



SIMONE COLLINS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
119 EAST LAFAYETTE STREET NORRISTOWN, PA 19401
PHONE: 610.239.7601 FAX: 610.239.7606
W W W . S I M O N E C O L L I N S . C O M

MEETING NOTES

Project:	Woodlawn Park Master Plan	Project No.:	21073.10
Location:	Upper Moreland Township Building	Meeting Date/Time:	November 30, 2022 7 – 8:30 PM
Re:	Committee Meeting #6	Issue Date:	December 2, 2022

ATTENDEES:

Anthony Benvenutti	Pat Stasio
Michale Chauveau	Katie Kollar
Jeff Herb	Jen Hartigan
Annmarie Mangin	Matt Candland
Mary Meister	Anthony Prousi
Phil Strybuc	Peter Simone, Simone Collins (SC)
Dean Swedberg	Sarah Leeper, SC
Barbara Tuck	

NOTES:

1. Pat Stasio gave a brief introduction about where we are in the process and that committee comments are still needed to finalize the plan.
2. Pete Simone noted that the master plan report was still in process. It will be forwarded to the committee members and the Board of Commissioners for review and comment in December. The final public meeting will be on Monday, February 6 at the Board of Commissioners meeting.
3. Sarah Leeper reviewed the draft plan area by area and there was discussion about each area of the proposed park improvements.
4. Division Avenue – proposed parking and pedestrian crossings

- a) Pat commented that community opinions about no parking in the park to some parking in the park have changed – to accept some parking in the park.
- b) Some community members like Division St. approach, some do not.
- c) Comment that proposed parking will be much better than current condition, more efficient.
- d) Comment about lots of cut-through traffic on Division at AM and PM rush hours.
- e) Comment that this approach will slow traffic. Also, some parking in park is good too.
- f) Comment - likes this approach – suggest showing photo speed table in report so as not to be confused by speed bump.
- g) Pat asked the question if a rapid flashing beacon for pedestrian crossings is needed? It could be added later if deemed necessary. Comment that this device is typically seen on busier roads. Lower Plateau – includes neighborhood recreation building, playground, lawn area, parking.
 - a) It was noted that the building plan is really a diagram of spaces and uses to show what can be accommodated in a 15,000 SF building.
 - b) It was noted that there have been some negative comments about building on social media.
 - c) Can we soften the proposed parking lot? Pete noted that to divide the parking into smaller lot areas might be counter productive. Perhaps porous asphalt is appropriate, although the use of it depends on soil test and the stormwater management plan to be done during engineering. Grass pavers are not appropriate in this situation.
 - d) How far is parking lot from Woodlawn Avenue? About 100 feet.
 - e) Where is flag located? It is at the USGS marker plaza.
 - f) Question – Isn't the existing site 4 different levels? It is but the first “level area” near Woodlawn Ave is rather small.
 - g) What about storm water management? Won't all the water go towards Woodlawn and drain into houses? Sarah and Pete – noted all stormwater would have to be accounted for in the park design. They reviewed the overall SWM approach, noting that it is schematic in concept and would need to be based on soil testing during design and engineering. The cost for SWM is included in the cost estimate. Final designs can be determined only after soil testing and engineering.
 - h) Question asked about why an ADA walkway is needed from Woodlawn and Silver. Sarah explained that it is not a “ramp” but proposed walkway gradients are within ADA requirements.
 - i) Pat mentioned that some comments are concerned with proposed stairs at Woodlawn and Division. Some have suggested that these are dangerous (i.e. skateboarders going down stairs into street. Should we take out steps?

Sarah made a case for keeping stairway – more accessible than the steep sidewalk from the corner up Division. She noted that the steps and the plaza at the bottom helps create a “Place” (i.e. placemaking). Some agreed. Perhaps examine taking steps / walkway not straight up hill (on diagonal) but more gently up hill to second plateau so that route is not as direct. SC to examine.

- j) Is there a concern with kids “falling off or out of playground” down the slope? Pete and Sarah responded not really, but there could be a fence on low side of playground area. Pete noted that kids will roll down any grassy hill. Great play activity.
- k) Keep green buffer along Woodland Ave – put a winding “arboretum” walk through the buffer is good idea.
- l) Frequent restroom access for the park is important (Pileggi Park locked bathrooms was mentioned as a bad example of available restrooms). Electronic locking system could be explored to make sure restrooms are open when needed. Middle Plateau
 - a) Pat mentioned the idea to make the entire park “flat”. Not practical or economically feasible to create a flat park.
 - b) Sarah mentioned that basketball court area will include lighting.

7. Upper Plateau

- a) Pat- are we still including an artificial turf surface for infield as an alternate? Yes, we are also including irrigation for the field. Why no lights on this field? – No sports league request for lighting.
- b) Pete noted that the USGS plaza will have benches. This plaza is visible from Division Street. Good safe place for teens to hang out.
- c) It was noted that there are not places to “hide” in the park – this is a good thing.
- d) Pat noted that he has received comments that many residents like the concept of low level (bollard) lighting along paths.
- e) The proposed buffers behind residential properties can vary in opacity. Future conversations with adjoining residents on the preferred buffer density.
- f) USGS Plaza – perhaps note Frasier Hill history at this location.
- g) Access path to park from Forest Street – very narrow, add new, high-quality fence (not chain link). There is a shared width of asphalt paving. Perhaps include unit pavers with concrete to create a higher quality walkway, so it “reads” as public space. Make pathway special.
- h) It was noted that there will be cameras in park (and included in plan cost estimates)
- i) Pat noted that the Township needs to make up for loss of 90’ field. Woodlawn park costs include costs to create an artificial turf field at Masons Mill Park

(\$500k). Pat noted that the School District 90-foot field – is in disrepair – Township could partner with SD to renovate this field.

8. General Comments

- a) From what budget was park purchased? General funds, and \$200K grant from DCNR.
- b) What happens when building is constructed as phase 2? Will construction destroy some phase 1 improvements? No, the phase 1 improvements will include most of park. Area for proposed neighborhood recreation building will be graded level. “Temporary” restroom / pavilion can be built where future building will go. Open play field will be built where future parking is located. Alternatively, the neighborhood recreation building could be built in phases.
- c) Pat concluded the meeting by thanking the committee for all of their work over the last several months. He asked that committee members continue to share information about the plan with the community. Pat noted that what is proposed is similar to what was there – Plus many new park and landscape improvements. Pat noted that while Woodlawn is a neighborhood park, it is large, so it has a community impact. The plan will be presented to the Board of Commissioners at their Monday, Feb 6th meeting.
- d) Commissioner Anthony Prousi echoed Pat’s thanks to the committee and noted that this park plan has something for everyone.

This report represents the Professional’s summation of the proceedings and is not a transcript. Unless written notice of any correction or clarification is received by the Professional within ten days of issue, the report shall be considered factually correct and shall become part of the official project record.

Sincerely,
SIMONE COLLINS, INC.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Peter Simone, RLA, FASLA
President