



TOWN of BROOKLINE  
*Massachusetts*

Park and Recreation Commission

**Park and Recreation Commission**

*John Bain, Chairperson*  
*Nancy O'Connor, Vice Chairperson*  
*Clara Batchelor*  
*James Carroll*  
*Daniel Lyons*  
*Antonia Bellalta*  
*Wendy Sheridan*

**Director of Parks and Open Space**

*Erin Chute Gallentine*

**Director of Recreation**

*Leigh Jackson*

**Cypress Street Playground  
Design Review Committee Meeting #3  
Meeting Minutes  
Community Room-Brookline Public Safety Building  
Wednesday, May 1, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

**Committee Members Present:** Nancy O'Connor (DRC Chair), Daniel Lyons, Wendy Sheridan, Clara Batchelor, Deborah Rivers, Helen Charlupski and Matthew Cooney

**Committee Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Erin Gallentine, Parks and Open Space Director, Jessica Zarni, Administrative Assistant, Scott W. Landgren, RLA, Senior Landscape Architect,

**Public Present:** see attached sign in sheet

**Welcome/Call Meeting to Order**

N. O'Connor welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for coming out. Helen moved approval of the previous meeting minutes. Seconded by W. Sheridan. All in favor. Scott Landgren introduced himself. Gene Bolinger and Brandon Kunkel from Weston & Sampson introduced themselves.

**Agenda**

Welcome and Introductions

Recap of Meeting #2 Project Scope & Schedule

**Part 1**

Overall Site Concepts and High School Project and Streetscape Coordination

**Part 2**

Concept Enlargements Greenough "Slow Street", Fields and Playgrounds

**Part 3**

Playground Equipment

Conclusion & Next Steps

**Recap of DRC Meeting #2**

- Preliminary Design Concepts for the playground
- Interfaces with Neighborhood and High School
- Destinations, Amenities Gathering Areas, & Placemaking
- Slow Street along High School/Greenough Street

The design Review Process and Project timeline was detailed.

Josh Burgel of Lemon Brooke Landscape Architects, with the High School design team, addressed the Committee.

### **High School Streetscape**

Josh described their work. The work is extending from the main building, to Tappan Street, up to Cypress Street, the new High School Building, and the new MBTA platform. He stated that the UAB, Tappan and High School Stem wing are the primary projects. Josh described the streetscape connection from Cypress to the main building. He stated that recently they have been working closely with the Parks and Open Space Division to tie the projects across the street to the park, and start to develop the streetscape with the park. The first improvement was widening the sidewalk all along Tappan Street on the High School side. The sidewalk increased from 6 feet to 12 to 15 feet (the width varies along the length). Street trees and a curb edge will be added to the sidewalk. There are new two new mid-block crossings added as described. The parking area is being reduced, so more plaza space can be given to access the MBTA. The mid-block crossing at UAB is lined up with the main stairs, increasing the visibility of this building. He stated that at the corner they are extending the raised crossing to improve crossings across the way in that location.

### **The Tappan Gym**

Josh discussed a side of the new front of the building, and the new landscaping with the widening of the sidewalks, a new streetscape all along the front of the buildings with new street trees. He reiterated these were concepts they are working on, in coordination with Parks to develop. He stated that there will be seating and places for people to stop/wait/hangout. A more social gathering space in front was shown. They have moved bikes from the front to along the side of the building. The cross section in front of Tappan was shown, the walls are necessary to step up to the base of the building and also providing opportunities for seating areas. The concept shows new street trees and seating. He stated that there is no impact to the width of the street though widening of the sidewalk. Sidewalk trees, ornamental trees and a back of sidewalk tree planting concept was discussed.

N. O'Connor stated that she was very pleased to hear the two design teams were working collaboratively.

### **Overall Design Concepts**

G. Bolinger stated that he is presenting three different concepts, Greenough as the slow street, the playground, court area/water play and field concepts. The goal is to obtain a better understanding of the preferred plan. He expects at the next DRC meeting to have discussion about the playgrounds and furniture on site. He stated that there has been significant

coordination and collaboration with the team making design improvements to the high school, which you will see tonight as an integrated cohesive plan. He stated that they are striving for a single and cohesive plan that is connected and feels like one larger place. G. Bolinger stated that there were a few basic things they are trying to “honor” in these design concepts that exist in the current conditions, they had a big impact on the ultimate build out of the park and arrangement of spaces within the park. He stated they maintained the tradition of sledding at the corner of Tappan and Cypress. They recognize there is a crucial movement from Dana Street thru the park over to MBTA station and this was acknowledged in all the schemes. He knows that the footprint of the multi-purpose field and softball field is crucial to supporting certain level of play on this field. He stated that the movement around and through the park, for both residents and students and understanding what these movements are critical for the ultimate design. He stated there are signature trees throughout and all the schemes and the attempt is to try to save those trees.

