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Purpose of Meeting

To Provide an opportunity for public input on the future improvements planned for the George Christopher Playground Project

(Please direct maintenance questions to Steven Cismowski at 415-831-6358 or steven.cismowski@sfgov.org. Thank you)
Ground Rules

• Keep to the agenda
• Turn off cell phones
• No disruptions
• Please hold all questions to the end of the presentation
• Raise your hand to speak
• Direct comments to the facilitator

Working together will make this a productive meeting
Project Team

Matt Jasmin, Project Manager – RPD
Steven Cismowski, Area Manager – RPD

Jasmine Kaw, Landscape Architect – SFPW
Brandon Johnson, Landscape Arch. Assistant – SFPW

Will Kwan, Architect, SFPW
1: Project Background
Lots and Property Boundaries
$2.8 Million
2012 “Clean and Safe” Park Bond
- Project Budget: $2,800,000
- Construction: $1,800,000 (64%)
- Contingency: $165,000 (6%)
- Soft Cost: $835,000 (30%)
  ~ Architecture & Engineering Services
  ~ Project Management
  ~ Construction Management
  ~ Permits, surveys, miscellaneous fees
Project Schedule

2015

2016

2017

2018

SNRAC | George Christopher Playground
Community Meeting (1) | September 24, 2015

RPD | Building Design & Construction
Project Scope

• Replace play structures & surfacing

• Renovate (1) clubhouse restroom interior for accessibility compliance

• Landscape and Irrigation System:
  – Tree management
  – Renovate landscaping and irrigation in select areas adjacent to the playground
  – Existing pathways adjacent the playground area will be repaved to provide accessible circulation
  – Evaluate and improve drainage conditions

• Replace or renovate existing site furnishings, including:
  – Benches, picnic tables and signs
## Community Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting #</th>
<th>Intent</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (1)</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; Public Input</td>
<td>September 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (2)</td>
<td>Draft Plan and Public Input</td>
<td>TBD - October - November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (3)</td>
<td>Final Conceptual Plan</td>
<td>TBD - December - January 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment to Date

- **Meetings with Rec & Park Operations, Property Management and Permit Staff**
  - Recreational recommendations
  - Operational concerns
  - Maintenance Issues

- **Surveys**
  - Code for America, online & phone Survey
  - Community comments received to date
  - Yelp reviews
  - Technical Surveys (Tree Assessment, Infrastructure Assessment, and Site Survey)
2: Site Analysis
Site Context

Diamond Heights
Glen Canyon Park

George Christopher
Playground

Glen Canyon
Park

Glen Canyon
Playground
Open Space and Playgrounds Nearby
Land Use & Circulation
Site Photos
Project Scope
Unisex Restroom Renovation Scope

Renovation of existing unisex restroom to be accessible from the playground

Interior of existing unisex restroom to be fully renovated for accessibility compliance with new fixtures and finishes. Fixtures will be sized per “adult” standards. Exterior door will be locked from inside by user.

The Noe Valley Nursery School restroom will have interior entry only from the clubhouse. No additional upgrade work planned for this restroom at this time.
Unisex Restroom Renovation Scope
Playground Renovation Scope

- Paved Outdoor Space
- School Age Play
- Tot Play & Infant Play
Playground Scale

George Christopher Playground vs. Koret Playground (Golden Gate Park)

7,000 SF vs 44,000 SF
You can fit 6 George Christopher Playgrounds in Koret Park

George Christopher Playground vs. Walter Haas Playground

7,000 SF vs 8,800 SF

George Christopher Playground vs. Glen Canyon Playground

7,000 SF vs 6,000 SF
Existing Playground Analysis

Paved Outdoor Space:

- Large Outdoor Paved Area
- Amphitheater Seating
- Colorful Concrete
- Access to Infant Play Area & Club House

Infant Play:

- Access to the Toddler Play Area
- Low Platforms/Decks
- Metal Interactive Structure
- Logs to Climb on
- Seating
## Existing Playground Analysis

### Pre-school Age Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucket Swings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4’-10” &amp; 6’-10”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freestanding Sculptures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Ladder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman’s Pole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing Beam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1’-6” to 6’-10”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Playground Analysis**

### School Age Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8’-0” and 10’-6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arched Monkey Bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decks</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5’-6” to 10’-6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman’s Pole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt Swings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we’ve heard so far about the existing playground:

- Love it! Love the playground as is.
- Like the risk of “castle playground” and “old fashioned equipment”
- Physically challenging and exciting.
- Only playground in the neighborhood suitable for older age kids (7-12)
- Like the perimeter walk and surrounding paths.
- Needs a few updates.

