



Mt. Jefferson Survey Results

1. Does the draft plan address your interest and needs for the park?

Count	Response
1	It does-
1	No
1	The draft plan is weighted towards the new residents of Oakville Triangle, not Del Ray.
1	To a large extent.
1	Unclear - will the improved dog exercise area be fenced in? If so, this addresses my needs.
6	Yes
1	don't know
2	yes
1	Concerns: Don't want the contained dog walk area to be cheaply made with chain link fence. If it's going to be contained it needs to fit within the look and feel of the park
1	Yes, I see that there are enhancements to the dog exercise area. It is unclear if there will be a fenced in dog park but that would be a great addition
1	The park needs to become accessible to ALL. That means the trail surface must allow easy access by wheelchairs, strollers, and bicycles and it must connect to ALL adjacent neighborhoods. Do not allow current users to "keep out" new residents by opposing new connections.
1	Yes it addresses the need for a better park, but their needs to be a integration with the existing play area.
1	a. Option D enhancement proposed for off-leash area is imo best, but should consider increasing overall area allotted given new residences will increase demand for dog uses. Not clear how 'open' access into off-leash area is. Creating a narrowing/throat reinforces off-leash area from remaining park as on-leash. b. Pedestrian access @ Stewart/Swann - good but imo, existing n/s path need not follow current alignment. That path exists only due to impediments which were removed. c. Proposed berms intended to "provide sense of enclosure" - good. Creating permeability into/out of park - good. d. Buffering (#5, #6) to east edge should move to west edge of path. Buffering of existing warehouses is utterly unnecessary. e. Bollards @ Rt. 1 instead of industrial gate - good/more welcoming.
1	Yes. I'd prefer a design that is more supportive of through bicycling but recognize that as, not being an immediate neighbor, that my needs are likely different than others.
1	Yes, we love the addition of a fenced dog park. Also, we like the widening of the park and adding a street along the path.
1	I would like to see an additional trail added on the east side of the park from Fannon to the south entrance to the park.
1	No, I am strongly opposed to the road running alongside the park for automobiles. The beauty of this particular green space is its feeling of being disconnected from cars. I would like to see the City and Triangle developer be a bit more creative in working with the natural environment and history of this space instead of compromising its unique qualities.

Count Response

1	My main use of the park is the dog exercise area. I like that the dog exercise area is so long, really providing a space for the dogs to run and play fetch. The new park would not continue to meet this need. As someone who walks through this park on a daily basis, I can attest that most of the residents who utilize this park do so with their dog.
1	Yes, highest priority for my family would be fixing drainage of existing dog park and nearby areas (currently next to useless since almost always flooded).
1	No. providing access from the sides of the park (especially from the oakville side where the population density is approximately 10 fold higher than the del ray side) will SIGNIFICANTLY diminish the value of the trail as a walking path. The north half of the trail will function primarily as a backyard to the town homes and apartments that will butt up next to it. Users will no longer feel compelled to walk the length of the trail which will create areas of high, stagnant, density. Furthermore, making the pathways north of swann suitable for bike traffic will further detract from the experience and will just add a component of stress to the pedestrians who will no need to look over their shoulder. It will become like Mt Jefferson Park north of Raymond (except with many more users) which clearly has much less appeal as a natural urban trail.
1	In general it looks okay but I believe the link between Stewart and Swann MUST be impervious. This will be the main route for many people to get between Rt. 1 and Mount Vernon Ave. Only an impervious surface will satisfy cyclists and strollers.
1	The plan should ensure that the park is open to all, including those in wheelchairs, with walkers or with strollers. Bonus points if it is accessible to those on bikes or rollerblades!
1	For the most part I think that it does. I think it is important to have the park feel safer and less isolated, while still maintaining its "natural" feel. I also think the park should not become Oakville's park, by being open on the Oakville side, but closed off by homes on the Del Ray side. I am not sure why the new trail will only be hard pack (suitable for bikes) up to the Stewart/Swann connection rather than all the way through the park?
1	Not entirely. I live on the paved trail near Commonwealth and travel it often with my dog. It would be nice if the dog park was completely enclosed. I have a rescue dog like many people in the neighborhood, and he cannot be off leash. There is only one on leash dog park in the area, but given the number of dogs in the area (particularly rescue dogs like mine) and the growing community on this side of Del Ray with the redevelopment efforts, I think a second enclosed dog park would be justified and provide a safe space for roaming dogs to play.
1	Yes/No - Don't care for cut through @Stewart. Bridge would be *much* better; having one entrance/exit is one of its most valuable assets; Drainage enhancements very much needed

