

**Chastain Park Civic Association
Board Meeting, June 2, 2008**

The Chastain Park Civic Association (“CPCA”) met on June 2, 2008. A quorum was present. A motion was made and seconded to approve the April minutes.

Jubal Gatwood reported that membership is right on target.

Caroline King reported on behalf of Melissa Abad that Chastain Chill, which has held twice at the playground on Tuesdays from 4pm – 7pm, was successful with approximately 100 people attending the first event and 150 attendees at the second event.

Jim King reported that the swimming pool is opening the season with 238 members. The renovations to the pool and facility have been completed. With improvements such as the new lanes, the refurbished ladies locker rooms and the warmer water temperature, Jim asked everyone to encourage their neighbors to visit the pool and join. He reminded everyone that Caroline King is in charge of membership.

Brian McHugh and Kirk Oppenlander reported on the joint traffic study. Currently, their goal is to find solutions for intersections where traffic dead ends or crosses over major arteries. After meeting with Lorn Whittaker from the City of Atlanta (“COA”) Public Works Department, they have identified 4 critical intersections: Powers Ferry Road at its intersections of Hillside, Pineland and Lake Forrest Drive at Interlochen Drive and Laurel Drive. It is under discussion to place stop signs at these intersections for all directions of traffic. They asked people to report accidents all accidents at these intersections because that data is used to determine qualifications for the addition of stop signs. Currently, due to a lack of reported accidents the Powers Ferry Road / Hillside intersection does not qualify for a stop sign.

Additionally, the other projects include: maintenance e.g. replacing signs / striping and general clean-up, the transportation portion of the Master Plan as well as entrance features to the park. They are also looking into extending PATH up from Sutton and Jett Road. Several questions were posed about the speed limit in the park including the purpose for the number of different speed limit signs and the possibility of having a uniform 25 mph speed limit. Jim King noted that the different speed limits were due to the varying speed limits set for speed bumps and school zones.

Jim King gave a report on behalf of Brink Dickerson about several pieces of City of Atlanta parks legislation regarding contracts, memo-of-understandings (MOU’s) and permits for operating in city parks. Jim stated that a group of attorneys represented our Chastain Park community/non-profits, as well as other Buckhead non-profits to ensure that our interests were protected. He said that the original legislation was improved to the satisfaction of the attorneys. Jim said that Brink can address further when he arrives.

The Chastain Horse Park (CHP) was able to extend its lease with by 15 years with the hope of receiving significant funding from private sources. Amy Lance added that there was an increase in CHP's rent, plus the extension to help procure more money to improve Horse Park. Mac Leath added that the Horse Park bond debt had not been retired yet and the net effect of the 15 year extension was a 25 year lease, which was close to the original contract including the original option clause.

John Williams gave the results of the Tennis Center study group. He gave a brief background on the history of the Master Plan. Bill Kasper, the CPCA representative in the creation of the Master Plan, worked with the Chastain Park Conservancy ("CPC") to ensure that there would be continued neighborhood representation within the master plan process. Language was drafted and added to the master plan which created the study group process. The CPC and the parks services supported the study group process.

The study group for the tennis center consisted of Mark Root (CPC), Teresa Breckenridge (CPC), Peggy Johnson (COA), John Williams (CPCA), Allen Graber (CPC), Robert Jackson (CPC) and Sherri Kimmell (CPC). The study group held five open houses during which time attendees reviewed plans for tennis center, which included in the 2,015 square foot structure inclusive of a pro-shop and locker rooms to replace what is now a 1,100 square foot building. Attendees were then asked to complete a survey as to their likes and dislikes. The first open house held by the study group was on April 2, 2008. Feedback from that open house reflected that attendees wanted an additional tennis court. The study group requested from Harrison Design, which was acting on a pro-bono basis, a revised rendering to reflect an additional court. The revision presented did not show an additional court but did reflect a 2,800 tennis center housing a twenty person conference room. This was contrary to responses from study group's open houses where 11 responders asked for additional court space and only 5 requested a conference room. The study group again asked for a rendering with an additional tennis court. However, by the study group's last meeting, the revised document only a now 3,200 square feet tennis center with yet no additional court. The study group had asked several times for this additional court reflecting a 3/4/3 set-up. The additional court concept was endorsed by Clair Muller and Diane Harnell-Cohen. And, yet this revision was never provided by the CPC to the study group.