### **Concept A**

Precedent Images of Concept A were shown to the Committee.

B. Kunkel stated this is the “grand arch” concept, with north to south access. They are defining some of edges with long sweeping arches, which is a response to how they think people from the neighborhood and school penetrate into park. This will hopefully engage people to embrace the edges in the slow street concept. This makes a connection along the campus wide corridor. This embraces the strong movement from Dana Street down to MBTA. He stated that you will see similarities in all the concepts, and that they are aware of all these elements that are scared. B. Kunkel discussed the on-site meeting they had with the Town Arborist, Tom Brady. B. Kunkel stated that the playground, while it changes shape, is in the central location where it is today and the basketball court shifts slightly. They are looking to make the park more porous around the edges, while providing crosswalks for stronger connections long the edges. The sidewalk widths were discussed. He stated that they are looking to see how the slow street really penetrates the campus edge, how do they really want to make it well known that cars are not welcome during the school hours and make it feel like a more plaza/an extension of the school. They are reinforcing grand sweeping arches, great for seating and preventing cut through, but allows for strong visibility into the park. They are looking at areas to soften with materials and reinforce with stronger plantings. They are mixing vertical elements with natural elements. Particularly in the playground and making it attractive to kids. They want to set it up as a destination playground.

### **Concept B**

Precedent Images of Concept B was shown to the Committee.

B. Kunkel described what he termed the “blurred edge” concept. It involves pulling the park into slow street zone into the park itself. They tried to soften the edge as much as possible by defining the slow street area and the park edge. They want it to feel more plaza than street when the design is completed. The plantings/trees in the streetscape area was detailed and discussed. There is a cohesive language of landscape along entire edge. Images of playing with pavers/materials for the slow street were discussed. A more natural play example for the playground was also detailed.

## Concept C

Precedent Images of Concept C was shown to the Committee.

B. Kunkel described what he termed the “book end” concept. This is a really strong edge, where it could be a stacked block wall, to help define this area as plaza, providing a strong connection to the school along slow street, a much stronger relationship to the new school building and have it be a gathering space. B. Kunkel stated that regarding the porous connections into the park, that the mid-block crossing provides for an equal opportunity into the park. New fencing along the perimeter edge was discussed. Imagery of potential playground pieces of embracing natural images/embracing slope with play elements was shown. Examples of plaza space, fixed seating and street trees were shown. Grand block examples that prevent people from cutting across park the park were detailed. Informal pathways were discussed.

G. Bolinger stated that he feels they are much better in sync through a series of meetings with the folks who are improving the school footprint and edges. His hope by raising the street to the sidewalk elevation is that it reads as one cohesive space that flows together. They want it to be welcoming, a flexible space and to be able to support many students.

Helen Charlupski asked if Concept C is the only concept that leaves the trees on Greenough Street. Brandon stated that it is the best concept to have the ability to preserve trees on Greenough now. E. Gallentine stated that the street trees along Greenough Street are in fair condition, according to the review by the Town Arborist. She thinks when we further this design, the lindens are on the latter part of their life, they are unwelcoming at the front door to the High School. E Gallentine thinks we need to think about replacing the lindens, they will be barrier between making connection the connection between the slow street and the park. G. Bolinger stated in general they are saving many of the trees and the general concept is to remove those trees that are unsafe and badly damaged. G. Bollinger discussed the various species of trees. The current granite benches were also discussed.

C. Batchelor stated that she is interested in how you separate pavement and benches from the slow street side and the field. She wondered if there will be a fence. G. Bolinger stated that he has heard the concern for the tendency for people to cut across the field. He stated that they are intending to introduce edge treatment seating wall heights. He stated that they have not yet shown fencing between the field and slow street, but they figure there would be raised elements that would serve to funnel traffic and to create a sense of separation. The intention is to develop a cohesive edge treatment all along the perimeter. He stated they are looking to develop a simple ornamental treatment along edges and there are some places to have sports netting.

