

*Noe Courts Park  
Park Improvement Plan*  
**Community Meeting #4 - November 13, 2013**

## **Transcription of Comment Cards**

---

Keep the park as is! As it was originally conceived, not as a place for dogs to play fetch, but as a place for children and adults to exercise and meet. Option D. Elizabeth 1/2 block.

Spend the \$\$\$! Enforce a dog-free area (in conjunction with an off-leash area. I lived in the neighborhood since 1974. Even after the 1980/81 upgrade, the tennis courts were always very highly used. The basketball/backboard court was always more used. Starting in the 1990s off-leash dog use increased to the detriment of other activities. Would like to change that. 800 block Elizabeth.

I like Option A from tonight. I liked Option 3 from June but #2 and #1 were also acceptable to me. 800 block Elizabeth.

Vote for Option D. All plans that make a dog area violate the dog policy. Tennis court needs to remain separate from basketball court. Sharing one space won't work. Exercise is needed to combat obesity. Dogs should go up to Douglas – the legal off-leash dog park.

Expanding green space is unrealistic because it will turn brown and messy as long as the Parks and Rec Dept. doesn't enforce the on-leash dog regulation. Better to keep the current layout with improvements like more attractive fencing and shrubbery. No lights please as they would contribute to noise in the evening and would shine on houses around the park.

Thank you very much to take the time to refine the plan – it is clear that the department put considerable time and effort into the proposal. I'm disappointed to see the proposal to delete or demote the tennis court. I enjoy the court and wish to see it remain. Your proposal to create a corral for dogs is a clever design, most dogs are let off-leash and this design will help maintain the dogs in one place. Noe Street at 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Great plan C, separating dog area, putting them in current tennis court space. Only please make a fence high enough to keep dogs in that designated space. Also, please allot some of that people only space/or the small children. They have no grass.

Keep the tennis court! Keep basketball court separate! No to multi-use tennis/basketball. That is a recipe for trouble. Keep the layout the way it is; just improve the drainage on the grass. 22<sup>nd</sup> and Douglass.

Please save the courts! 24<sup>th</sup> St.

Favor Option D – something like today or original concept that won the grant. Improving, not eliminating the tennis court should be a no-brainer. It serves as a necessary and secure place, especially in winter. I signed Larry Kane's earlier petition and still support its content.

If forced, I would choose B. But it represents too much of a collision of uses. Children actually use hardtop a lot, so attempting to maximize “green space” seems short-sighted. I would favor the original concept plan from 3 years ago. 24<sup>th</sup> and Homestead.

If more parents of younger children could have been here (difficult with dinner/bedtimes), there would have been more votes for Option C which creates a contiguous space for people (basketball courts, people grass and playground) with a separate space for dogs. In options A & B the dog space bisects the people space which isn't ideal. With Option C I'm picturing setting up a picnic in the center of the park on tables or grass while the older kids play on the courts and the younger on the playground – while parents can keep an eye on everyone in the center. I also highly stress the importance of fencing off the dog area (not just tiered seating or some such) so dogs stay truly separate (I'm thinking owners never fully follow the on-leash rule though I wish they would considering they have a legal off-leash park at Douglass.) I do not think we should keep park as is with Option D – that would only continue dog-soiled grass not fit for people. Hoffman & 25<sup>th</sup>.

Prefer to keep the multi-use park that have now. Our children (over 18 years) still have 3<sup>rd</sup> grader – have used small child park, tennis and basketball. Developmentally these are all important to have. We often try the Douglass Park first for tennis and when full, try Noe Courts. I am concerned that the focus on needs of younger kids for green open space will not be as useful over the long haul. When courts are utilized all year even when wet and muddy times. 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Choice C is my first choice because it is the most likely to provide sustained and protected green space for humans. I'm a parent of 2 children too old for the playground and too young to use courts. They do however play exclusively on courts in school and I desperately want for them to have green space in their lives. My priorities: #1 green space – increased from current layout, protected against dog excrement-flat to allow for soccer, picnics etc. #2 removal of tennis – too exclusive for a tiny nook sized neighborhood park – adds concrete to a concrete filled city with limited alternate use that isn't already provided by basketball. #3 dogs on leash enforcement – without this the money invested to improve this park will rapidly be degraded. Elizabeth & Noe.

I can't understand why we have 4 meetings and it appears we are back to the same thing that exists. The tennis courts in my opinion are not used.

