









Mills Park Site Plan 2nd Questionnaire

1. How many Mills Park Site Plan Community Meetings have you attended?			Response Percent	Response Count
0			29.7%	19
1			20.3%	13
2			23.4%	15
3			26.6%	17
			answered question	64
			skipped question	0

2. What overall scheme do you prefer for Mills Park? (To view the schemes copy and paste this link in your browser http://www.oakparkparks.com/currentevents/futureplans_millspark.htm)			Response Percent	Response Count
Scheme A			11.9%	
Scheme B			6.8%	
Scheme C			35.6%	
Scheme C1			45.8%	
			answered question	
			skipped question	

3. Why do you prefer Scheme A?		Response Count
		7
		answered question
		7
		skipped question
		57

4. Why do you prefer Scheme B?		Response Count
		4
	<i>answered question</i>	4
	<i>skipped question</i>	60

5. Why do you prefer Scheme C?		Response Count
		16
	<i>answered question</i>	16
	<i>skipped question</i>	48

6. Why do you prefer Scheme C1?		Response Count
		18
	<i>answered question</i>	18
	<i>skipped question</i>	46

7. Do you have any other comments?		Response Count
		40
	<i>answered question</i>	40
	<i>skipped question</i>	24

1. Why do you prefer Scheme A?

1. simplicity; probably least expensive; most likely to get completed; absence of benches (benches encourage loiterers and impede flow of people along paths; paths curved rather than straight; provides good screening from/for apartment building on West side of park; Sun, 11/23/08 2:27 PM
2. I don't like it because it includes a pavilion for Pleasant Home Sun, 11/23/08 8:51 AM
3. simplicity Sat, 11/22/08 9:47 AM
4. I cannot tell anything from the pictures you provided. Tue, 11/18/08 12:00 PM
5. Because I like the park as it is Mon, 11/17/08 8:44 PM
6. It's the least invasive Sat, 11/15/08 10:10 AM
7. It is neatly laid out and makes the park more accessible Fri, 11/14/08 4:21 PM

1. Why do you prefer Scheme B?

1. It seems to better encourage passive use of the park. Tue, 11/18/08 3:33 PM
2. Path widths and distinct areas Mon, 11/17/08 11:22 AM
3. It enhances the park a bit and includes benches. Sun, 11/16/08 8:07 PM
4. House adds a formal element and promenade echoes that. Also this looks like it can provide easier access for police and other services if necessary. Sat, 11/15/08 8:54 AM

1. Why do you prefer Scheme C?

1. I feel it will be less intrusive to the Mills Park residential building. Thank you. Mon, 11/24/08 1:11 PM
2. I prefer scheme C because it does not have the jogging path (as well as additional benches and lighting) along the northwest corner of the park. I believe this allows for a modicum of respect to be given to the residences that border this end of the park (Mills Park Apartments) as well as in keeping with all of the commentary given to this effect in the last three meetings. That said, I would like to point out the fact that currently the park is a passive park with much green space. Many people come to this park for that very reason. I think we are forgetting about the fact that people actually like to walk, play, jog

