

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
1	Cohen	Are there design alternatives that would substantially achieve the City’s inclusivity goals, but would preserve more of the forested natural character of the park?	<p>Following the evaluation of multiple design concepts and community input, a preferred site plan was identified and advanced for further refinement. Once the preferred concept was established, additional design alternatives were not pursued as part of the site plan development process.</p> <p>The selected site plan reflects a balance between achieving the City’s inclusivity and accessibility goals while responding to site constraints and community feedback gathered during the earlier concept development phase.</p>
2	Cohen	Are there design alternatives that would substantially achieve the City’s inclusivity goals, but would increase the likelihood that children in older age groups would remain interested in using the park over time?	<p>The Site Plan reflects the preferred concept that emerged from the community engagement and concept development phases of the project. After the preferred concept was identified, the design process focused on refining that concept rather than developing additional design alternatives.</p> <p>The selected Site Plan was designed to support a range of play experiences for different ages and abilities while advancing the City’s inclusivity and accessibility goals and incorporating feedback gathered during earlier phases of the project.</p>
3	Marxen	Please confirm the specific documents that are considered the site plan. The report? The “overall site plan” drawing, the presentation, etc.?	<p>The “Site Plan” refers specifically to the Overall Site Plan drawing, which is included as Exhibit 2 of the March 5, 2026 agenda item and was approved by the Parks &amp; Recreation Commission on February 5, 2026. The Overall Site Plan also includes the play equipment layout, shown on the second page of the PDF.</p> <p>The accompanying report and presentation materials were provided for reference and context; however, they are not themselves the adopted Site Plan.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
4	Marxen	During community data collection what materials were shared? Have the community seen the same presentation that was shared with the PRC on March 5 <sup>th</sup> ? If not I would like for the community to have an opportunity to see the more detailed concept plans and provide input.	<p>Extensive community outreach took place between April and August during the initial input and design concept development phases. During that time, staff shared project information through the project <a href="#">Let's Talk page</a>, community engagement materials, and public meetings. A summary of the community engagement process and the materials shared was presented to the Parks &amp; Recreation Commission on <a href="#">November 6</a>.</p> <p>Refinements to the concept plan were subsequently shared publicly through updates on the Let's Talk page and at Parks &amp; Recreation Commission meetings on <a href="#">September 4</a> and <a href="#">November 6</a>, as well as at the Arts Council meeting on <a href="#">October 15</a>, prior to the Commission's Site Plan approval on <a href="#">February 5</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">February 5</a> PRC presentation included additional detail and refinement of the concept plan based on Commission feedback from <a href="#">November 6</a>. These materials are available on the <a href="#">Let's Talk page</a>.</p>
5	Marxen	Can you please point me towards the development/land use policy that applies to Deanne's Children's Park?	<p>Island Crest Park- Including Deane's Children's Park are zoned- Parks.</p> <p>The Parks Zone was established under <a href="#">ORDINANCE NO. 25C-16</a> and became effective on December 31, 2025. This ordinance includes development and land use regulations for properties zoned as Parks.</p>
<b>Suggested Edits</b>			

