Summary of Results

August 11 – August 21, 2020

Total No. of Responses: 211

Question 1: ADA-Accessible Pathway Design Options

Incorporating accessible pathways was identified as a high priority by park users. Respondents commented on the difficulty to get around in a wheelchair, concerns regarding the rough terrain, and the challenges for accessing the playground with a stroller. Two options have been identified. Option A involves creating an ADA-accessible pathway that connects the upper parking lot to all park amenities, including the play area, future seating around the amphitheater, and the picnic shelter. This option will be several times costlier and require the use of large retaining walls in the lower section to ensure sustainability. In Option B, the ADA pathway from the upper parking lot would provide access down to the playground and possibly the upper level of planned seating around the amphitheater. The picnic area and lower seating around the amphitheater would be accessible via the existing lower parking lot entrance. Which option do you prefer?
1. ADA-accessible Pathway Design Options: Which do you prefer?

![Bar chart showing preferences between Option A, Option B, Whichever is most cost-effective, and Other (please specify).]

Other:
- Let’s spend our taxes on preventing residents from becoming homeless during this pandemic. This is not a priority clearly a lot has changed since 2012-2013.
- Whichever maintains the trees.
- If Option B provides ADA access to the playground, why can’t it be extended to loop around the playground and link to the pavilion from the other direction? A retaining wall would still be required, but there is already one in place so this would just be an improvement of existing infrastructure without the massive overhaul described above.
- Dog park!
- Stroller access all the way to the playground. No stairs. I guess I prefer option B, but can’t really tell from info provided.
- We are in an economic downturn - now is not the time to spend a bunch of money on a park that has not been assessable for months. Wait on this.
- Disc golf course or dog park.
- No ADA pathway
- Ask those who have disabilities. As an able-bodied person, I do not feel qualified to offer an opinion.
- Put the excess money into the playground or back to taxpayers, please.
- If Option B would allow access to everything and save significant money, then Option B. If Option B would leave any part of the park inaccessible, then Option A. If Option A, despite being several times more expensive than Option B, would still be a small percentage of the overall costs, then Option A. In other words, I prefer Option A but I’d be fine with compromising if Option B still gave equitable access and saved a ton of money.
- Whatever plan maintains the trees.
- Combine A & B
- I prefer Option A but would like to be sure that the retaining walls will be safe - not something someone could climb or fall over. If safety is of concern Option B is preferred.
Question 2: ADA-Accessible Pathway Entrances

What entry point(s) would be most convenient for accessing a future accessible trail from the upper parking lot? Consider where you enter on a regular park visit as well as where you enter on Cheverly Day or during other days where there’s lots of activity. Select up to two preferred entrances to the future ADA pathway from the upper parking lot.

2. ADA-Accessible Pathway Entrance Preferences

- Option #1 – south end of the upper parking lot
- Option #2 – north end of the upper parking lot
- Option #3 – along the roadway where there is an existing concrete apron
- Other (please specify)

Other:
- An entry could also be an exit. Perhaps have main entry Opt #1 but 2nd access point at the road? Assuming town would allow parking along the road?
- Whatever is cost-effective and preserves as much parking as possible.
- See my previous answer - this is not a critical to Cheverly residents at this time.
- Whichever maintains the trees.
- We are in an economic downturn - now is not the time to spend a bunch of money on a park that has not been assessable for months. Wait on this.
- See comment for #1.
- Hi. I’m new here. I don’t know the park well enough to tell.
- I don’t need a wheelchair or a stroller, so I think others should decide.
- Whatever plan maintains the trees.
- No Preference
- Most cost-effective options.
Question 3: Playground Equipment Themes

The Playground/Play Equipment was identified as a high priority by park users. The concept design calls for a permeable playground surface to provide temporary storage and infiltration of runoff underneath. The Town would like your input on future play area designs, be it a more traditional playground, a nature play, or discovery play design. Please select the image that best exemplifies your preferred theme. There will be future opportunities to talk about specific playground equipment design, maintenance, and accessibility.