and just enjoy green space without the encumbrance of pathways, benches and lampposts. Perhaps John MacManus of Altamanu says it best when he describes the park as the only green space available south of the metra/green line train tracks. He's also pointed out the wonderful green meadow area in the northwest area of the park and that it would be a shame to lose it. Well, why not keep this meadow area? There is a way this could be accomplished. If the path way that proceeds starting at Mills Park Tower and meanders northwest up to the entrance walk of the Pleasant Home were extended beyond the walk and curved around the northeast part of the house to the drive, a complete south to north (and north to south) path would be created. Make the path wide and soft enough (no concrete please!) to be handicapped accessible, and there would be no reason to cut a path through the wonderful green meadow space. You therefore have something for everyone to enjoy the park. I like the additional entrance at Home Ave. Again, this allows handicapped (as well as all other) accessibility to the park to all sides of the park. I do like the new welcoming entrance to the park at Marion Street (as long as no trees are cut down or interfered with). However, there seems an excess of pathway extending from this entrance. I do not think the short-cut east-west path is necessary. Currently, there are angled paths (desire lines) and there is no worn foot-traffic desire line that cuts across like the one shown on scheme C. Again, we must remember - people come to this park to play/walk/jog on the green space. Please don't take so much of this enjoyable nature-filled green space away. If one wants/needs to proceed on a designated path, they can do so by following the angled paths as they've always done so. It may seem a slight more distance, however, one can enjoy the journey more. The labyrinth is a nice addition for children as well as adults as long as it will not harm dogs' paws in the winter. And this is something very important to consider (as well as the harmful affect of salt use) on pathways in the winter, because after all, this park is utilized very much for the enjoyment of dogs and their owners and children. I believe the number of benches (30+) seen on all the plans is extremely excessive. Most people agreed (at all 3 previous community meetings as well as prior focus meetings) that some benches would be nice as long as they are placed in areas not encroaching on the residences surrounding the park. However, most people thought an excess of benches will create an opportunity for nefarious nightly activity: homelessness, rowdy youth, littering, and noise. This could be a problem in the day as well. Also the numerous benches pose a physical hazard and liability to any play - children/pets/people/nature, as well as maintenance issues. Please limit the benches to the new entrances at the east and west end of the park, Mills Park Tower entrance and the intersecting meandering long south to north and east to west path. The tent-like pavilion proposal would be a nice addition as well as benefit the Pleasant Home Foundation if it were just that - an addition that is architecturally designed in keeping with the context of the home in aesthetics as well as materials. (And also providing handicapped accessible restrooms.) However, a tent is just that - a tent. It does not belong here on a permanent basis as there is already in place the ability to have temporary tents (and large ones at that)/chairs/tables and catering brought in. (And then removed after the event, thus allowing the park to revert back to its natural self.) Plus there should be attention brought to the fact there is a five foot (+) space between the tent and the house. This dead-end alley can only lead to vandalism and other nefarious activity as well as maintenance issues. The argument that the tent-like pavilion is needed because of all the wear and tear on the house is debatable. Since Pleasant Home

Foundation has pointed out that any year round event held in the tent will use the house's facilities as well as the desire that patrons of the events will then meander into the house to view the house as a museum, then it can only be assumed this will actually create more wear and tear on the house - not less! Thank you for your consideration. Mon, 11/24/08 7:51 AM

3. Puts everything together in a pleasing arrangement and allows accessibility to all patrons. Fri, 11/21/08 8:53 PM

4. I live in the neighborhood and like Mills Park just the way it is. I really don't think it needs any changing at all, but if you must change it, scheme c seems pretty innocuous. Thu, 11/20/08 7:57 PM

5. most quiet for residents.concerned about security Thu, 11/20/08 5:03 PM

6. for its aesthetics and functionality Thu, 11/20/08 4:15 PM

7. provides more quiet seating areas Thu, 11/20/08 8:32 AM

8. Least obtrusive and intrusive to community and neighbors Wed, 11/19/08 7:11 PM

9. We live in Mills Park apartments and overlook the park. Scheme C seemed the least intrusive and the most aesthetically appealing. Wed, 11/19/08 3:25 PM

10. It seems less extreme than A and B (it seems as if the fence disappears in Scheme A--and the paths are too big in B)--I do not see the difference between C and C1 Tue, 11/18/08 2:45 PM

11. I enjoy the flow of the pathways better Tue, 11/18/08 12:34 PM

12. No benches, lighting or concrete pathway near Mills Park Apartments Mon, 11/17/08 2:28 PM

13. Shape and route of paths Mon, 11/17/08 2:22 PM

14. like the natural look of wavy paths and the open meadow on the north end Sat, 11/15/08 6:21 PM

15. It has a winding walkway/benches along the west side of the meadow, providing a full view of the meadow landscape and perspective of the park space, and also provides a nice walking trail to enjoy a morning nature walk around the park. Sat, 11/15/08 1:48 PM

