

City of Sammamish
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

MEETING SUMMARY

October 25, 2004

Commissioners Present: John Rossi, Lynn Rehm, Joyce McCallum, Cornell Amaya, Tom Schloetter

Staff Present: Jeff Watling, Hope Gibson, Consultant Leslie Wiscomb, Janie Smith

Meeting was called to order at 6:38

Public Comment

Marta Ullman, 2024 218th PI NE
Public is interested in dog park areas. She was hoping for an off-leash area at Ebright Creek Park and was disappointed that that option had not been chosen.

Ongoing Business

Ebright Creek Park

Concepts are ready to present to Council with the following elements:

- Sports Court
- Playfield
- Play Pods
- Picnic Areas
- No Freed House
- No Off-leash Dog Area

With regards to the off-leash dog areas, it has been recognized that there is a need for this park element with a City-wide approach to a solution. It was determined that Ebright Creek Park was not a suitable location for an off-leash area.

Retention of trees – need to utilize the space we can for park elements

Leslie Wiscomb has taken ideas from the public, City Council and Parks Commission and sketched three concepts that included the preferred program elements. Sketches were numbered 1, 2-A and 2-B and were explained as follows:

General comments by Leslie:

- Play area might be too shady.
- May reduce size of sport court – perhaps a compromise between tennis and basketball.
- Spread out larger groups in the park in different areas.
- West side no longer has dog area.
- Study restroom and play area – move to eastern section.

Explanation of concepts by Leslie:

- 1) The study of moving play area and restroom to the east side close to parking lot. Safety being a concern, the play area is located about 100 feet from the parking lot. Elements include three play pods, lawn and planting area. All concepts have a 42 stall parking lot. There is a connection across the wetland. Sports court would move for better access to the west end for passive users. Closest house is approx 210 feet with planting buffer between. Playfield is 140 x 250 with 20 trees being removed for sport court. There is a loop to a viewing platform. West side could be nice meadow area or grass area with small picnic shelter. In comment forms people liked life trail system with stations.
- 2-A Sports court would stay in the original location but would be made smaller. It would be longer than a normal basketball court. Hoops and goals can be added. There is a lawn area with plantings, a wetland connection similar to concept A but stretched the shape a little bit. Restroom building is on the south side with two stalls each, men and women. Existing trees are shown in green, x's are trees to be removed. Play area has been shifted. There is a small picnic shelter with two tables and pads for picnic tables. The playfield is 140 x 250 and removes 17 trees. Basically the same in both concepts without life trail or shelter
- 2-B This concept is just a little different in the center. The play area has been moved. There is a bigger picnic shelter than concept A. Concentrated restroom and play area with buffer between it and the and play area. 17 trees removed. Tricycle loop.

Time line: SEPA application will be done soon. The council needs an update on a preferred concept. We will be seeking approval of the design by council at the December 14th study session followed by permitting. Construction could start next summer or fall.

Comments by Park Commission and Staff:

- With regard to moving sports court – too many trees in that area and it would be a mess to clean up. Like it separate from that particular portion of the park, maybe in the upper portion.
- With regard to the children's play area – would rather have them closer to the middle rather than secluded.
- Play pods would take more leveling of ground on east portion.
- In favor of play pods farther on northern portion as in 2-A.
- In all concepts it seems like there's only a 3 or 4 tree difference.
- Talked about 17 trees 4 may not be cut.
- For purposes of planning there will be 17 – should say 15 to 19 to err on the side of caution.
- Like the play area on same spot as previous comment. Same reasons.
- Some councilmembers wanted it put by parking area – Pine Lake Park play area is not by parking area. Wouldn't be a bad thing to have play area across the lawn from parking lot. Gets people out enjoying the passive elements of park.
- Would impact passive users to have play area in that location.
- When talking programming, the middle was occupying all the energy. Try and spread out use.
- Nice when someone uses park when they feel like they get away. Leave your car. Agree that everything clumped together would discourage use of entire park.
- Structures are ugly. Life trail deal – wonderful concept – do we have to have to have big white signs and yellow handrails? Looks like it belongs on an urban street.
- Don't like lifetrail. People use for a while and then that's it.
- Could be a small line.
- Misplaced – this is a passive part of the park. Rather have benches and picnic areas.
- What happened to labeling flora and fauna? West side is more passive – shouldn't be active.
- Want it to be a teaching area.
- Objection to architecture. Takes away from passive
- Want to sit and read a book and watch birds. Careful about overdoing that area.
- Other than that a wonderful plan.
- Need to have benches around children's play area.
- Climbing rock – huge attraction at Pine Lake Park. Kids love it – doesn't take up a lot of space.
- Would like climbing structure by parking lot.
- 3 play pod areas haven't been designed – could climbing wall go there?
- Grade out retaining wall area – seat wall area – could put it there.

- 2-A could have some type of boulder or climbing structure in front – in back eliminate lifetrail element and emphasis on picnic area and benches. Call out native plants with small signs.
- 2-A restroom area has been moved toward front – play area out – retained trees – play lawn got a little bigger with same amount of trees
- Have to be careful of – trails in sensitive areas. Should show trails outside the buffer to comply with existing code. If code is amended could show trails in buffer. Buffer averaging is allowed. Could retain the shape.

The following are comments from the public:

- 2-A: Little kids on north side have long way to go to bathroom
- Reminds me of Mcwhirter Park. Didn't mind going farther away for different favorite elements.
- Never seen anyone use lifetrail
- Need sport court close to road. Will be a hang out.
- No sport court in middle. Heavy equipment would have to cross the wetland. What kind of grass to far west? How would it need to be maintained? Should have natural grass in west section so it wouldn't have to be mowed or irrigated. Picnic shelters? 2-A has two and pads throughout. Lake Sammamish State Park has lots of picnic tables but people use shelters more than the tables.