I am a native San Franciscan, and this process has shown me why it is so hard to get something done in this city. The park is used mostly by people in a 5-6 block area and the first two meetings brought some positive results. When word got out about possible elimination of the tennis courts, it seems like lobbyists from as far away as Hill and Church St. were brought in to “save” the tennis courts. Let's just put it on the ballot. Plenty of tennis courts at 8 Washington. Yes on the Warriors event pavilion. 24<sup>th</sup> St. across from the park.

Parks and Rec need to talk with tennis people/basketball people and dog people on separate meetings and listen to the essence of what each of these groups needs are. Just because you have the funds you don't have to spend it all, either (or use it to hire a “good” designer). I would rather see the current one repaired and add lights for evenings. 24<sup>th</sup> and Hoffman.

I personally would be very disappointed to see the tennis courts go. As a tennis player, I mainly play at other courts because 1. The actual court is often not in an area (dense foggy/drizzly raining seasons) 2. When I have attempted to play against the backboard in the mornings, I was bullied and harassed off by the dog meet-up group. However, I believe first and foremost needs to be the interest of kids of all ages. I do not have kids myself. However, I do agree and understand that as a pocket-park, tennis courts allow only 2-4 people to use at a time. I would be fascinated to see examples of multi-use courts and how communities have dealt and feel about the policy issues or respected times. 24<sup>th</sup> and Hoffman.

The multi-use option would not work on weekends. I am concerned about the conflict. I feel that the tennis court area is also used for children for playing, shooting, bouncing ball. It would be sad to lose tennis to make the dog people happy. I do not live in the neighborhood but I represent SF Tennis. Good luck!

Option D. We have not addressed the needs of teenagers. Kids who don't drive yet. It's not a great neighborhood for kids on bikes. Kids need a place to play sports and organized games and can walk there. Elizabeth St.

Whatever you do, please enforce leash laws! Thank you. 24<sup>th</sup> Street.

The tennis court is a great multi-use space already, Tennis, catch, Frisbee, learning to ride a bike. Kids safe play area. Please strongly reconsider new presentations and renovate what is already in existence. 21<sup>st</sup> St.

Is it true that this is really about dog vs. non-dog people? This is my first meeting. I have a puppy and go to the park every single day. I can count on one hand the number of times I've seen any use of the tennis court. I would support any option that increases green space and delineates a separate space for dogs leaving it as is with improvements would be ok too. Elizabeth St.

I support an Option D that maintains the tennis court, basketball court and a separate dog area. Within the 3 options presented tonight I would have any option that keeps the tennis court and separates the dogs with a high fence. The usage data is flawed because people don't want to play there. 90% of the time when I go to Upper Noe to play tennis, I have to wait. It is in the morning that I try to play tennis and also after school. Vicksburg St.

Thank you for your work. I use the park 2-3x a day and vehemently believe that the tennis courts need to be converted to green space or multi-use. They are under-utilized. Space can be better used. 23<sup>rd</sup> block Douglass/Hoffman.

I'd be happy with Option A or C with a slight preference for A as it maximizes the use of level ground for humans. The idea of the community self-policing the basketball/tennis time share in Option B is absurd. The notion that 2 or 4 tennis players have the right to monopolize such a large swath of such a small park is also absurd. 23<sup>rd</sup> St.

I prefer Option #3/C because I like the people-designated grass area in this one better than using that long grass area for dogs. Also like the green area to be near the playground. If some option to keep both tennis and basketball courts is chosen, I still vote for the area that

links to Douglass and Elizabeth Streets to be for people. Also want to make sure there are some benches with backs in the park for people to sit on. Castro.

It would be really sort sighted to remove the tennis courts. It seems unfair to solve the dog conflict by taking a tennis court away from the tennis players. This hardscape is used in many other ways by many kids. Elizabeth St.

I had to leave early and couldn't vote. I live one block from the park and visit it every day, often twice. I have used it for eight years as a parent and for five more years without kids but with my dog. I have attended all of the meetings. I like A the most. B second although I would drop tennis. I would like C more but there is too little dog space. It would be my favorite of it were significantly larger. Douglass at 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Can you add up lighting so it is not a black hole at night? Up lighting will not allow folks to see but will improve the void at night. Or sell the land and lower our property taxes. 24<sup>th</sup> at Douglass.