2. Does the draft plan reflect and balance the community needs and comments received to date?(click here to see previous community comments)

Count Response

1	I appreciate the need for a dog park, but I would hate for the whole thing to become one.
1	I have not read previous comments
1	I would call this reasonable.
1	More or less
1	Mostly, they seem sort of mixed.
1	No, because "natural" trail surfaces are still called for in the east end.
1	No, trail surface options should be limited to those that allow access for all.
1	Somewhat
6	Yes

Count Response

1	Yes and I believe that an enclosed dog park would be a great addition.
1	mostly.
1	unknown
3	yes
1	No - Raymond Ave. needs better traffic calming between Dewitt and Montrose. Cars and trucks use this as a main cut-thru between Mount Vernon and Route 1. With the playground area it is not safe for children and pedestrians. Better containment around the play area.
1	Not enough enclosure to the park. The current residents only have two points of access to the park (soon to have three). The new users should have the same points of access. Suggest a fence along Park Road with two openings (since one of the openings is at Custis Ave).
1	What sort of transition materials/buffers are going to be installed between the Oakville property and the Mount Jefferson Greenway ROW
1	No - I really don't believe anyone (or at least a significant amount) of the community wants a cut through @Stewart
1	Some residents say no, some dog owners say no. Sounds like the beginning of a compromise to me ;-)
1	The dog park needs to be fenced-in. My dog loves to walk along the trail, but she is not good with other dogs. Right now, the unfenced off-leash area makes me very nervous that a dog will come up to her and she will get defensive and it gets ugly fast.
1	No, the community wants this area to retain its feeling of seclusion. The area should be opened up to pedestrians and cyclists (and dogs!) as a beautiful path and peaceful alternative to Route 1, as this design does. However, the proposed Park Road running parallel ruins any improvements to the space. If the Triangle developer doesn't want to alter their design, turn Park Road into a pedestrian only plaza with cafes and benches, farmer's market, chess tables, water features, street art, mimic a train station. Do not allow vehicle traffic here, it is unnecessary and the small benefit it may provide (to whom?) does not warrant destroying the unique character of this space. The immediate community will not be driving to this park therefore this road in my eyes serves no purpose other than to provide parking spaces for the Triangle development. This is not desirable. Provide pedestrian/cyclist access points from Triangle to Del Ray (via the park) but design a stronger green border along the east boundary of the park to maintain the illusion of being in a forest path.
1	No. During the 11/18 park planning meeting there was overwhelming support in the room for keeping the trail a pedestrian trail and limiting access only to the Custis and Raymond entrances. Also suggested, as a means of addressing the desire to connect del ray with the commercial/community assets of Oakville and vice versa, a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the trail at Stewart/Swann was suggested. These ideas drew a large round of applause. So much so that folks on the city planning team even suggested that the current planned access from the del ray side scheduled to be put in next month should probably also be reconsidered. In the attached notes, there are 7 comments explicitly calling for end-only access and 3 comments supporting the idea of a foot/bike bridge. There were zero comments suggesting that a berm would be sufficient and yet that's the current plan. It's clear that at least one member of the citizens' committee really likes the berm-plus-cut-through concept, but where are the all the voices calling for this? Why have these ideas been removed from consideration? I have heard mumblings about cost, but no estimates on the incremental cost of bridge/wall construction have been obtained.
1	Again, for the most part, yes. I think the dog exercise situation needs to be resolved, but I don't think scheduling specific hours for the whole park to be available is a good solution. The hours proposed are peak use hours for any user, not just dog owners. Additionally, I liked the idea of having the townhomes back onto the park, rather than the road - this idea does not seem to have been considered, but it would really buffer the park from traffic and noise.

Preference for Option A at Raymond to Swann/Stewart Trail**3. Explain-Option A**

Count	Response
1	Doesn't address storm run-off from higher elevation.
1	I can't really tell the difference

3. Preference for Option B at Raymond to Swann/Stewart Trail

3. Explain-Option B

Count	Response
1	Area needs to be enclosed with fence but needs to extend further into the park.
1	Doesn't address storm run-off from higher elevation.
1	Like fence.
1	slight preference. I think you need to have a fence. Other options seem like overkill.