16. The lack of path near the apartments to the west Fri, 11/14/08 3:06 PM

1. Why do you prefer Scheme C1?

- 1.** It provides for more access to the park for residents, visitors and the handicap. In particular, I like the smaller paths that have been placed on the NW corner of the park that provide more access to the entire park but are still respectful of the neighbors bordering the NW side. I really like the fountain. I've been a proponent of a more permanent, but removable pavilion, but if the tree line is placed somewhere near the pavilion, it would be more aesthetically pleasing to the park users. Fri, 11/21/08 11:40 PM
- 2.** The paths should be permanent - I'd like to walk all the way around the park no matter the weather or time of year. Lots of benches too - if you can have paths and benches in Austin Gardens you can have them in Mills Park. Fri, 11/21/08 1:58 PM
- 3.** love the paths - ALL paths should be paved though. Fri, 11/21/08 1:49 PM
- 4.** It just seems aesthetically more satisfying Wed, 11/19/08 2:40 PM
- 5.** all, including quiet loop around northwest side Tue, 11/18/08 12:12 PM
- 6.** It appears to have the most walking paths.... Mon, 11/17/08 3:17 PM
- 7.** Makes best use of space Mon, 11/17/08 10:21 AM
- 8.** I like the additional path around the North and West side of the park. Mon, 11/17/08 6:54 AM
- 9.** I like the flow of the paths, the opening in the fence on Home Avenue (if that is approved), and the fountain (which I know is in each of the plans) Sun, 11/16/08 1:02 PM
- 10.** balanced plan allowing for public access Sat, 11/15/08 4:11 PM
- 11.** C and C1 are close, though I'm not sure that the walking path will get enough use to make it worth while, I do like it. C and C1 have the circular entrance on Marion that I like and the maze, which I see as more of a kid feature than a senior feature. I'm not sure that the North - South path to mid Pleasant is needed. I don't know who would use it. People going from Mills Tower to points east would use one of the Home exits and people going from Mills Tower to 'mall' would use the Marion St. exit. Sat, 11/15/08 2:59 PM
- 12.** C and C1 are close. Sat, 11/15/08 2:46 PM
- 13.** The walkway loop expands the way one can utilize and view the park. Sat, 11/15/08 12:07 PM

14. The path on the North/ northwest side of the park Sat, 11/15/08 1:05 AM
15. like walking path. other paths' designs, entrance, better general configuration, make sure pavilion blends with house. Fri, 11/14/08 4:44 PM
16. Addition of "soft" walking, running path Fri, 11/14/08 4:36 PM
17. path Fri, 11/14/08 1:15 PM
18. The pathway loop around the north end of the park. Thu, 11/13/08 7:16 PM

1. Do you have any other comments?

1. Thank you. Mon, 11/24/08 1:11 PM
2. We prefer scheme C because it does not have the jogging path (as does scheme C1) as well as additional benches and lampposts, that allows for a modicum of respect to Mills Park Apartments as was requested at the three previous meetings as well as prior focus group meetings. That said, we would like to point out the fact that currently the park is a passive park with much green space. Many people come to the park for that very reason. We think you are forgetting that people actually like to walk/play/jog and just enjoy green grass without the encumbrance of pathways, benches, and lampposts. Perhaps John MacManus of Altamanu says it best when he describes the park as the only green space available south of the metra/green line train tracks. He's also pointed out the wonderful green meadow area in the northwest area of the park and that it would be a shame to lose it. Well, why not keep this meadow area? There is a way this could be accomplished. If the pathway that proceeds starting at Mills Park Tower and meanders northeast up to the entrance walk to the Pleasant Home were extended beyond the home's walkway and curved around the northeast part of the house to the drive - a complete south to north (and vice-versa) path would be created. Make the path wide and soft enough (no concrete please!) to be handicapped accessible, and there would be no reason to cut a path through the wonderful green meadow. Therefore, there is something for everyone to enjoy in the park. We like the additional entrance at Home Avenue. Again, this allows for handicapped (as well as all other) accessibility to the park at all sides of the park. We do like the new welcoming entrance to the park at Marion Street (as long as no trees are cut down or interfered with). However, there seems an excess of pathways extending from this entrance. We do not think the short-cut east to west path is necessary. Currently there are angled paths (desire lines) and there is no worn foot-traffic desire line that cuts across the angled paths at the southwest area of the park. Again - we must remember - people come to this park to play/walk/jog/dog walk on the green spaces. If one wants/needs to proceed on a designated path, they can do so by following the angled paths as they've always done so. It may seem a slight more distance, however, one can enjoy the journey more. The labyrinth is a nice addition for children as well as adults as long as it will not

