



# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland



## Meeting Summary

Beech Project Advisory Committee Meeting 1

January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015

3:30 - 5:30PM

## Location

Shaver Elementary Parent Room

3701 Northeast 131st Place

## In attendance

### PAC members:

Courtney Gearhaut, resident, parent of young kids

Fred Colley, resident, dog walker, scientist

Jamari Gilbert, resident, student at Park Rose High School

Russell George, resident, Argay Neighborhood Association

Corinne Phillips, resident, parent of young kids, small business owner,

Bill Lindekugel, Argay Neighborhood Association

Nina Palacios, resident, parent of young kids

Meryl Redisch, Portland Parks Board, Urban Forestry Commission

### Staff:

Hun Taing PP&R Community Engagement Coordinator

Britta Herwig PP&R Project Manager

Jeff Milkes PP&R South/Shoutheast Zone Manager

Melinda Graham, Jonathan Beaver, Tommy King (2.ink Studios)

## Summary

Each PAC member received their project binders with information about the master plan, the PAC role, schedule, ground rules and were asked to bring the binder to every meeting.

Quick summary of last meeting was presented and Goals for PAC 1 were outlined as:

1. Confirm vision and goals for Beech Park
2. Learn about the park site
3. Confirm importance of design and program elements from the Master Plan
4. Discuss relationship between different park elements
5. Identify characteristics of park elements

### I. Confirm Vision & Goals. P. 7 & 8 of Master Plan.

The group all agreed that the vision and goals are relevant and current. The goal around sustainability produced some discussion and will need to be clarified through the design process.

Historic and neighborhood context is interpreted to mean that the design will reflect the residential character of the neighborhood and perhaps lean on the site's agricultural past.

### II. Site presentation

The presentation included an overview of the site's physical characteristics and the opportunities and constraints presented both by the site and the surrounding area such as:

- great mountain views,



# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

- average slope across the site of 5% - steeper on south parcel,
- lack of trees across the site – great views,
- possible locations for sewer connection on the north end of the site,
- lack of park access from the west side,
- proximity of 25 immediate neighbors,
- direct connections to Shaver Elementary school and the farmland,
- major entry points in to the site and the very visible pedestrian paths illustrating where people currently walk through the site.

A quick review of the master plan and the program elements (stuff that makes up the park) showed that while there were a lot of activities shown, the plan should be improved:

- program elements are scattered rather than organized to create a ‘heart’ or hub of activity
- major views to the north are not celebrated (soccer field is located in the area)
- a major sports field is located on the steepest slopes on the site (elevation change of 13 feet from the south to the north side of the field) – this is not really feasible to work around.

### III. Discussion on importance of park elements, their character, and their relationships

The design team presented a park element matrix as well as three diagrams illustrating different possible locations for and relationships between design elements (attached). Images from other parks were used to illustrate some options of possible character and scale for the different design elements such as play/water, shelters, community gardens, teen areas, dog parks, and art. The purpose of the three schemes/diagrams was to test the importance and size/priority of several elements such as sports field, parking, playground as well as their possible location on the site. Schemes also provide different level of active (scheme A) to passive uses (scheme B). PAC contribution and discussion resulting from the presentation of the schemes included:

- Exploring options for sustainable park design (wind turbines in the park to use the east winds??)
- Striving for a balance for parking (concern about parking in front of private properties)
- need for parking changes with the level of activity in the park (big field = more parking)
- Finding a way to keep certain elements close to parking (community garden, dog park, fields)
- Keeping dog park away from playground and community garden to avoid conflicts
- Keeping dog park away from the adjacent school
- Creating a strong relationship between the school and the park (community garden close to Shaver, possible shared parking lot – will need more conversation with Parkrose District)
- Including elements for all age groups in the park to make it equitable
- Creating the central space on the upper slope (south property) to take advantage of the open and inviting feeling there
- The strong pedestrian corridor through the north property along NE 131 Pl. needs to be maintained (or if there is a field/meadow in the middle of the site, careful design is needed to avoid a cut through path)

Overall, there was agreement from the PAC to develop the three presented schemes further for the first Public Open House/Community Forum.

The design team will present more detailed concept design options at the next PAC meeting on February 12<sup>th</sup> and the PAC will review them before the Open House on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.