3. Which Playground/Play Equipment Theme Do You Prefer?
Question 4: Cookhouse/Concession Stand Options

The conceptual design calls for the existing Cookhouse/Concession Stand that is directly below the multi-use court to be removed. Removing it will reduce the need for vehicles to enter the park and increase opportunities for improved stormwater management and an expanded playground area. The options are to relocate the cookhouse or remove it altogether. Please review the map and specify your preference. Note: Relocation of the Cookhouse/Concession stand is contingent upon the feasibility of constructing water and sewer service as well as review by the Fire Marshall and the County Department of Inspections and Enforcement to ensure that all building codes and access requirements are met.

4. Cookhouse/Concession Stand Relocation Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option #1 – near the pavilion</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option #2 – near the upper parking lot</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither – a cookhouse is not necessary</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither, but would like to consider adding a concession stand near the ballparks</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5: Open-Ended Responses/Thoughts/Comments

- "For the ADA pathway I prefer option 3. However, is there also a way to connect to it via south end of parking lot?
- Also, some sort of pathway, possibly with steps, with minimal impact should connect the Picnic Shelter and the playground (or people will create their own route causing erosion. I prefer this to be done with a minimum of retaining walls and I understand this one section of path would not meet ADA standards.
- And how is the drainage ditch along the south side of the property being redesigned as a functionally better and more visually appealing stormwater management feature?
- Please add in the existing 2nd "Scout Trailhead" near the picnic table shelter. This improvement made trail access easier and more popular.
- "I would really like to preserve the tall straight slide. There are few like it anymore, and it brings immense enjoyment to the children. It also helps them first test their limits and develop courage.
- A cook house option anywhere on the property is probably fine. It seems like if the facility were more serviceable it would get more (any?) use."
- "Regarding the existing Cookhouse/Concession Stand. I urge consideration of relocating it to an area that provides customers/users a place to sit. Currently, the area around the existing Cookhouse/Concession Stand has benches, picnic benches and the large Sheltered Picnic area. Relocating it in either Option 1 or 2 does not include information about sitting area for customers/users of the Cookhouse/Concession Stand. Will the Ex. Pavillion have sitting area including disability accessible seating area?"
- Regarding the playground options. I understand Natural and Discovery playgrounds can offer additional benefits than a traditional playground, but they require greater maintenance and there are traditional playgrounds around town now that are not being maintained. Would it be possible to include discussion about the maintenance aspect of each of the three options? Thanks."
- Think about a play area that can accommodate a wider age range of children. Please take a look at Rocky Run Park in Arlington, VA. W may not have as much space but the options for play are great.
- The pathway and any other structural features should be placed such that they are away from tree roots and root spread; no trees should be removed in the process and no mulch placed around the base of the existing trees. A paved pathway, if impermeable, will lead to erosion adjacent to the path and the weight of the path will press down upon the extended root apron of any tree nearby. Additional locally native shrubs should be added to the site to enhance the area and give ADA users a more fulfilling experience.
- No additional comments
- "For option 2, I would like for the committee to consider a hybrid play area. I would like to consider having a horseshoe pit."
• Thank you inquiring- will need community engagement before moving forward. Our Town funds should not be used for this - PLACE ON HOLD and revisit later.
• I think the survey would have been easier to understand from a user perspective if all the maps had been reoriented 180 degrees, matching the approach to the park areas from the roadway, which is the most common approach.
• I think the survey would have been easier to understand from a user perspective if all the maps had been reoriented 180 degrees, matching the approach to the park areas from the roadway, which is the most common approach.
• Please consider small group seating/benches throughout the meandering path area. Additionally, access to the PW bathrooms via a trail along the backside of the play area/pavilion will keep children from having to cross the parking lot and improve the overall safety of the park.
• The playground near the national cathedral is an excellent example of nature playground. Using the elevations changes at the area in a similar fashion would be great.
• The existing running track is frequently used. Please add a track to the new park. Thank you.
• Don’t spent tax money right now - wait.
• over the past 20-30 years the space from the upper lot to lower lot has steadily decreased in tree canopy and become more ""turf"" (grass); the natural appearance and biodiversity has decreased; the original discussion about a ""trail"" from upper area to lower was for the purpose of ecological restoration; if ada pathway is built, please do incorporate ecological restoration 
• All great ideas! Here are my reasons for my choices:
  • ADA pathway to playground would be better since there is no existing pathway there (and there already is for the pavilion,) and since the playground is public but the pavilion can be rented.
  • I think the existing apron is a good place for the entryway to route foot traffic away from the market area and the ADA community center door, and/or so parking doesn't get clogged on the pavilion end of the upper lot.
  • would love to see a Nature playground because kids love the equipment, but we have traditional playgrounds around already.
  • I feel most strongly that the cookhouse be moved to the pavilion area. It would be a perfect place for events for all types of groups. It doesn't make much sense to move it to the center of the parking lot, in my opinion.
Thank you for this survey!!
• Dog park, frisbee golf course please
• A water feature for kids to play and cool off would be a great investment to the playground area (whether a misting feature or spray park style). Many families are not Cheverly Pool Members because of the expensive cost and waiting times. This would be an inclusive addition to our community.
• We should still consider a concession stand near the ballpark.
Question 5: Open-Ended Responses (continued)

