the dogs into its section on the northern end of the park Mimic Duboce Park with a walking path that bifurcates the park into two sections; define the dog play area clearly with fencing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing general agreement in the neighborhood is not working out. (Northern end for dogs, Southern end for people) 	<p>From RPD Dog Policy:</p> <p>What is RPD’s requirements for dog fences?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Where fencing is required it will be 4 feet high.” “To the extent possible, RPD will advocate for non-fence alternatives.” “Boundaries of dog play areas will be identified with physical enclosures. All barriers will strive to be aesthetically pleasing using landscape features such as shrubs and vines.” Also see boundary requirements for smaller parks 0-10 acres in dog policy. <u>“Do not replicate the fencing used at Duboce Park to separate the Dog Area. Design a nice enclosure.”</u>