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
1.	Cohen	<p><b>Add</b> [possibly on page 3, before Conclusion] to describe more fully the background of arriving at the recommendation:</p> <p>"The Commission approved recommending the proposed design to the City Council for adoption by a vote of 4 in favor and 2 opposed. A minority of the Commissioners expressed concerns about whether the proposed design sufficiently preserves the forested natural character of the park and whether it includes play structures and equipment that would be expected to keep children in older age groups interested over time, while still substantially achieving the City's inclusivity goals. Regardless of the "split" vote, the Commission felt these considerations should be among those referenced in this memo."</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend adding this language to the memo.</p> <p>The purpose of the hand-off memo is to summarize the Commission's formal action and convey its recommendation to the City Council, along with key considerations identified by the Commission for Council's awareness.</p> <p>The official meeting minutes and the meeting video provide the full and accurate record of the Commission's vote and the discussion that occurred during the meeting, including the range of perspectives expressed by Commissioners.</p>
2	Brettmann	<p><b>Edit for Paragraph 1: amend to add</b> "with 4 in favor and 2 opposed" to read "At its February 5, 2026, meeting, the Commission voted, with 4 in favor and 2 opposed, to recommend the Plan. . ."</p>	<p>See previous response.</p>
3	Brettmann	<p><b>Edit for page 2, under the heading Site Plan Recommendations, edit sentence 3 to replace:</b> "remains" with "is."</p>	<p>Staff have no concerns with this revision.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
4	Brettmann	<p><b>Edit for page two, 1a.:</b> Ensure all park areas are accessible and welcoming to people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p><b>Proposed language:</b> Increase the accessibility to playground equipment in order to become more welcoming to people of all ages and abilities, while also differentiating for children with slower movement and reaction times, sensory processing differences, and other accessibility needs or safety considerations.</p>	<p>Staff recommend retaining the original language, which broadly captures accessibility for all park areas.</p> <p>Staff acknowledge the intent of the commissioner’s proposal to make playground equipment more inclusive for children with diverse abilities. The Site Plan already incorporates accessible, developmentally appropriate equipment for a range of ages and abilities, including features that support varied movement, sensory, and coordination needs.</p>

5	Brettmann	<p><b>Edit for page two, under 1. Accessibility and Inclusivity:</b></p> <p><b>Add:</b> "d. Increase the percentage of age-focused playground equipment for 5 to 12 year olds to at least 40% in order to continue to be a park where both young and older children feel welcome and engaged."</p>	<p><b>Staff Language Recommendation:</b></p> <p>b. Incorporate play equipment that supports both early childhood development (ages 2–5) and increasing levels of physical challenge, height, coordination, and social interaction for children ages 5–12+, thoughtfully organized to encourage movement-oriented and imaginative play (such as circuit play) and long-term engagement as children grow.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Staff are supportive of revising item <b>b</b> to more explicitly reference intentional challenge and complexity for children ages 5–12+. This approach reinforces the design intent to support older children without introducing a prescriptive metric that could conflict with the broader inclusive play strategy.</p> <p>The play areas are intentionally organized to support age progression, with equipment selections that expand in challenge and complexity as users grow. The Critter Corner and Discovery Path areas focus on low-lying, developmentally appropriate equipment designed to support early strength, balance, and coordination. Moving into the Central Play Zone, the equipment remains accessible and approachable for ages 2–5 (balancing, sliding, spinning, rocking, climbing, sensory, and social elements), while also providing increased height, complexity, and graduated challenge for ages 5–12+. Importantly, equipment labeled strictly “5–12” does not fully capture the usable play value for elementary-aged children. Many 2–12 and 2–12+ components are intentionally designed to support overlapping age use and sibling play. This blended approach reflects feedback received during community engagement, which consistently supported multi-generational, integrated play opportunities rather than rigid separation by age.</p>
---	-----------	--	---