John stated that he was concerned about the viability of the study group process for the following reasons:

- 1) This is a test of the sub-group process with additional projects to follow. It appears that the study group process doesn't work.
- 2) Initially CPC stated that the Master Plan was a flexible / living document that would allow for community input. However, now they state that any deviation from the Master Plan requires an amendment to the Master Plan which would entail getting going through a formal approval process with the park services.

- 3) The proposal of the study group supported the 3/4/3 structure with additional court.

Oscar Hurtado, an instructor at the tennis center stated that he had initially thought of the idea of a conference room. He had asked Peggy about a room to use for rainy days when lessons were scheduled. He also thought that they could use the room to have a Tennis Center Academy 9a – 5p for 10-18 kids. Additionally, they could use them room to show videos for PTR member workshop for certification. None of this can be currently done because there is not a conference room. Oscar went onto say that the size of the proposed conference room is not large enough room to address these needs. Oscar went on to say that addition tennis courts are also needed. In the Spring the Galloway tennis team uses 6 Courts from 2:30p – 5:00p. The five Pros at the center share 3 courts. Then there is the tennis academy. And, starting at 5pm additional people come to the courts.

Bill Kasper stated that he struggles with proposed conference room. He asked the amount revenue generated by conference room. He pointed out that other tennis centers have strong youth programs but one does not current at Chastain. Kurt Oppenlander asked what revenue would be generated by the additional court vs. a conference room. John stated that an additional court could support an additional five tennis teams bring in \$80 per play. He went on to say that this \$800K opportunity bond is the community's money, and, that in this revenue constrained environment a court would be more profitable than a conference room. Penelope Malone asked if the proposed court would come from practice court. John Williams stated that it the practice court would remain with the play courts having a 3-4-3 set-up. Penelope also asked if anyone other than Galloway tied-up courts? John Williams answered that both Galloway and Sutton use the tennis center.

Caroline King stated that a 3,200 square feet structure is larger than the size of some houses. She asked if the tennis center would be one or two stories. Bill Kasper stated that you would need to increase the size of the existing 1,100 square foot structure to 1,800 square foot max to accommodate green space and visual space. Caroline King asked it the size of the conference room was the size of this meeting room? John Williams stated that during the study group process that the size of the conference room grew.

There was discussion about the impact of LEED Certification on the project. Did LEED Certification drive the footprint size of the project? Would the addition of a tennis court with a tank for run-off meet LEED requirements? LEED requirements did not drive the footprint. LEED Certification has different criteria for new and existing projects.

Caroline King said with a 5 man study group test case she didn't trust going forward. John Williams stated he was not convinced study group process gives us a voice. It was asked if the structure and court be on same lot. John Williams answered in his opinion it could if a basic conference room was built.

Jim King stated that it needed to be clarified who was in charge of the tennis center project. That it appeared that the CPC was in charge when it should be led by the city park services department. He went on to say that the timeline for the bond money should be through year end. Jim then went on to commend John Williams saying that John had done a yeoman's job even though the numbers were not provided to him. Although, the committee process is not pretty – not park commissioner's fault and we need to have discussions.

Jim stated that he was concerned about the tennis center project and the study group process because of the following issues:

- John's questions were not answered
- several new inputs
- open house identified the need for additional courts
- open house reflected that people prioritized courts over conference space
- play is difficult in three courts to play w/o net - must address in proposal
- told during Master Plan process that it is a living document – CPCA approved MP because we were told changes/modifications could made going forward

He went on to say that if the point was to build more courts for tennis center, then groups could use other offsite meeting rooms, such as Galloway. He said that the impervious surface constraints could limit building foot print. \$800K can build adequate structure and court.