3. Preference for Option C at Raymond to Swann/Stewart Trail

3. Explain-Option C

Count	Response
1	Doesn't address storm run-off from higher elevation.
1	I like the seated wall idea and prefer a fence on all sides of the dog park.
1	I like the seating on the retaining wall.
1	Solely based on the largest square footage for dog park.
1	Yay for sitting!
1	large area for dog use area
1	I like the sitting wall within the dog park and the fence/landscaping running along the path. The fence should be high enough that dogs can't jump it from the sitting wall.
1	I like the low wall, it'll be more attractive. the bioswale idea makes me nervous- we already have terrible mosquito issues, and I'm afraid it would not improve the situation at all.

3. Preference for Option D at Raymond to Swann/Stewart Trail

3. Explain-Option D

Count	Response
1	Can't let all that dog poop go straight into our streams. Bioswale for filtration!
1	I actually can't figure out the differences
1	I find this is a good compromise of space between the park and trail and water management.

Count Response

1	I would love to bring my dog here.
1	Seems to provide better separation between dog park & trail
1	I think?! I'm not entirely sure what a bioswale is, but you need to be keenly aware of the fact that there are pit bulls who go to this dog park and you have moved the dog area to within STEPS of a children's park directly across the street.
1	Positive: Addresses storm run-off from higher elevation. Provides some seating for dog owners. Negative: Does not increase overall area as much as Option B or C. This can be overcome by lengthening the off-leash area as was proposed in October 2013.

4. Preference for Option A at Swann/Stewart Crossing

4. Explain-Option A

Count Response

1	I suspect less foliage here will improve safety
1	Would actually prefer no access from Stewart
1	more grass, less bushes
1	ornamental trees do little for me

4. Preference for Option B at Swann/Stewart Crossing

4. Explain-Option B

Count Response

1	Berm to abate noise from street.
1	Bravo shade trees!
1	I can't really figure out the diff
1	I like the additional landscaping
1	I like the berm as a noise barrier
1	Landscape berms will be more attractive
1	Like more plants between path and street.
1	Maximizes separation between park and road, which is important.
1	Preference for more foliage
1	Why wouldn't one prefer landscape enhancements, if they are indeed enhancements?
1	i can't really tell the difference
1	more vegetation is better
1	provides screening from park road

Count Response

1	Need to enclose the park more. Suggest fence along to restrict open access. People will walk across landscaping especially when it is not established.
1	Landscape berms along Park Drive attempt to replicate current sense of enclosure. Enhanced landscaping elsewhere encourages passive use and may help deter undesirable activities. Again, be not married to existing path location which exists by virtue of barriers with gates (All were removed several years ago) and drainage issues that should (as promised) be resolved.
1	Honestly neither, I do not think Park Road should be there. If it must be, allow it to be pedestrian only extension of the Plaza and Retail space. Block with landscape berm and more trees to retain forest feel in the park.

5. Preference for Option A at reclaimed park area

5. Explain-Option A

Count Response

1	The trail in option B seems too elaborate. Maybe a simpler connection between Fannon St and the trail? Otherwise you'll likely get a "desire path."
1	The solitary path retains more of the original forest character. I don't think Park Road should be there. Add more trees along the border of the park to buffer the path from the new Triangle development and cars.
1	Do not believe 2nd trail is necessary, seems like it could be added at a later date as an improvement if desired.
1	The additional pathway fragments the narrow park. Considering how far the residents of Del Ray have to walk to enter the park, it is not that big of a deal to ask Oakville residents to do the same.

5. Preference for Option B at reclaimed park area

5. Explain-Option B

Count Response

1	I like the idea of the spur trail.
1	I like the two trails.
1	I like the two walkway option
1	I'm not big on ornamental trees but I like the second trail to connect to Fannon.
1	Like more plants between path and street.
1	Need the spur trail connectivity so that more people can enjoy the park!
1	Preference for more foliage.
1	There should be a trail connection to the street here.
1	Trail should run south back to main entrance at route 1
1	appreciate multiple paths and more landscaping
1	i like the spur trail idea

Count Response

1	more options for encounter avoidance
1	I like the spur- it'll give dog walkers more options since one since the more direct option will end up being utilized more for bikers/runners (and the hard surface trail improvements will result in improved bike conditions)
1	A second path is good if there are people walking dogs that they do not want to introduce to each other. They can stay separate and keep on with their walk.
1	Berms! Berms! Berms! Examine paths of least resistance ('cause, let's face it, people are lazy! And if you don't believe that then go look at all the folks who park as close to the door at the YMCA to go exercise.)

6. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions related to the overall plan and trail sections.

