



CHUGIAK-EAGLE RIVER DOG PARKS

MOA Parks & Recreation
Community Open House 1

Date / Location: Thursday, May 24, 2018 / Eagle River Community Room 170, 12001 Business Blvd. |

Project Team

MOA Parks & Recreation:

John Rodda, Director
Karen Richards, Eagle River/Chugiak Manager

R&M Consultants:

Van Le, AICP, Project Manager
Emily Benti, Planner & Public Involvement
Taryn Oleson, Planner & Public Involvement

Attachments

Meeting Summary

The Eagle River Community Room was set up with two rows of tables and chairs oriented towards a large projector screen displaying a rotating slideshow on the Dog Park Study. A sign in table with fact sheet, comment forms and copies of the draft study was placed just inside the door to the community room, where Taryn and Emily greeted attendees as they arrived. Light snacks were provided. Van began the public meeting at 7:10 PM with introductions of the project team and provided an overview of what has been done before the meeting. She stated that this is the first open house and the public has not missed any other project specific open houses, and explained that the study has been ongoing with support from the Parks & Rec Board of Supervisors and we are here today to get your feedback on the two sites being forwarded. Questions were asked throughout the meeting and presentation, and are summarized in the next section.

Emily began a presentation on the Dog Park Site Selection study with discussion of the five initial candidate sites under consideration, results of the 2017 survey of area residents, and described the criteria and evaluation process those sites were put through. She described the three sites that were not put forward for further study, Beach Lake Park, Loretta French Ball Field, and the NW 1/4 of Section 25, and provided a brief explanation for their elimination. Firehouse Park and Peter's Creek Park Parcel were then discussed in the context of the primary selector criteria the Parks & Recreation Board of Supervisors considered as most important; location, size and adjacent existing uses, safety, and maintenance.

Questions & Answers

Comments

The following comments were submitted using the comment forms provided at the meeting.

- I am delighted to see the Firehouse Lane Park for not only myself but my wife who is handicapped with a bum knee. This will be a gift to her as we have limited space for folks like her to use an open space (legally) to let their dogs run. I AM SO EXCITED!!

- Thank you for the study. Eagle River is a diverse community with people of all needs and wants. We are long overdue for a park to legally walk our dog off leash. We do walk them on a normal basis and socialize them. However, giving them the freedom to run and frolic without being worried about their safety is of the utmost importance to me. Please move forward with planning and development of these parks. We would be more inclined to use the Peter's Creek Park, unless the plans for Firehouse included removing the tennis courts to allow more space.
- I am in favor of the small and large dog parks (Firehouse and Peter's Creek Parcel). Excited to attend next meeting and get the most up to date information.
- Sounds good, build them!!!
- Opposed to Firehouse Tennis Park Area: it is a small area less than an acre, designated tennis park with trees being a buffer (serenity and quietness disturbed if a dog park was here), the existing activity of playing tennis is not compatible with a dog park next to it with barking dogs (not meeting selection criteria). This park would be located in the Eagle River Heights area where there is a covenant (?) of 2 dogs per household. No sidewalks on Firehouse Lane, and is near a busy intersection, which does not support the walkability of this park. Where would the entrance be? The Park Board did not get their skate board park here so want to make use of this space. Keep this place a serene tennis park. Near a busy road. Not enough parking area. Crowded area for dogs. Survey that was done did not get a response from all the people in the area – five neighbors did not get the survey. Dogs living in the nearby area barking with dogs at the park.
- The Firehouse Lane site is not big enough to supply a dog park. Access is not sufficient with existing parking and gates. Noise barrier for the residents will be taken away because the trees act as a barrier. If dogs are barking all day long do I get to call animal control for a complaint? If my neighbor's dog is barking, they get 3 chances before they get a fine and if it continues they will remove the dog (I called animal control).
- I believe the dog-use area (Firehouse Park) is too small to be attractive for dog walkers in the area.
- Concern is over size of park (Firehouse) and use. Only 5 parking spaces for tennis courts (existing) and dog park will not be enough. If trees are removed, noise will be overwhelming from Eagle River Road (already noisy enough). The traffic along Eagle River Road and Fire House are very busy. No decision should be made for having this park here if these concerns not even considered.
- I live on Old Eagle River Road. Due to illness I couldn't be there tonight, so I have asked my friend to read/submit this. That property (Firehouse Park) is too small for a dog park. This was also one of the same concerns stated when a skateboard park was planned on the same small piece of property. I don't know the person who keeps wanting to put something on that small parcel of land, but he needs to stop it and leave it as a natural sound barrier. Thank you.
- Too small, don't need extra noise, lights, congestion on an already too busy Firehouse Lane. Will be a real issue when I'm walking my dog along Eagle River Road and dogs are running to the fence barking, etc. We need our trees left alone for noise abatement and privacy. You took a large portion for a paved parking area for tennis courts – we are not the concrete jungle of Anchorage – preserve our quiet residential area we all love – it's why we bought here. Thanks for opportunity to comment – of the 5 of us here tonight from the Firehouse area, not one of us was surveyed. Why not, it's based on our address and proximity, so few of us weighed in – not right and appears biased survey?