Mark Root commended John William's efforts. He went on to review the MP process. He stated that a lot of community input went in the MP but that it didn't include courts. He went on to say that the original plan for the tennis center included 3,200 square foot facility and a 20 person conference room. He stated that it was left out of the subgroup because it moved quickly. He explained that the conference room need was stated by COA. He said that they vetted four options:

- 1) 9 court – 4 court / 18 mo initial
- 2) Additional 2 clay courts in front
- 3) Rebuild building itself and add rebuild as basement with green-space
- 4) Was discussion for welcome center on top

He explained that the tennis center needed space for public facilities including vending. He went on to give the history of the CPC association with the tennis center. He stated that once CPC had completed the MP they could relax and start a new activity. He said that the Conservancy asked about the status of pool and tennis center – city stated overhead needed help. He explained that the Conservancy offered to help. He said that CPC didn't want to loose the opportunity bond money. He pointed out that CPC didn't micro-manage gym / pool. He stated that one should consider the investment for conservancy and the significant pro-bono work Harrison Design and Ed Castro. He said that the building will be competitively bid. He went on to say that the initial 2,000 square feet of building added a conference room. He said that they vetted against 2,000

square foot building for estimate bid. There was no formal bid - no definitive cost. It could be \$80k - \$70k.

Mark went on to ask if the CPCA wanted more tennis courts. He asked if it was the broad community or the tennis community. He said that the 3/4/3 configuration could be balanced. He went on to say that an extra court would mean more team time than individual time. Mark stated the CPC was in the position to balance 3/4/3 courts, patio, green space, and picnic area. He stated that the bleachers on each side were gone, an architectural dream with environmentally rolling hills and solar recycling impact. Mark stated that the possibilities were:

1) Courts

a) Court y/n = y

b) Court first building 2nd or building 1st and court 2nd - Variance to mp

2) Conference room – original plan Oct / Jan

Mark reminded everyone that COA is the tenant. They do the programming. They determined the need of conference room. He said that the Gym / Pool projects were not micro managed – the client asked for it. John Williams asked why an additional court would be a variation to the master plan (MP). Mark Root answered that the MP talks of land use if we add additional court it changes the use of the land. He went on to say that the neighborhood asked for increased green space not an additional court.

John Williams asked if the MP allowed for additional elements or programming? Mark Root answered by comparing it to PATH vs. programming? MP now calls for additional PATH sidewalks. Caroline King stated that the MP does not appear to be flexible? Mark Root said that it is within the scope, e.g. NYO and proposed road behind the gym. Mark went on to say that the study group called for new facility / building. It was the general idea of CPCA that that in approving the MP that in discussing details that neighborhood concerns would be listened to and addressed. Caroline questioned did the study group call for all of it? It was stated that the MPA approval process would discuss in detail and that concerns would be addressed and listened to. Mark Root stated that Harrison Design still has cost invested although pro-bono and that CPC didn't want to ask to re-do plans for 2 courts. John Williams stated that the study group asked for revision after 1, 3, and 4 meetings. Mark Root stated that there is a difference between a floor plan and site plan. Jim King pointed out to Mark Root that he was a representative of the CPC.

At that time, Justin Wiedeman and J.P. Matzigkeit both interrupted the meeting from the audience and were not recognized to speak.

John Williams asked Mark Root to confirm that the next step for the Tennis Center was for the proposal to go before the NPU's. Mark confirmed approximately \$830,000 site plan for Option 4 would be presented. Mark stated that the bond money was required to be spent by December 31, 2008. John

Williams pointed out that the study group process was slow with a 6 week lag between meetings. Jim King asked John if there was a willingness to build a court and a building with the balance. He said that both should be able to be financed with the bond money.

Mark pointed out that LEED is a city mandate. Jim King summarized CPCA feelings by stating that John Williams felt he and study group were ignored. If you ignore John and the study group then you ignore CPCA. Mark stated that this was just a difference in philosophy. Since the Master Plan didn't reflect a court then the Opportunity bond is only for the building. Jim King pointed out that the Opportunity Bond was not only for the tennis center but also the gym and the pool. He stated that there were issues in the MP methodology and in the way the MP survey was created and the corresponding results. He referred to Jo Elliott's past comments about the original MP survey in which the CPC (Conservancy) asked the questions in the context of a green organization with very few specific questions and subjectively correlated the survey results. Also, he pointed out that the Opportunity Bond is money derived from COA tax dollars. If tax payers have requested an additional court then their tax dollars should be used to build an additional court.