Formal Recommendation by Parks Commission: 2-A excluding lifetrail and including climbing structure if possible. Motion passes unanimously.

Trails, Bikeways and Paths Plan

The Comprehensive Plan amendments are moving forward. There was a hearing last Thursday. The Planning Commission likes both documents with small policy changes being considered. The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is November 4th. The first reading of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan amendments will be at the November 16th study session and the second reading is in December. The Planning commission was very complimentary of both the TBP Plan and the Parks Comprehensive Plan, however they raised a few comments relating to the policy section on TBP Plan such as addressing support facilities, water fountains, benches, etc. This doesn't change vision but articulates it more clearly. The new policy encourages a public/private process which had been intended but not spelled out. Any location using 'equestrian' should be in trail uses

Trail standards applied to any city trail. Caught oversight – should apply to public trails. Maintenance owned. Final comment condemnation: add trails to list city will not condemn for. Language in comp plan states condemnation being a last resort. It is a last resort for trails.

neighborhood paths – need to use right of way . Regional examples by Otak. Tried to show options within 60 feet of right of way shows idea of softer paths.

Not hard curb, gutter, sidewalk becomes expensive when you consider right of way acquisition. Proposed on couple arterials pathways. Nice feel – like on Island crest way.

Comments from Park Commission regarding TBP Plan:

- Like both of them – like more intimate one. Go forward – stay far away from that look (228th)
- New road by park and ride has curb, gutter, sidewalk (Issaquah-Pine lake road extension)
- Does park comm. Need to recommend to P/W that we do not want curb, gutter and sidewalk?
- Jeff – from safety standpoint. Major arterials mixing heavy vehicle use with pedestrian use having more of a separation. Might be why.
- Has to be another strong recommendation for soft trail instead of curb, gutter and sidewalk. More safety with green buffer or elevated. Must have enough room. Hope will find out why.
- Guess that current council would choose soft trail over curb, gutter and sidewalk.
- Minor tweaks. Improved document.
- Question: is there anything in plan saying anything about architecture used on trails?
- Sensitivity to park environment. Would like a statement that says neighborhood path would be the preferred statement. Is there language that would facilitate path idea – natural materials used so that intent is not implied but clearly stated.
- Projects in the South Pine Lake corridor are being shown with curb, gutter and sidewalk instead of pathways. From now on the Park Commission wants to make sure this park plan is not oblique. If we put specific wording in, it would be beneficial. This could be a critical issue for the look and character of the city.
- Do we need to recommend adding a policy considering pathways on right of way – **it is a recommendation**. When considering pathways on right of way consider the neighborhood path standard first. When planning new pedestrian facilities in right of way consider the neighborhood path standard as preferred approach.

Closed public hearing - meeting on the 4th. Could open public hearing. When it goes to council there will be another public hearing.

Recommendations should be made. Can be lumped together.

Parks Recreation & Open Space Plan

Planning Commission had no recommendations. The document stands with no changes.

Recommendation to Council to accept the Trails, Bikeways and Paths Plan and the Parks, Recreation and Opens Space Plan with addition of extra language about pathways. Passes unanimously.

Sports Field Update

Eastlake High School is transferring their practice field to become a community facility. The past four weeks there have been specific points discussed about the interlocal agreement. The scope of the project will be a multi-use field with lighting and a restroom on the visitor side. The restroom will be a shared cost. We need to get 50 percent approval from adjacent property owners with regard to field lighting. Maintenance and operation costs will be shared 50 percent. We will have maintenance responsibility but school will be reimbursing City 50 percent. We will charge facility fees as council sees fit. This is a 2.5 million investment and there is a question of how to recoup annual costs. We have an approved contract. DA Hogen is the consultant. Neighbors stated that lights at Eastlake are bad. School district is considering upgrading these lights. We are adding new lights but the net effect will be less because the lights will be upgraded. Design is underway. Discussion with neighbors is underway. We would like bid documents ready by spring. Construction may start this summer. The field could be ready for play next fall.

New Business

It was suggested that the Parks Commission schedule a date to visit each park or potential park in the City to become familiar with each location. Have a chance to visit what is being talked about.

What is planned along Lake Sammamish should be complimentary. There is a worry about break down with the two agencies – city and county. In terms of code, access, parkway, planning the envelope through which the trail passes. While the trail is being planned, City should have control where it is the decision maker. All access to the County's properties is City responsibility and is intended for the comfort and convenience of residents. All these are complimentary. Field trip should include trail. January would be good time to look at date for field trip.

Need to be thinking about goals for next year:

- Dog park
- Waterfront park
- North end – Galley property
- Commons
- New chairman

There were questions about the Sammamish Commons project answered as follows:

The project is in the design and permitting process as well as SEPA and CUP process. The project, managed by Sevda Baran in the City Manager's department includes a civic plaza, skate park, trail, play area, play field and garden. The two houses on the property had been slated for demolition but are being kept, with the question of how they will be programmed to be answered at a later date. It has not been determined how parking and access will be addressed on the NE 4th side. How does that side of the park function? Freed House may move to site. Sevda will be invited to the November meeting to address these questions. Depending on the SEPA and CUP process, the project should be ready for bid by next spring with ground breaking next summer.

The transfer or partial transfer of Section 36 from King County to Sammamish is still being discussed.

The Interlocal agreement has been signed by the Issaquah School District and City. City is considering an interlocal agreement with the Lake Washington School District.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40