harm dogs' paws in the winter. And this is something very important to consider (as well as the harmful affects of salt use on the pathways in winter) because, after all, this park is utilized very much for the enjoyment of dogs and their owners and children. We believe the number of benches (30+) seen on all the plans is extremely excessive. Most people agreed (at all 3 previous meetings and prior focus group meetings) that some benches would be nice as long as they are placed in areas not encroaching on the residences surrounding the park. However, most people thought an excess of benches will create an opportunity for nefarious nightly activity: homelessness, rowdy youth, littering and noise. This could be a problem in the day as well. Also the numerous benches pose a physical hazard and liability to any play (children/pets/people/nature) as well as maintenance issues. Please limit the benches to the new entrances at the east and west side of the park, Mills Park Tower entrance and the intersecting meandering long south to north and east to west path. The tent-like pavilion proposal would be a nice addition as well as benefit the Pleasant Home Foundation if it were just this - an addition that is architecturally designed in keeping with the context of the home in aesthetics as well as materials. (And also providing handicapped accessible restrooms.) However, a tent is just that - a tent. It does not belong here on a permanent basis as there is already in place the ability to have temporary tents/chairs/tables and catering brought in. (And then removal after the event, thus allowing the park to revert back to its natural self.) Plus there should be attention brought to the fact there is a 5 foot(+) space between the tent and the house. This dead-end alley can only lead to vandalism and other nefarious activity as well as maintenance issues. The arguement that the tent-like pavillion is needed because of all the wear and tear on the house is debatable. Since Pleasant Home Foundation has pointed out that any yearound event held in the tent will use the house's facilities, as well as the desire that patrons of the events will then meander into the house to view the house as a museum, it can only be assumed the incresed number of events will actually create increased wear and tear - not less. Thank you for your consideration. Mon, 11/24/08 9:00 AM

3. (1) Forget about a fountain (fountains require costly maintenance; they invariably have plumbing/leakage problems); if not regularly checked and cleaned by dedicated upkeep crews, they quickly become substitute waste-bins and may encourage mosquitoes, etc.; they encourage pranksters (soap-suds, clothing dyes, etc.)(personal experience); inappropriate for a relatively small Park (these are not the gardens at Versailles - despite grandiose plans of original owners); you would do better to get a local consortium to put up a modest sum for juried competition to create a suitable piece of modern sculpture (to be located perhaps at round-about on proposed Home Ave entrance path in SE corner; (2) Definitely do what can be done to reduce / eliminate the eyesore of the easement (is there a legal loop-hole to terminate the easement without undue cost?); if the driveway gets fenced off, plant dense foliage (preferably thorny) to reinforce; (3) remove fencing in SW corner (Mills Tower entrance) and possibly replace with knee-high version (if any) to deter small children from running into Marion traffic, parking lane; (4)keep the Home Ave entrance modest but well-designed (there has been much renovation along that street in recent years); (4) pavilion probably OK if the concerns expressed at meetings about appearance, upkeep, etc., are kept in mind; (5) do not be afraid to remove trees (despite what some misinformed enthusiasts say); just because a tree is very old is not in itself a

complete defense against removing it if damaged by storm, disease, neglect, or improper care; Sun, 11/23/08 3:02 PM

4. All of the schemes include a pavilion for Pleasant Home. Why is this not also on the table for comment? the various constructs of the wading pool have no interest for me. Sun, 11/23/08 8:52 AM

5. Keep this park as an open grassland area with lovely trees! Sat, 11/22/08 9:48 AM

6. I've been extremely frustrated with the negativity of those neighbors bordering the NW section of the park the process and their outright lies in the newspapers. I cannot remember if C1 has a limited / posted "doggy playtime," but I think that would also be a good idea as long as they are respectful of the time and pick up after themselves. Please keep up the good work and communications. I applaud the very well-organized meetings and ability to handle adverse reactions of some of the participants. Fri, 11/21/08 11:40 PM

7. I like the integration of culture, natural, and historic aspects into the total plan. The children's play area would be fun and educational following a plan similar to the Arboretum. Fri, 11/21/08 8:55 PM

8. I would prefer a small piece of REAL playground equipment near an entrance at Marion. Something more engaging for kids with benches around the area so parents can sit and talk while watching their kids play. Fri, 11/21/08 1:59 PM

9. A piece of playground equipment amongst the trees by Marion would not be the end of the world. Nor would paths and benches near "the maiden in the park" XXX's apartment. Everyone's ability to enjoy the park should not hinge on whether it interrupts XXX's view and misplaced thoughts that somehow this is only her park. You have given her thoughts and loud opinions plenty of airtime but enough is enough. Fri, 11/21/08 1:53 PM

10. I wish you weren't changing the park at all. It is well-used by the community just as it is and only really needs maintenance-level renovation. I particularly don't like the idea of the pavilion. I am afraid that I work evenings during the fall, and will not be available on December 3, but were it not for these facts I would be present in meetings about Mills Park to voice my concerns. Thu, 11/20/08 8:00 PM

11. too difficult to voice concerns at meeting. There is a big problem with noise after 10:00. p.m. very concerned that this will get worse. not true that we can call 911 and get help. Thu, 11/20/08 5:04 PM