Deborah Rivers stated that there also needs to be some emphasis on the slow street side near the playgrounds. The same concept of kids coming out spilling across the street has been underestimated. She stated that the path never gets plowed straight and wants to think practically about having a plowed edge there. She thinks the straighter the better. Shading the street is as important as shading the park.

A resident addressed the Committee. His one concern is he hates the fence. He understands having a fence being around the playground area, but would like to see the rest of the park become super porous. G. Bolinger thinks the fencing is important for sports. G. Bolinger would

like to see granite slabs benches to sit on and these could keep balls from flying out and be a nice approach.

Johnathan Smalls addressed the Committee. He thinks we should not underestimate how far kids go when they sled. He thinks concept A won't work because of that. He asked why change the location/orientation of the basketball court. G. Bolinger stated that it's the same geographically; they are just different design adjustments. J. Smalls stated that the little grassy knoll next to basketball court serves an important function to little kids. He thinks Concept A kills that zone and B and C hinder it quite a bit. He wanted to reiterate what D. Rivers said about the plows. He discussed creating some smooth physical elements. He asked if they considered in the same way you can't turn down Greenough, maybe not allowing people to turn right on Tappan. Ray Masek from the Town indicated this would back traffic up for miles. D. Rivers discussed what happened when they had to close Greenough in the past.

J. Bain likes the idea of elevating slow street to sidewalk slow. He wonders how you would define parking when school is closed if its level. B. Kunkel discussed heavy duty pavers defining parking zone with another material.

A resident stated that the fight to close Greenough was "bloody". She stated that the real question with a proposed slow street, is that Tappan Street, in front of Tappan Street Gym, is going to new building. She is concerned with traffic slowing, especially if you slow the commuter traffic back onto Summer. She stated that we would want kids to be safe, but want the design to really think about what works and what doesn't. She stated that if you push the traffic out into neighborhoods and everywhere else, you will get gridlock.

## **Part 2 - Focus Areas Slow Street Concepts**

### **Concept A "Slow Street"**

B. Kunkel stated that Concept A is using the arch on this side of project to start to define this portion and in the front door of three buildings that serve as the school. They are taking the opportunity of to think about what is that and goes to C. Batchelor's comment about transitions. Is it all fences? Their thinking are low seat walls to help deter people and provide an opportunity for people to sit and interact with informal space. They want to start to anchor that edge of the park and the school, but understand how people move through it. In this concept they are breaking up the parking, reducing from current capacity, embracing the strong connection and framing up the main entrance to the school. He knows the stem wing is going to create opportunity to have a second major entrance to the school. They have opened up for more hardscape, seating, fixed seating, trees to sit under and larger paved space that serves as a plaza. He thinks it is strong to have a consistent material connection visually that draws people across the space; embrace the edges and then creating a softer garden space. He discussed possible strong shade elements.

### **Concept B "Slow Street"**

This is the concept that talks about blurring that edge and pulling park into slow street/ plaza space to park. This is looking at making it less street and more plazas. There would be flushed curbs along edges. They would put in a gate to prevent travel during certain hours. He stated from a paving standpoint, they really looked at softening the edge to provide a larger plaza for

kids to gather. This still provides opportunities for kid to sit, travel along the edge and spill out on lower part of the school campus

### **Concept C “Slow Street ”**

There would be breaks at the ends. It is not formal, vertical and more of a sculptural stacked stone wall. B. Kunkel gave an example of this concept wrapping around while embracing concepts where kids will spill out.

### **Concept C:”Slow Street ” Perspective**

An artistic rendering of how this starts to look like a plaza space was shown to the committee.

B. Kunkel stated one thing they have been struggling with is existing utilities.

The various parking options for all three concepts were detailed.

### **Questions**

Deborah Rivers and E. Gallentine discussed the Contra bike lane

Hellen Charlupski thinks the contra bike lane is a great idea. She also suggested some chess tables/checkers throughout the park.

C. Batchelor wanted to discuss concept A. This is very strong graphically, but she feels where there are lawn patches we have to think about what it will look like. She thinks it will turn to dirt. It has a graphic appeal, but when you lose grass, you lose the appeal. She stated that Concept B is fun, but if you raise all the areas and its covered with kids, just walking from top to bottom they will cut through the indentations. She doesn't think it can't be maintained. She stated that Concept C is maybe less dynamic graphically, but thinks you can do a much more interesting job of furniture arrangement rather than tree with a bench on each side. She stated that it has a lot of appeal; it will potentially better survive the kids and the community.