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
6	Brettmann	<p><b>Edit for page two, 3a.:</b> The Commission requests the opportunity to review and provide input on each phase of improvements at the 30% design stage to confirm alignment with the adopted Site Plan and established community priorities.</p> <p><b>Proposed language:</b> Remove "with the adopted Site Plan and" to read "The Commission requests the opportunity to review and provide input on each phase of improvements at the 30% design stage to confirm alignment with established community priorities."</p>	<p>Staff recommend retaining the original language.</p> <p>The Site Plan will be formally adopted by City Council and will serve as the governing framework for future phased improvements. Referencing "the adopted Site Plan" clarifies that 30% design review will confirm alignment not only with established community priorities, but also with the Council-adopted plan that provides formal policy direction. Removing this reference could create ambiguity regarding the Site Plan's role in guiding subsequent design phases.</p>
7	Westberg	<p><b>The only suggestion I have is to:</b></p> <p><b>Add:</b> a bullet under <u>Design Review and Phasing</u> that reaffirms the opportunity for continued community engagement and review during the 30% design stage.</p>	<p><b>Staff Language Recommendation:</b></p> <p>d. The Commission requests that City Council consider including community engagement at the 30% design stage, such as an online survey or other feedback opportunities, to allow community members to provide input prior to final design decisions.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Staff have no concerns with adding language to include the opportunity for continued community engagement during the 30% design stage. However, the level and format of community engagement is ultimately determined by City Council. Depending on Council direction, engagement at the 30% design stage could include an online survey and/or other public feedback opportunities prior to final design decisions. Additional community engagement would require consultant support and may result in additional consultant fees for each phase of development.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
8	Struck	<p><b>On p.3, Site Plan Recommendation, #3 - Design Review:</b></p> <p><b>[Add]:</b> “The Commission requests the opportunity to review and provide input <i>to the Council ....</i>”</p> <p>* This makes it explicit to whom we need to address our input to in the future.</p>	<p>Staff have no concerns with this revision.</p> <p>The level and frequency of PRC input is ultimately determined by City Council. Council will decide whether and how the PRC provides input at various stages of design. Reviews could require additional consultant support, which may result in added fees for review.</p>
9	Marxen	<p><b>Current:</b> a. Ensure all park areas are accessible and welcoming to people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Strive to provide accessibility to the primary play areas of the park while ensuring the forested nature of the park is not degraded.</p>	<p><b>Language Recommendation:</b></p> <p>a. Ensure the park is accessible and welcoming to people of all ages and abilities. Provide accessible connections to all formal play zones and key amenities to meet project accessibility goals, while preserving the forested character of the park.</p> <p>Staff believe the Site Plan balances accessibility with forest preservation by providing accessible routes to all formal play areas and key amenities.</p>
10	Marxen	<p><b>Current:</b> b. Incorporate play equipment that serves a wide range of age groups, thoughtfully organized to encourage movement-oriented and imaginative play (such as circuit play) supporting durability of interest and longevity of use.</p> <p><b>Proposed</b> – remove...from this section. Not relevant to accessible and inclusivity.</p>	<p>Staff do not recommend this proposal.</p> <p>This consideration is relevant to inclusive and accessible play.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
11	Marxen	<p><b>Current:</b> Limit the expansion of impervious surfaces where feasible to protect natural drainage patterns and ecological function.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> Limit the expansion of impervious surfaces within the park to protect the natural character of this unique forested playground, natural drainage patterns and ecological function. Utilize future Island Crest road/sidewalk development to improve accessibility between Island Park and Island Crest Park rather than addition of a paved concrete pathway through Deane’s Park between Island Crest Park and Island Park elementary.</p>	<p>Staff do not recommend this proposal.</p> <p>Staff do not oppose using the future shared-use path along Island Crest Road but recommend preserving an accessible connection within Deane’s Children’s Park to Island Park Elementary.</p>
12	Marxen	<p><b>Current:</b> The proposed Site Plan represents a shared vision for the long-term evolution of Deane’s Children’s Park. It reflects extensive community engagement, careful site analysis, a strong commitment to accessibility and inclusivity, and preservation of the park’s natural character.</p> <p><b>Proposed:</b> The proposed Site Plan represents a proposed long-term evolution for Deane’s Children’s Park. The concepts developed for the park were guided by extensive community engagement, careful site analysis, a strong commitment to accessibility and inclusivity. However, the look and feel of the final site plan deviated from the concept phase in unexpected ways and the PRC encourages the city to ensure that the 30% design re-focuses on preserving the park’s natural character while providing accessibility to the primary play areas.</p>	<p>Staff consider this request fulfilled under 3a of the “Key Considerations.”</p> <p>Staff do not agree that the Site Plan deviates from the concept phase. The Site Plan is consistent with the concepts developed during the engagement and concept phases and reflects extensive community engagement, careful site analysis, a strong commitment to accessibility and inclusivity, and preservation of the park’s natural character. This was confirmed at the November and February PRC meetings when seeking input on play equipment selection and overall look and feel.</p>

Log #	Received From	Question/Edits	Staff Response
13	Marxen	<p><b>Add:</b> to design review and phasing:                      The PRC does not recommend that the “extra opportunities” phase of the site plan should be included as it expands the development of play ground structures into the natural wooded area of the park.</p>	<p>Staff do not support this addition as it is contradictory to the approved Site Plan.</p>

This matrix will be shared with all Commissioners ahead of the meeting and published to the packet following the meeting.