Existing Features We Like:
- Big Slides
- Big Swings
- Monkey Bars
- Balancing Beam
- Climbing Ladders
- Fire Pole
- Saucer
What we’ve heard so far about the existing playground:

Existing Features We Like to Improve:
• Metal slides and metal features can get too hot
• Sand – gets too hot and super dirty.
• We need more shade or shade structures

Conflicting Items:
• Playground Surfacing: Sand vs. Safety Surface
• Mixed Age vs. Separate Age
• Dogs – “do not fence off a dog area” vs. Dedicated Dog area
• Safer Play Equipment vs. Current “Risky” Play Equipment
• Monkey Bars vs. “Safer or no Monkey Bars”
What we’ve heard so far about the existing playground:

Wish List for Future Improvement:

• Challenging playground with risk element for ages 7 and up
• Climbing Wall; Spinning Element; Cement Slide
• Nature Based Theme / “Natural” play structures / “Walk in the Tree Trunks”
• Water Feature
• Specific defined areas for specific age groups
• More sitting/tables in shade
• Trash cans
• Soft surface for the playground
• More colors / colorful and whimsical animals
• Add a “No Smoking” sign
• “Artistic climbing structures” like Patricia’s Green
• “Fire truck at Balboa Park”
• Bocce courts
• More greenery
• No Dog Access
Opportunities & Constraints

- Playground
- Pave Outdoor Space
- Restroom
- Microclimate
Opportunities & Constraints

Opportunities:
• Sunny Orientation
• Large, Open Space
• Existing Play Structures have desirable features, especially swings, slides and challenging climbing elements.
• Site location is neighborhood based; mainly attracts neighborhood residents.
• The site has a usable restroom.
• Adjacent and open to nearby shopping
• Adjacent and connected to Glen Canyon Park

Constraints:
• Too much sun exposure in the summer
• Windy in the afternoon
• Existing Play structures are outdated and do not meet current code and safety requirements
• Site location is too tucked away; hard to know that there is a playground.
• Existing restroom is old, not accessible and hard to get to from the playground.
• Existing sand surfacing is problematic; can get too hot, has issues with sanitation and maintenance.
• Openness and transparent nature of the existing playground is hard to contain small children and keep dogs out.
Accessibility/Circulation
Wind Assessment

8AM - Low Winds (+/-5mph)

12PM - Medium Winds (+/-5 to 10mph)

4PM - High Winds (+10mph)

Wind Speed Sample Date: Sunday, August 9, 2015
Tree Management

Tree Conditions

- **Fair Condition** (Moderate to High Preservation Suitability)
- **Poor Condition**
- **Low Preservation Suitability**
Utilities

Utility Legend
- Storm Drain
- Manhole
- Light Pole
- Sewer Line
- Solid Drain Line
- Swale or Trench Drain
- Perforated Pipe
3: Design Vision
Design Vision

- Site Analysis
- RPD Program Requirements
- RPD Maintenance and Operation Requirements
- Safety Standards and Code Requirement
- Aesthetic
- Community Input: Play Vision
- Budget
Design Vision: RPD Program / Maintenance Operation Requirements

✓ Playground for Age 2-5 and 5-12

✓ Unisex restroom accessible to the playground

✓ Areas to sit; picnic tables

✓ Space that meets RPD’s maintenance needs
Design Vision: Safety Standards and Code Requirements

✓ Renovated Project Must Meet American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standards for Playgrounds

✓ Renovated project must meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

✓ Renovated project must be reviewed and approved by SF Department of Building Inspections (DBI)
Play Structures & Fall Zones
Playground Surfacing

Safety Surface

Synthetic Turf
4: Public Comment & Visual Survey
Public Comments

• What are your priorities for the playground?
• What do you like about the playground?
• How can George Christopher Playground be a better place?
• Playground deficiencies
• Recreational Activities
• Use Patterns
• Other Considerations
Design Vision: Visual Survey
5: Next Steps
5: Next Steps

Generate Project Program

Develop Design Concepts

Present Program and Concepts for Comment. . .
narrow to a preferred option

Next Community Meeting: October/November (tentative)
Contact Information

Matt Jasmin, Project Manager

Recreation and Part Department
30 Van Ness Ave., 3\textsuperscript{rd} Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 581-2552
E-Mail: Matt.Jasmin@sfgov.org
Website: www.sf.parks.sfgov.org
Thank You

Please Take The Visual Survey Before You Leave!