A resident wanted to comment on the parking. She stated that it's a community facility. And thinks we have to maintain as much parking as we can. B. Kunkel agrees and thinks there are ways to soften and make it feel less like a parking edge.

A resident addressed the Committee. He noted there are numerous during drop off and wonders if we will be creating enough space for drop-off width being reduced. B. Kunkel stated that there will be enough space for people to stop and pull over on the school side. The resident thinks it will be dangerous if it all one level people will be pulling over on then driving cars can be up on sidewalk. B. Kunkel stated that the design calls for an 18-24 feet travel lane. The resident is just afraid of a backup/jam he thinks it will be tight with doors open. G. Bolinger stated that they will visit the site to observe this happening. Deborah Rivers wants him to make sure Weston and Sampson observes the pickup in front of the school, which she finds to be even more problematic.

J. Bain and G. Bolinger discussed how many parking spaces will be lost in each design concept.

E. Gallentine stated that she talked to the head of school and they are trying to figure out a way to engage the students in the design process.

A resident he likes concept B, and thinks there is playfulness and creates activity. He thinks student would be able to use it in an interesting way. He thinks the proposed bike lane is a school contra biking lane. He would strongly recommend or request you look at flipping the positions of bike lanes and cars and he thinks it could be a way to deal with drop off.

## **Fields Layout**

### **Concept A “Fields Layout”**

G. Bolinger showed the committee a graph that gives a sense of different levels of play require from a recommendation standpoint for distances. He stated that we are in good shape for girls’ softball and little league. He stated that in regards men’s softball, it can be greater than 300 feet, so you could get some balls in neighbor’s yards using typical projections.

All of the footprints they are showing are identical. He stated that under current conditions the multi-purpose field is 300-ft by 180-ft, under proposed conditions the multi-propose field can stretch in the width 180-ft to 195-ft, through the benefit of relocating some of the drainage structures that are located within the confines of what would be that 195 ft width. The length and baseball diamond stays same. He stated that what is really different in this scheme they are introducing a concept of having sports netting along the edge of the field. These netting can be taken down on a seasonal basis and would run along the trees. It still won’t stop the high arching home run, but it may stop more than just the canopy of the trees. The scheme also shows ornamental fencing shown along the edge of park along sidewalk, introduces a new entrance, a seating wall and another crossing. The fencing and pathway for this scheme was detailed.

### **Concept B “Fields Layout”**

This concept was detailed for the Committee.

### **Concept C “Fields Layout”**

This concept was detailed for the Committee.

### **Concept C :”Fields Layout ” Perspective**

A layout perspective of this concept was shared with the Committee

## **Questions & Comments**

J. Bain is concerned that opening along Davis will create a natural walking path.

The NFHS (National Federation of High Schools) standard size ranges were discussed.

The potential netting/posts were discussed.

Deborah Rivers stated that currently the only field lighted is the eastern most one, which she finds more dimensionally challenged. She thinks we need to think about who we lease this to.

E. Gallentine asked if they considered the perimeter fence on Davis, removing all tree and putting in a fence and netting. She asked if they stepped in with the netting because you thought it was more visually appealing. G. Bolinger stated that if we had the opportunity to

remove the vegetation and start from scratch, then it would make a lot of sense to have ornamental 4 ft and then have sport netting pick up and reintroduce meeting on the park side. He stated that we could go with a different type of tree so that it doesn't spill out onto Davis Avenue. D. Rivers stated that you should want that shade on Davis because it is a heat island.

A resident asked if the right hand softball field is being pulled further to the right. G. Bolinger stated that if it is, it is very slightly. The resident hates the idea of ripping out the trees along Davis. He would prefer to keep the trees, than have sports netting. He stated that having a stacked granite wall that people can sit on would be so much cooler than a fence.

