

PIERCE STREET PARK: RECOMMENDATION/INPUT MATRIX

10-4-12

Park Program	Working Group	Planning & Zoning Commission	Park & Recreation Commission	Traffic & Safety Commission	Additional Thoughts
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The park should have a minimal amount of new parking dedicated to park Disagreement over location Minimal support for Calhoun location The working group was divided on whether the park should include parking as part of the park or not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed opinion on parking. Some support for northern parking location. Others do not think this is an appropriate location Concern about the Calhoun entrance and potential conflict with neighbors. Potential to have structured parking within the maintenance facility site. Consider the potential to separate out the City Staff parking from the maintenance facility requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wide support for on-street parking if it is possible. Need to coordinate on-street parking with traffic calming Divergent views on amount of parking to provide. Based upon desire to attract users from other parts of City and encourage less driving. Desire to maintain park land for park uses 1 commissioner support for northern location Need to provide ADA and family parking for those who need it Support for limiting the amount of parking because the City wants to encourage driving less and the use of transit, bikes and walking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, the commission felt there was not the need to provide space within the park for parking. Supported the idea of creating on-street parking along Pierce Street (and possibly Cleveland Avenue). Request that the City consider utilizing on-street areas along Cleveland Street or the space below the overpass for maintenance staff parking The entrance from Calhoun does provide good ADA access Parking requirements for the building are driving a lot of the design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for Cleveland Avenue to be used for on-street parking for the park and to connect the park to Cleveland via a long stairway at the southwestern corner of the park
Multi-Use Path	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate location Some felt a lot of space in the design is dedicated to bicyclists Concern about conflict between commuters and park users. Concern about conflict between bicycles and vehicles if driveway at Calhoun 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential conflict point with vehicles at Calhoun parking lot entrance The path should include speed limits for bicyclists Potential conflict of having pedestrian and bicycle path intersect in Alternative A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall support for a 8'-10' wide trail, which deemed more fitting for likely use Overall support to have the trail end at the corner of Cleveland and Washington as a Class I path. The trail should be designed to allow for police and maintenance access Preference for the path outlined in Alternative B because there is an intersection with a walking Path depicted in Alternative A Visibility and Safety key in the southern area of the Park where the path is adjacent to the building site, retaining walls or fence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall support for a 8'-10' wide trail, which deemed more fitting for likely use Overall support to have the trail end at the corner of Cleveland and Washington as a Class I path. The trail should be designed to allow for police and maintenance access Preference for the path outlined in Alternative B because there is an intersection with a walking Path depicted in Alternative A Visibility and Safety key in the southern area of the Park where the path is adjacent to the building site, retaining walls or fence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AS&R prefers 8-10 foot path AS&R prefers route in Alt B Support for speed limits on path Class I paths attract a specific type of user, people who likely don't feel comfortable riding on the roadway. This should be taken into consideration when designing the path and having a continuous trail. AS&R representative not concerned too much with the potential for conflict at a Calhoun Driveway entrance because of the low volume of cars that would be utilizing the driveway
Playground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A necessity for the park Located near bathroom and parking Support for slide and idea to integrate topography into the playground design (similar to Dolores Park, SF) Pierce Street Parcel is not the correct location for a community garden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A must. Supported by all. Support for a creative playground similar to Dolores Park, SF. Support for the idea of a slide that is incorporated into the topography 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the idea of the slide as part of the Playground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighborhood and community members have all supported the idea of including a playground as part of the park program
Community Garden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pierce Street Parcel is not the correct location for a community garden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No strong support for including at this location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed 	
Entrance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Support for terraced entrance Terraced entrance planted with a number of different things including demonstration garden or Asian-themed plants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the Terraced Entrance Potential maintenance costs Support for viewing location/platform. Consider raising to create more viewing opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the Terraced Entrance Potential maintenance costs Support for viewing location/platform. Consider raising to create more viewing opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed 	