Plan A – is the best plan because the neighborhood really needs more green space for neighbors to meet and young children to utilize. As a tennis player, I am ok losing the court. Thanks. 23<sup>rd</sup> between Castro and Noe.

Option 1. Improving on the current footprint including tennis was taken off the table due to low participation in previous meetings. Tonight seven speakers showed that with broad community participation tennis should be able to have a space. 25<sup>th</sup> St.

I was not aware of previous meetings and was very disappointed to hear that the tennis courts are in jeopardy. What happened to repairing/improving the existing plan – keep it multi-use? The USTA numbers that were presented were laughable – completely out of context; without other numbers for comparison. All of us need place for recreation. We need tennis courts! They're currently not used because the condition is so poor. It is very frustrating to see the full tennis courts are not presented as an option! 25<sup>th</sup> St.

I support Plan A and believe it respects the diverse needs of the community. It is important to provide green space for all the community to enjoy. Very important to provide space for residents and their dogs and keep the basketball court. I never see anyone using the tennis court to eliminate it. 24<sup>th</sup> St.

I think any of 3 options (A, B, C) would be good but that Option A is the best. 24<sup>th</sup> St. Please continue to consider school age children. They need flat grass for ball play and black-top for various riding and other ball play. 24<sup>th</sup> St.

After meeting #3 there should have been an option that keeps the tennis court. None of the 3 options are acceptable. Keep the park as it is but divide grass into on-leash dog and no dog area.

I was disappointed to not see a formal proposal for the park that retains a tennis court. I hope that the show of support for Option D will prompt a reconsideration of the plans. The idea of removing athletic courts and fields because their capacity is limited seems terribly

unguided to me. All athletic facilities are limited in this way and I hope that we can agree that design should promote fitness and particularly tennis as an ongoing use for the park. Didn't know about previous meetings. Nightlights, Douglass full, examples of successful shared use. In favor of keeping court. Playing sports requires space, infrastructure. 21<sup>st</sup> St.

I prefer Plan A. Also the data showed we have 3x more courts than the Tennis Association recommends so that seems an obvious solution.

Option D+. Full tennis, 1/2 basketball/ 1/2 grass, kids, dogs. This is better than shared tennis and basketball – removes conflict. Nobody plays full basketball. Church St.

Please don't snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. 800 block Elizabeth St.

I would be very concerned and opposed to lights being added to the plans. Elizabeth St.

I enjoy all areas and uses of this park as part of a family with a dog and 3 kids. But I believe the park is too small to have it all. I think we have to sacrifice the tennis court because it only serves a few people at a time in order to improve the other areas that serve a larger population. Elizabeth near Douglass.

Wherever the dog area is, it needs to be enclosed fully. Dogs are able to leave the park currently and it is dangerous. I think the combined basketball/tennis is the most fair but it needs to be really thought out. I also could live with it how it currently is configured. 22<sup>nd</sup> St.

Speaking as captain of an over 65 women's tennis team and an over 70 women's tennis team, we need more tennis courts in this tennis supportive city of San Francisco, not less. We should never eliminate an existing court. 27<sup>th</sup> St.

If a dog park is included in the plan, please have it all fenced in! The tree-lined street is ok as is, but be open areas 1. to the right and left of Elizabeth exit and 2. to the left of the children's area (not a formal exit) are a major problem as dogs get loose and follow people out of the park. Kids need grass too, and expanding their grass area makes sense but dog urine and kids don't mix. Separate out the two areas. Our #1 priority is having a dog park – enclosed, safe and clean (i.e. with good drainage). Go with Option B!

I can't imagine leaving it the way it is. It will remain a dog park that is unusable for people without dogs and children. We need separate space away from the dogs. Please! Elizabeth St., 7 houses up from park.

I support Option D. Leave west side as improved hardscape. Tennis and basketball. East side develop green and dog. Option on tennis court = grass court. Hill St.

Since optimization is a primary objective, tennis players use the space in the most inefficient way of any park users. I utilize the park each day with a dog. Frequently, there are no people during my stay on either the basketball court or tennis court. Douglass 1.5 blocks from the park.

Here's the irony. At meeting #1, without an agenda, the tennis court (because nobody but a handful of people cared about it) seemed like the logical piece to eliminate in order to achieve the one thing that \*everyone\* wanted: grass area for people only. Once the tennis crowd learned of this plan – their numbers and voices suddenly rose. Try suggesting to eliminate the dog areas and watch the people unite. Douglass 1.5 blocks from the park.