Mark Reece stated that we could prioritize the tennis center and the additional court as follows:

- 1) build base building
- 2) build court
- 3) build addition for conference room

Caroline King asked when the plans for the tennis center were to be presented. John Williams stated that it goes before the UDC on June 9 and NPU-A on July 1. Jim King stated that as John Williams said this is a test case for study groups

Mark Root said that the recommendation from CPC is:

- 1) build building including conference room
- 2) build court
- 3) recoat courts

Mark Root said that the Opportunity Bond Money was distributed in Chastain as follows:

\$1M pool
\$200K gym
\$800K tennis center

Mark Root stated that Recreation has always asked for conference room.

Justin Wiedeman and J.P. Matzigkeit both interrupted the meeting from the audience again and were ruled out-of-order by the chair. Statements were exchanged concerning the circumstances about Justin's prior exit from the CPCA board. In addition, there was a reference to the circumstances regarding the initial funding/motion for support by the CPCA for the master plan.

Bill Kasper stated as the last comment about the MP and study group process that he wanted to pointed out that we will get to issues we disagree on and it's ok to disagree. But that in this case CPCA doesn't know where CPC is coming from and feels that CPC didn't give it their all.

Brink Dickerson stated he had three issues:

- 1) Hope MP doesn't have to be amended for every change; this will take a lot of unnecessary time
- 2) Process issue
- 3) Building will last a long time – tennis courts don't. You can only build a building once. The building will have a greater level of operating permanence.

Mark Reese: Base on option number

Mark Root: Option #4

Jim asked Mark Reese if he motioned for:

- 1) Accomplish base building of modest size and scope
- 2) Build court
- 3) Court and building
- 4) Conference room

The CPCA Board was asked to approve with above priorities. Additionally, Mark Elliott asked that all support would be withdrawn if project used more than \$800K from Chastain Park designated Opportunity Bond monies because the gym's \$500K had been reduced to \$200K with the remainder given to the tennis center.

Quick math by Mac Leath = \$750+ / court =

Jim clarifies Caroline's motion with Mark Elliott's amendment to propose court and building be built in \$800K within the existing \$800K budget.

Tennis Center: To build an adequate new building and an additional tennis court within the \$800,000 Opportunity Bond budget. Also, it is stipulated that if the project exceeds the \$800,000 that it not use the additional Opportunity Bond monies (\$200,000) specifically allocated for the upgrade of the Chastain Gym. In such a case, CPCA support would be withdrawn.

Y= all

N=0

A=1 (Brink)

Todd Davis gave an update about security in and around the park. He stated that the Buckhead Alliance has installed five security cameras around the park area including three in the park, one at Landmark Diner and one at Filene's Pizza.

The cameras feed directly into the local zone of the Atlanta Police Department and are managed by Kendall Craig at the Buckhead Alliance. Currently, the park cameras are financed by Buckhead Alliance until they can be adopted. Todd stated that there is nothing to report for our police zone. Additionally, he stated that he will update the CPAC website with the letter regarding CPAC's of the CoA to close Park Drive at night as well as links to the representatives to contact to petition.

Kirk Oppenlander and Mark Reese stated that there were no issues to report in NPU-A and NPA-B. Penelope Malone reported that there was no news to report from Sandy Springs. She stated that sidewalks are underway on Windsor Parkway from YMCA soccer fields to Roswell Road. Susan Pitt is currently researching the concept of neighborhood parking permits and has looked into parking permits in the Ansley Park neighborhood. Currently, parking is not allowed on both Stella and Dudley from 7 pm to 11 pm. Carlos Moreno reported that the COA is responded positively to inquiries about putting a sidewalk on Dudley lane. Jim King stated that the goal is to connect via sidewalks all arteries around the park.

Caroline King proposed on behalf of Melissa Abad that a Fourth of July Parade be held as a neighborhood event. Melissa had suggested the event to be held at the park on July 4. She envisioned a parade with neighborhood children and families on bicycles and wagons decorated with crepe paper and afterward family entertainment with a fire truck, band, face painting and food. Melissa has contacted the neighborhood fire station and applied for the park permit. The parade would be from 10:30 am to 12:30 pm followed by a cook-out at the pool. If this were a success perhaps it could be followed with an event at Halloween. Please contact Melissa if you are interested in volunteering at the event.