PAGE 2

Mediation Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support, Not too much concern about location other than should be located near complementary adjacent uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question of whether this is the appropriate location for a meditation area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support Avoid potential conflicts with bike path 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed
Fountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support Could be a play fountain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the fountain will not really be able to compete with the freeway noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that a water feature is not consistent with water conservation goals. Play fountain would require fresh water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed
Skate Park/ BMX Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pierce Street Parcel is not the best location for a skate park Not too much concern about location other than should be located near complementary adjacent uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed opinions of the idea of a skate park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for a skate/bmx park that caters to younger children and “tweens” More support for BMX uses than for skate uses. BMX uses are quieter than skate parks = less conflict with neighbors Avoid potential conflicts with teenagers and creating a “hang-out” area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed There is a great skate park less than a mile away AS&R supports this location for a possible BMX park for young children
Parcourse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good idea and location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for parcourse (especially if not along Ohlone anymore) Good use at this location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed Parcourse advocate feels that the Greenway is a more appropriate location for a parcourse Neighbor support for a parcourse at this location.
Demonstration Garden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good idea, could be in various flexible locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the use of native plants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wide support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed
Basketball/ Pickleball Courts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed
Restrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needed. Should be located near playground A lot of concern expressed about hours of bathroom and preventing use by nearby homeless population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likes having the building incorporated into the maintenance facility building for safety and maintenance purposes The restroom should be located close to the playground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for having the restroom be a part of the maintenance facility, for both cost and safety reasons
Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some felt there was too much space dedicated to open grass area/water consumptive use. Others felt that the appropriate location for grassy open spaces is in a park and that use of water is better in a park than a home. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for multi-use field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore the spatial requirements to include area for soccer (U7 and U8) Some concern that too much open space goes unused, and should be used for structured play instead. 	
Dog Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some felt it was a good idea to include a small fenced location for dogs, if so the northern portion of the site is appropriate Location adjacent to the Maintenance facility was also suggested Opinions changed on this when supporters for the dog park shared their opinion that having a dedicated area for dogs will prevent owners from allowing their dogs to use other areas “illegally” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No strong opinion of whether dogs are appropriate at this location. Some support, and some lack of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal support for dog park A dog park close to residential may not be appropriate A dog park next to a bike path is a bad idea Potential for a dog park under the freeway? Dog parks do not integrate well into other multi-use areas Already have nearby dog parks A dog park may attract non-local people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Building Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lots of discussion- no consensus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Support for Building Alternative 1. Desire to have the building anchor the corner and have it be less 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All commissioners support Alternative 3 (northern location without access from Calhoun). Support for the location because of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations for green roof or solar panels

	integrated into the landscape.	security, and restroom in building
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Building Alternative 3 with parking on top of building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also liked Alternative 3 because of the potential for synergy of uses
Pierce Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General concern for Safety and speeds. Concern regarding bus traffic Concern regarding existing parking. Resident support to relocate the existing southbound bus stop to a bus pull-in adjacent to the entrance of the park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the idea of widening Pierce Street and creating on-street parking. Support for creating more raised crosswalks along Pierce streets and using them as traffic calming devices.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the idea of additional crosswalks. Support for the idea of relocating AC Transit bus stops. Support for parking on Pierce Street and the potential for it to be regulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concern about safety and ease of access for having parking on Pierce Street Need for traffic calming on Pierce Street. Concern that widening it will just make the traffic worse. Some support for on-street parking if possible. Potential for on-street parking to be metered during daylight hours Underground utilizes along Pierce Street
Sustainable Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make sure to carefully choose the roof materials for the maintenance building because of the high visibility Support for including solar panels as part of the maintenance facility design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable and pervious materials should be used for the hardscape in the project. Support for solar panels to be included on the maintenance facility building and as part of the covered parking for the maintenance vehicles. Support for having a green roof as part of the maintenance facility building
Additional comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible to connect the park to Albany Hill? Potential for an electronic billboard in the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New sidewalks along Pierce Street should include a planter strip to buffer the pedestrian from the roadway A longtime park advocate and neighbor is concerned that there is too much programmed use in the park, and a not enough preservation of the existing open space
Potential Benefits		
Parking Location	Potential Drawbacks	
Northern End of Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good use of difficult space Easy access from Pierce Street Allows close proximity to other park programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential negative traffic impacts on Pierce street because of topography Requires driveway easement on Caltrans property Requires dedication of large portion of park area to parking
On-Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to widen Pierce Street and minimize some of the existing parking/driving limitations on Pierce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires dedication of park parcel to parking Parking is not adjacent to many park program (i.e. playground)
Shared Parking at Southern Edge of Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to share parking between maintenance facility and park Provides good ADA access to plateau of site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased Traffic on Calhoun Minimal number of dedicated parking spaces for park during maintenance facility hours Potential conflict point between cars and bicycles when driveway crossing bicycle path
Potential Benefits		
Building Footprint	Potential Drawbacks	
Alternative 1 – Corner of Washington and Cleveland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building helps to define street edge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first floor of the building will not open to the street. Detailing and fenestration can animate façade, but because of functional use requirements, the building will not “activate” the street corner.
Alternative 2 – Northern edge of site (Shared Parking at Calhoun)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacency to the park creates an “eyes-on-the-park” situation which will help improve park safety Provides 4-6 parking spots at-grade for the park Allows “level-in” entry to offices from Calhoun. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrance to parking lot from Calhoun creates a conflict point between vehicles and bicyclists/pedestrians using the Class I path Increases traffic on Calhoun Street
Alternative 3 – Northern edge of site (all parking within Locked Maintenance Facility)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacency to the park creates an “eyes-on-the-park” situation which will help improve park safety/Restroom located in building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dedicated parking for park use at south end of the park.