• I would love it if it would be possible to combine the nature playground with the discovery garden theme.
• I think the questions about ADA pathways and access should be answered by people who NEED ADA access. They would know better what would and would not work for them. I suggest you identify such persons and conduct a focus group with them before proceeding.
• Move forward with the dog park. This is an amenity that goes beyond just families with children. The town SF it’s a great job of connecting families, but less so in connecting those of us without school aged kids. A dog park is a great way to partially fill that gap.
• Moving forward with the dog park would be welcome.
• Thank you for creating this survey and taking time to receive community feedback.
• I’d love to know the timeline for this project and how long the current playground would be out of use before the new playground is built. I’d prefer to have the existing playground stay there if construction will take a long time because my kids currently play there so I would lose a much-needed recreational tool during construction.
• Is this really the best use of money right now? I am concerned that we may have more pressing needs coming soon.
• Toddler to 10-year-old mini sports courts with mini size tennis nets, mini goals, mini soccer goals
• I think a fountain that children can touch would be really neat. There’s one at the park in Brentwood that is very popular with children.
• Separate play structures for small vs big kids would be much appreciated.
• ADA accessibility should be as complete as possible. In fact, to have it debated among options — less accessible or more accessible — is insulting to people with disabilities; another reminder that our participation in community is conditional on the desires or lack thereof of the temporarily able-bodied. It should be as accessible as we can possibly make it — no ifs, ands or buts. Otherwise, very excited by the different plans!
• The relocation options given for the cookhouse seem odd and poorly located. I would prefer to see a cookhouse down by the picnic shelter, closer to the ball fields. You need the seating to eat close to the cooking area, and near enough to the stands if a team wants to run a concession
• Thanks so much for working on these much-needed changes! We really appreciate the shade the Town Park playground offers but find it so difficult to access with a stroller that sometimes it deters us from going at all. We definitely could use new and expanded playground equipment! I am happy with the traditional playground or nature playground as long as there is plenty for the kids to do. Thanks!
• Whatever plan maintains the trees.
• None
• A fully ADA accessible playground would be ideal (meaning that kids of all abilities are able to play on different features-wide entries etc.
• It’s incumbent upon those planning and executing this project to use existing revenue and complete this project in the most cost-effective manner as possible, or to not do the project.
Question 5: Open-Ended Responses (continued)

- I’d like to know more about the intended use of the concession stand. If it would be used once a year only, it’s probably not worth the expense.
- As far as the playground spaces, I think the natural playground would be super cool but would like to know more about how maintenance intensive it would be."
- We need a Bocce court incorporated into a flat open space for people to gather & play
- "The concession stand near the ball fields would be great. Either.
- I don't really understand the difference between the two options for the ADA path. One costs more, but I don't know what we get for that or what the cost difference is. Hard to vote on the ADA options.
- It would be beneficial to disclose how often the existing cookhouse is used and if there are any benefits to having a concession near the ballparks, more utilization? Revenue from selling snacks during games?
- Also, shade is a key draw to town park. Any design that improves or maintains the existing tree cover would be well received.
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