

## **UACC Comments Submitted 8/17/20 to the MUNI Regarding Parking Lot Improvements at University Lake Park**

From: **Steven Callaghan** <[arborsurv@gmail.com](mailto:arborsurv@gmail.com)>

Date: Mon, Aug 17, 2020 at 10:28 PM

Subject: University Lake Park Comments

To: <[lori.blake@anchorageak.gov](mailto:lori.blake@anchorageak.gov)>, <[corliss.kimmel@anchorageak.gov](mailto:corliss.kimmel@anchorageak.gov)>

Hello Corliss and Lori,

Following are comments from UACC regarding the improvements at University Lake Park, Planning Case 2020-0102

Comment group #1, proposed path on the south side:

I did briefly look at the master plan and the plan set for the parking, and the only thing that stands out to me is the master plan has a new proposed path on the south side of the parking that the extended access road to the parking accommodate however I don't see that path on the plan set So I guess I would just question that should the path go in in the future or if it's still in the plan would this parking accommodate it? It also seems like there is a lot of concern about mixed uses of the park (unleashed dogs and other recreators), it looks like there's only one path to take from lot parking lot and I'm not sure if that is used by all or at what point you have to have your dog on a leash? I guess maybe just ensuring there is enough signage for what is allowed on the only access from the parking lot. Otherwise I think it looks like a good plan. I assume that is the maximum number of Parking spaces that will fit in the lot.

Perhaps future improvements could include additional connections to the parking lot from the University Lake Park path and other pedestrian routes to improve connectivity.

Comment group #2, overall parking lot comments:

I took some time looking this over and seeing exactly how the new 49-car parking lot is placed in the park relative to the existing 20-car lot that it will replace. The design seems well thought out and very functional. It mentions that the park doesn't now have a playground or picnic area and I agree with the plan that having contingency parking for either would be warranted. I could see a not unlikely event of a dog getting loose and threatening children or eating someone's lunch - things clearly to be avoided.

One ongoing issue with the existing conditions at the park is bad actors hiding in the bushy areas surrounding the 20-car parking lot waiting to break into park users vehicles when no-one else is around. Please request the Muni to assure that the greenery in and to proximate to (within 20-30 feet) the parking area be designed to provide no

camouflage opportunity for anyone to hide. To me, that means only single trunk indigenous trees (e.g., birch) and/or possibly a hardy ground cover (e.g, dogwood) that can't grow more than about 6" high, but no bushes.

Appears future amenities have been planned and the parking is adequate. Will there be a need for water or sewer? Is there enough room for a fire truck turnaround? If a structure or picnic shelter is constructed, a turnaround may be needed.

Comment group #3, entrance area from parking lot:

Looks like what was in the UL master plan. In addition I think that they should put a chicane fence in the gravel walkway that goes from the dog trail to the intersection of the bike trail, where the little flower roundabout is located. Need to discourage people from congregating in this area with their dogs, which they currently do, and avoid creating a bike/dog collision conflict.

I support the recommendation for a chicane fence to prevent dog/bike collisions would make an excellent addition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,

Steven Callaghan  
UACC  
907-529-2446