G. Bolinger discussed the concern about natural path formation along the field

### **Concept A "Play Area"**

B. Kunkel stated that this concept goes back to the strong arch formation. They are trying to define this edge in this concept. This concept provides double side seating but would have breaks in the wall to allow penetration. They want people to funnel down to the central core of the park. He stated that knowing there will be a lot of kids coming from 9<sup>th</sup> grade wing, they are hoping the plaza space lends into the basketball space and becomes a large multi-purpose gathering space. This concept shows seating on the perimeter that would allow watching of the game. This concept shows a strong geometric shaped playground. Brandon pointed out the four sacred trees that will not be touched. He disused pass through/ play tower options. This could provide elements of surprise for kids as they enter to this space. This concept is still embracing embankment of existing slope. He discussed the idea of parents hanging out on embankment on summer, kids in the splash pad area. It is a large playground area so you could get high/vertical play structures in this area. This concept shows play structures along the perimeter, while bringing ADA access to heart of the playground. This concept has the largest impact on the sledding hill; this is defined by the vertical obstructions there today. This concept gets a much larger playground area. He pointed out the informal lawn refurbished that is there today was shown. G. Bolinger stated that in all three schemes the space designated to water play and the playground are all modest in size.

### **Concept B "Play Area"**

This has the most organic playground. They are trying to nestle in to the existing topography. This is the smallest footprint and has the least impact on the sledding zone that exists. The Splash pad in general same location as today with natural elements on edges.

### **Concept C "Play Area"**

The concept embraces the three trees; it has a larger footprint than previous scheme and a perimeter edge. This concept has the most generous play area that is continuous. He stated that they studied how they could get some of the contours. He stated that they are pretty confident that can achieve accessibility on all sides and raise grade 4 feet above street level. This would be above car elevation in the playground. The potential elevations were detailed. They are taking the existing embankment, raising it up and leveraging that to have different terraces and embankments within the playground itself. He stated that they feel this concept provides the greatest opportunity to really engage in and embrace embankment play and leverage that with the play equipment being proposed. The concept shows the splash pad being surrounded by

natural elements. He showed an example of engaging a pathway with the tip of the hill, along with possible seating. Informal pathway/bank granite blocks at grade to create smaller open lawn informal areas underneath trees were discussed. Double seating on granite block options was shown in this concept.

N. O'Connor and B. Kunkel discussed the multi-purpose space near the basketball court /overflow space where kids can hang out.

### **Concept C : "Play Area" Perspective was shown to the Committee**

H. Charlupski and E. Gallentine discussed how this playground will accommodate 2-5 and 5-12 year olds, both younger and older.

D. Rivers stated that the width of path in concept A seems about right, but by the time you get to concept C you are at a pinch point. She doesn't think it is accommodating the amount of people going through there. E. Gallentine stated that with the snow plow and potential for damage, but all concepts are straighter than it is now. She thinks this maybe an opportunity to make it wider, still have gentle curves and allow for a plow to go through.

C. Batchelor stated that in concept A, when you have an egg shape it is the most difficult to get play equipment to fit into because of safety zones. She feels this one does the most damage to the trees. She stated that there is not much difference B and C, but she thinks it great that on concept C it's curved to go up and the kids can see. She doesn't see reason to have benches up there; it's not a pleasant corner to sit at. She thinks this concept works very well but the path needs to be made wider, but it can be down. She loves the granite. She likes Concept C for the street and playground.

W. Sheridan stated that she prefers concept C, she feels that it is has a little more intimacy in the playground and what appears like islands along the path dividing. She feels like it separates two spaces in a positive way, while at the same time embracing basketball area as potential gathering spot for high school students. She does see the potential to use the basketball courts into grass area as event space/park use in off season. She likes where the water paly is between basketball court and play space. N. O'Connor is thinking of mixing and matching. W. Sheridan stated that it could just be graphics, but Concept B feels more exposed to her. She would like to make sure at some point we engage Brookline High School Athletics Department.

Jonathon Small addressed the Committee. He stated that in both Concept B and C kids are run going to run into rocks/platform. He suggested creating an up-slope to slow down the sleds.

A resident stated that Concept B and Concept C look the same. He likes in Concept C that it is a different playground than anywhere else in Brookline. He likes that we can embrace the contours and elevation is great. He likes the idea of an up-slope for the sledders. He stated that in Concept B, he like curves by Davis Ave, but there is a lot of useless space in this concept. He stated that in C the path is continuous and people will use it more.

D. Lyons likes concept C primarily, the path can be widened. He loves the granite seating area and even thinks we could use granite from the Reservoir. He thinks the path could be widened. He thinks it a straighter path out from Tappan to Dana Street. He doesn't like the steps to the bottom right hand side, he agrees that putting benches up at top does not make sense.