12. Unfortunately I was ill for the first three meetings. My main concern with Mills Park is the lack of supervision. Dog owners love to run their dogs -off leash - in the park. I can understand them wanting to do this but the dogs at least should be under voice command when this is allowed and no dog who is not properly trained should be allowed to run off

leash. I have personally been attacked by a large black dog while the owner was sitting on the bench. As far as which scheme I prefer, it is impossible to tell what difference there is between any of the schemes in order to make an informed decision. The management of my building thinks that Scheme C would be the least intrusive on us but it is impossible to tell. I live at Fountainhead right across from Mills Park. A playground, a picnic table or two would be nice and offer alternative uses for the park. I have lived here 5 years and love Mills Park. I hope whatever the Park District does to the park will not change its quality. More places to sit, a few picnic tables and a playground would be great. I don't see the need for any edifice added to the park. What is the purpose of the edifice? There is no explanation on the web site. Thank you for your time. Thu, 11/20/08 4:02 PM

13. I prefer to keep the park a quiet retreat for local residents to walk, exercise, read, etc. Thu, 11/20/08 8:34 AM

14. While I understand the need for the building, I think the rest of the work in these unsettled financial times with not enough police and dwindling village resources is a waste. In better times, perhaps, exploring options might be an idea. I also have a concern for the spirit in which the meetings were conducted. It seemed to me that the overbearing person who did all the talking had ideas in mind and really was not open to any free discussion. When people tried to speak up, he belittled them and denigrated their ideas. I spoke out when I was there and had elderly residents of Mills Tower come up to me afterwards saying they agreed but were afraid to talk. The village--and Park Department--lost a lot of respect in my eyes for the high-handed father-knows-best tactics employed. I thought the ED of the Parks Department seemed like a nice person, but not after he took no steps to control the mean-spirited discussion. Whatever the outcome, the only winner is the mean man who spoke -- I don't recall his name. He will be paid for designing and overseeing implementation of a project that is not needed and not wanted. For myself, I will move. And, it will be out of Oak Park. Wed, 11/19/08 7:19 PM

15. The park needs to be kept as it is now in terms of being a "quiet" place for visitors to read, sunbathe, exercise their pets, etc. Don't over-develop the park, but it's ok to make it prettier. Wed, 11/19/08 3:28 PM

16. Yes, in fact, I don't like any of the options. I would prefer that the angular path from Pleasant Home's front gate toward Mills Tower be fully paved. Otherwise, forget any other paths. I only prefer C1 if it is absolutely necessary to have more paths. When the paths are put in Mills Park will look like a park instead of the pastoral patch that it is now. Wed, 11/19/08 2:42 PM

17. Unfortunately, I've had to leave both of the last planning meetings because of a simultaneous Historical Society board meeting upstairs in Pleasant Home. I can't really tell enough about your alternate plans to select one rationally. When I view the plans through the posted links, all I see are drawings with insufficient information to tell what I'm viewing. I think Plan B has a lot more benches and places to sit, and Plans C have play lots, but I'm not at all sure. I'm guessing that a fountain south of the house is an

option on all the plans. I doubt that anyone not attending the meetings would be able to comment intelligently. I do object most strenuously to the "pavilion" stuck on the back of Pleasant Home having already been included in all the plans. This, and the accompanying justification passed out at the meeting, seem to say that just keeping Pleasant Home open and standing will require it to become much more self-sufficient as a party venue. There seems to be a complete abandonment of the idea of restoring the house. I have to assume this, and the Park District's capital plan, reflect the Park District's priorities clearly. If there's money to spend on Pleasant Home, why not spend it on urgently needed repairs/restoration? Fool that I am, I tend to think of the site as a historic estate incorporating a park instead of as a park which inconveniently contains a historic house which must be made to pay its own way. A restored Pleasant Home, with, ultimately, its original landscaping and outbuildings, could be a viable regional attraction. A small park with or without a "tot lot" will never be. Why does anyone think people will rent a "pavilion" behind Pleasant Home for parties? I thought the attraction was being able to use the interior of the house. Tue, 11/18/08 3:49 PM

18. Yes, I do Tai Chi in the park every Saturday and Sunday morning (weather permitting), and I like the park as it is, though I can see that there are some improvements that could make the park better. I do not believe that a playground is needed, since these can be found in many places around the village--children can see here that spaces without swings, etc. can be "fun" too. Tue, 11/18/08 2:49 PM