Count Response

1	Build it.
1	If wheeled vehicles aren't using Stewart/Swann, you did it wrong.
1	Strongly prefer no access to/from Stewart Ave
1	This seems like a park for Oakville and not a park for Del Ray.
1	I'll just note that this will completely change the character of the area and eliminate its use as a trail and turn it into a static park/front yard for the new apartment buildings that will go up. The trail should have RESTRICTED access on both sides instead of turning it into a green strip part with limited access from Del Ray
1	I recognize this is a tough balancing act, but IMHO it is important to keep the park as natural and continuous as possible, while improving entry/exit points and landscaping. Also, to reiterate, this should not become Oakville's park by default since it is more open on that side of the park.
1	The swann/stewart trail seems to connect at a pedestrian plaza of some kind. I suggest that the optimum connection for biking not be the one that goes through a pedestrian plaza. Maybe I'm mis-reading it.
1	Overall good and doesn't appear to be a huge difference between the options (all of them would be an improvement).
1	Are their going to be repairs to the existing storm drainage system within Mount Jefferson Greenway
1	The trails should be wide enough for two wheelchairs to comfortable pass each other. ALL trails should be asphalt, concrete or another surface that is smooth enough for wheelchairs and strollers.
1	Unlike (too many of I'm dismayed to hear) Del Ray residents, I believe the park should be as welcoming to Oakville residents as it is respectful of Randolph/Raymond Ave residents. This is a city park, a public amenity, not a private enclave for dog owners (regardless of them disobeying/obeying leash laws). I think staff has done an admirable job of initially trying to address the many highly conflicting requests while remaining true to the department's purpose.
1	Connections between Oakville Triangle and existing Del Ray neighborhoods and providing access to US 1 and the new BRT station is extremely important.
1	Nothing in this plan shows integration between the dog park area and the playground - the greenway doesn't stop at Raymond. Would like to see some idea of what that transition is going to consist of. The play area was recently upgraded, but the pathways from Raymond onto the greenway is less than desirable.
1	Thanks--all these improvements will go a long way to addressing a very deteriorating public area. For those that want to keep the area untouched--you clearly don't use it. It's a mosquito infested, garbage strewn mess in parts. More usable trails, natural landscaping, better storm water management and greater safety and visibility are vital. Certainly, let's also keep the dog area as well! Raymond Ave resident with kids and dog.

Count Response

-
- | Count | Response |
|-------|--|
| 1 | End only access should be seriously reconsidered. I will volunteer my time to provide cost estimates for decorative walls and bridges. I suspect that if it came down to it, significant funding could be raised to offset some or all of these costs in order to provide the community with a really unique and valuable asset. Required reading for the committee: W.G. Clark "Replacement" (2-page essay describing good settlement) |
| 1 | 1. This is primarily an area in the middle of the city where kids can run for a 1/2 mile. I like that its mostly fenced, and the kids can't get away. Opening the trail up to a nearby road eliminates one of the parks biggest benefits. 2. Its semi-untouched. or as closes as you can get in the city. 3. Storm water management is biggest improvement required. |
| 1 | Honestly, the little dog "exercise" area is pretty useless. No one really uses it. It's too close to the Raymond. It's not safe. It's us dog walkers who mostly use the entire length of the park. It is so serene and quiet. I know some neighbors on Randolph don't want dogs to get access to the entire park, but if you focus on use, we're the ones who use it. Only one owner who has a hole in his fence has ever complained. |
| 1 | I would like to see the Jefferson Park path provide an easy connection for pedestrians and cyclists to access Mount Vernon trail. This would be useful for Del Ray bike commuters and very desirable for families as a healthy and safe way to explore the city without driving. Ideally, I would love to see a pedestrian/bike bridge over Route 1 to avoid having to cross such a dangerous commuter road. Extend the forest path above the road (award-winning design with trees and landscaping!) but also allow access to Route 1 for people walking their dogs to Del Ray vet clinic. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts! |
| 1 | This is likely to be an improvement to the area I care most about as I'm the second house to the left of the park on Raymond, but the proximity of a dog area to the street and to the park across the street give me concern. I also worry about the constant noise of dog barking near my house and would want to consider some sort of mitigation strategy there. Open/close times? I think the plan calls for it but we'll need new trees planted to help with sound etc at the entrance at Raymond Ave. |
| 1 | Trail should be MINIMUM 10' wide, and be easily accessible to strollers, wheelchairs and bikes even after heavy rains. If that's possible with a permeable/semipermeable surface then great. If not, suck it up and do asphalt. |