

**PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS
MARCH 8, 2023 MEETING**

5.1 Evelyn Park Conceptual Review and Recommendation, Project 21-60

1. Has staff considered more naturalistic play equipment, made of materials other than plastic and open to less structured play experiences than slides and swings? Wyandotte Park has some examples, as does a small new park in Palo Alto on Olmsted Road.

Naturalistic play equipment materials and nature play would be a good fit here and can be further explored during the next phase of design.

2. Are trees being added to the park's street interface (in addition to the required street trees)?

Yes, concepts D & E propose trees in the planting area behind the sidewalk and complement the existing street trees already planted within the park strip.

3. What are the street trees on Evelyn Avenue?

*All existing street trees in front of the proposed Evelyn Park are London Plane (*platanus x acerifolia*) trees. The second row of new trees planted within the development, behind the sidewalk, are Vine Maples specified at 8' to 10' in height.*

4. How does this park compare in size to the Villa Park? I noticed a grassy area in the U-opening of the project at Villa, is that where the park is planned to be?

Villa Park is approximately 0.39-ac and is rectangular shaped. The site is approximately 202' wide and 80' deep from the street curb. Evelyn Park is 0.68-acre and is trapezoidal shape. The park frontage is about 187' long and ranges from 147' to 172' deep from the street curb. Villa Park is located along Villa Street as pictured below.



5. In concepts D and E, is there any fencing on the southern edge of the park between the lawn area and Evelyn Avenue?

Low fencing is intended to be included at the back of the Evelyn Avenue sidewalk along the park's street frontage for both concepts. Fencing is shown in Concept D, but it is not shown in Concept E. Should Concept E be recommended, staff would include low fencing at the back of the Evelyn Avenue sidewalk with the development of the construction documents.

6. The report mentions habitat gardens. Where are those located in the two concepts?

Habitat gardens are not specifically called out in the concepts, but potential locations for both concepts can integrate gardens in the southwestern and southeastern edges of the park where planting/groundcover are shown.

5.2 Advisory Body Input on the Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2024-25 Council Work Plan Potential Projects

7. Which, if any, project on the list aligns with the current Biodiversity Strategy that CSD/PRC is already working on with SFEI? Project #24 might be close, but seems more narrow in scope. Would a vote for #25 (Community Tree Master Plan) serve as a vote for both the Biodiversity Strategy and the CTMP?

Project number 24 is intended to represent the full scope of the Biodiversity Strategy project which will include an Urban Forest Plan that replaces the previous Community Tree Master Plan. Project 25 is a carryforward project that existed before it was determined that the Biodiversity Strategy scope would include an Urban Forest Plan. During the PRC meeting, we will discuss the connection of these two projects moving forward.

8. Is there any guidance provided consistently to all commissions regarding whether prioritization voting by advisory bodies should be done with commissioners/committee members wearing a City hat, a PRC hat, or a personal preference?

While PRC commissioners are expected to advise on what is most beneficial for parks and recreation needs throughout the City, commissioners are also encouraged to frame their project selections holistically with the City as a whole in mind.