19. In some of the Foundations original ideas for the park, they used original site plans from George Maher and the designer of the grounds. There was a plan to put the Coach House back up and to recreate the formal gardens. I would prefer to see that happen to what you are planning. Tue, 11/18/08 12:36 PM

20. nice plan that will make this park much more friendly to users Tue, 11/18/08 12:12 PM

21. As someone who uses the park on a regular basis (I do T'ai Chi with a group there every weekend), I would like to see as little as possible, or better yet, nothing at all done to the park. The only thing that might possible be an improvement is to make the path safer for seniors. We have such a beautiful, mostly unspoiled park, let's not ruin it with a bunch of "stuff" nobody needs! Thank you. Tue, 11/18/08 12:03 PM

22. Please don't touch that wonderful park!!! Mon, 11/17/08 8:45 PM

23. Passive activities like covered card playing areas -- checkers -- chess -- etc. would be perfect for this park. In addition, good places to read a book or share a meal..... Mon, 11/17/08 3:18 PM

24. The beauty of this park is all the greenspace, by adding the pavilion, benches (people have always brought blankets, lounge chairs to enjoy the park) Your drawings show trees in abundance along the fence lines, which is not true... adding benches will cause the park

to once again be a hangout for teens, the homeless, etc. which we have finally gotten rid of, by removing the benches.. Mon, 11/17/08 2:33 PM

25. It's kind of hard to select a scheme when you're not really sure what all the elements are that are shown, such as the interesting swirl by the SW side, and where potential additional entrances are. Mon, 11/17/08 11:23 AM

26. Keeping the park a place where children can play in a grassy field; where people can stroll and where you can sit on a bench to relax or read; also a great place for an art fair in the meadow. The way it is laid out with inviting entrances, pathways and seating areas, this will be a great addition to Oak Park public green spaces. Mon, 11/17/08 10:25 AM

27. I agree with those who say the park doesn't need playground equipment, and I would like to see better security and maintenance for the park and its surrounding sidewalks and parkways. Sun, 11/16/08 8:08 PM

28. Thank you for the process. It has been handled very well. I understand that there might be signage in the park similar to that at Field. I would endorse that wholeheartedly. I love the signage there and the information given is great. Similar signs in Mills Park would definitely enhance the appreciation of the history of Pleasant Home and the surrounding grounds for all visitors. Sun, 11/16/08 1:09 PM

29. thought the kids experience area was fantastic. like the idea of culture and the arts as a part of it that everyone can enjoy. the stones, the labrynth, natural bridge, etc is unlike anything else we have in oak park and would be a wonderful, peaceful reflective discovery area that would really add to our parks. If C1 goes through, would like to see it as unobtrusive as possible on the north end - with no lights or benches, otherwise when you look at it, it wouldn't look as much like a meadow. Sat, 11/15/08 6:25 PM

30. Your presentations have won me over! Sat, 11/15/08 4:12 PM

31. Fountain restoration a great idea Sat, 11/15/08 4:11 PM

32. I do have concerns about the temporary / permanent structure for use weddings and classes. I also like the idea of natural features in the children's play area. Sat, 11/15/08 3:06 PM

33. I would like to see a meadow design that includes wildflowers and native grass species and Oak trees to bring out an element of Oak Park pre-settlement landscape. Parenthetically I can tell you based on years as a volunteer steward with the FPDCC when citizens have a park or preserve in their community that they appreciate and use the undesirables move out. Sat, 11/15/08 2:29 PM

34. I would prefer a low wall on the western border to provide seating space. However, I don't think the park needs as many benches as indicated on C1. (I count more than 25.) Sat, 11/15/08 12:12 PM

35. As it becomes available, more info needs to be provided about the Pavilion design and structure. Also, more info needs to be made public about the contractual arrangement with the donor...what will happen if the donor doesn't get enough business for it to be money making proposition for them? What upkeep/maintenance responsibilities do they have for the finished structure? What penalties will be specified in the contract for failure to comply with any and all restrictions, including noise? Sat, 11/15/08 10:17 AM

36. no Sat, 11/15/08 1:05 AM

37. no Fri, 11/14/08 4:45 PM

38. I also support the concept of connecting architectural elements of Pleasant Home in the children's play area. Children may enjoy the motifs and later recognize them when they visit the home, either on children's day, a tour group, or visit with their families. These motifs help connect the home to the park and convey continuity to visitors young and old. Overall, a well-done, beautiful concept! Fri, 11/14/08 4:38 PM

39. nope Fri, 11/14/08 1:15 PM

40. Thank you. Thu, 11/13/08 7:16 PM