D. Rivers stated that until she sees a 3d to see the raised corner, she is not convinced. She thinks it would be nice to be lower and get sheltering from the street.

Helen Charlupski stated that its too hard of a surface, it will get hit by plows and ruined. She likes the wooden piece on B, it has an interesting shape. She thinks the triangles are harder to plow.

The potential granite in this area was discussed. N. O'Connor wonders if there was seating that had front and back, you could sit on either side.

Josh from the High School Design team stated that in B that path is widened and integrates better. It makes it work together.

D. Rivers would not vote on these things. N. O'Connor stated that we need to give them direction.

A resident stated that he would echo Josh's sentiments regarding option B, and that connection across Tappan. It is a better use of the space than C.

C. Batchelor would like to make a proposal for when you come back with a new option ( Concept D): She would like this option to rely heavily on the direction of Concept C for the slow street, rely heavily the Concept C for play area and (b and c have basketball court in same area) that you take advantage of more open plaza area of B for marrying that with Concept C. She thinks for the playing field she isn't sure a decision can be made tonight on opening it up. Nancy O'Connor is fine with that, but would add parking on concept C. Helen Charlupski likes the way the kids go into the park.

S. Landgren wanted to point out that they are designing the slow street but it is not in the scope of the budget initially, in terms of the edge. E. Gallentine is unsure, but it will be packed to the end right of the curb of Greenough and the slow street can some later.

Deborah Rivers would hate to see end of Davis venue loose the trees and be covered in netting.

C. Batchelor repeated the motion of Option D. This option would rely heavily on the direction of Concept C for the slow street ( with more parking and refinement), rely heavily the Concept C for play equipment/area and (b and c have basketball court in same area) so you use the connection in Concept C between the basketball court and Dana Street. She stated that the new Concept D will straighten out that path and go towards more Concept B for the lower Connection of the new 9<sup>th</sup> grade building. She stated that the playing fields are very different; the only thing that differs is the middle area.

D. Lyons completely agrees but would like to see a combination of granite and wood, in regards to seating.

W. Sheridan would prefer to stick to Concept C completely, but if it is the hillside that is of interest to people in Concept B playground, maybe see if you can incorporate that into concept B.

**Slow street option:** Nancy O'Connor , Wendy Sheridan, Clara Batchleor, Helen Charlupski and Matthew Cooney voted to move forward with the direction of Concept C for the slow street. Deborah Rivers and Dan Lyons abstained from voting. The Field layout will continue to be further looked at.

### **Playground Option:**

Deborah Rivers would like for the upcoming meeting that there is a slide that shows the opposite side of the street. Helen Charlupski would like to see something more three dimensional for the next meeting; it is hard looking at it flat.

The Committee voted to merge both Concept B and C together for the playground option. It will be a hybrid option, which is softened. Deborah Rivers abstained from voting.

### **Play Area- Vendors**

Examples of play structures from each vendor was shown.

1. Berliner-Playground Equipment options were shared with the Committee
2. Goric
3. Kompan
4. Landscape Structures- ME O'Brien
5. Landscape Structures- LSI

C. Batchelor stated that before you start you should decide on a budget for the playground.

N. O'Connor loves the little tree houses, but in terms of all the ones she has seen she is being drawn back to is the Berliner.

H. Charlupski asked if E. Gallentine has had a better experience than others. E. Gallentine stated that these are all companies we have used. They are durable proven play manufacturers that all have elements in town.

D. Rovers stated that she feels like this destination needs to be a concept.

Swings / Dish swings were discussed.

The big net blue structure, with above and below play was looked at. W. Sheridan and N. O'Connor discussed the play value of this piece.

E. Gallentine stated that she is going to push back on wood, just because of maintenance and splinters.

Erin Gallentine stated that for the June meeting they will pull some different things together that would be an option with this new modified B and C concept that works together. H. Charlupski stated that we need to make sure we balance out the cost.

E. Gallentine thanked everyone for all their work. She stated for June 19<sup>th</sup> Weston and Sampson will come back with a refined concept for the overall park that will take in consider everything heard tonight. She stated that we will also be looking furniture, lighting, seating,

master plan, revisit the sledding hill, coordinate with the high school and look into some site visit and figuring out with to best get input from the high school.

Nancy O'Connor thanked everyone for coming out.