



North Portland Aquatic Center: Phase 2 / Cycle 2 Online Survey Summary – August 2025

For the second cycle of engagement for the North Portland Aquatic Center (NPAC) design process, the design team at Scott Edwards Architecture provided three updated design options that responded to input received in the prior engagement cycle in March 2025, provided more detailed layouts, and showed exterior building design options.

Community members were invited to give input via an online survey in English and Spanish. The survey was promoted through email to the overall 5,500 email subscribers for the project, posts on social media, attendees at the community gathering on August 21, and direct outreach to local schools and community partners. The online survey was open for two weeks from August 21 – September 4, 2025.

Three responses were received in Spanish and were incorporated into the overall summary. A total of 500 responses were received. It should be noted that this report reflects the opinions of those who chose to participate in this survey and is not necessarily representative of the broader community.

This online survey was part of a larger engagement effort in August 2025 that also included:

- 8/18/25: NPAC Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting
- 8/19/25: Focus Groups with Priority Communities
- 8/21/25: Community Gathering at Roosevelt High School
- 8/23/25: Display at Kidz Outside Festival at George Park
- Portland Public School staff meeting
- Technical Advisory Committee review (a group of PP&R staff who will maintain and program the future NPAC and park amenities).

All input received in this cycle of engagement will be used to further the final design for the North Portland Aquatic Center, and the next round of engagement for the preferred design concept will occur in early 2026. Summaries of all engagement to date can be found online at portland.gov/parks/NPAC.

Table of Contents:

1. Site Plan Designs (full set of designs can be found online portland.gov/parks/NPAC) – page 2-3
2. Summary of Online Survey Responses – page 3-8
3. Appendices – all open-ended comments about options – page 9-31

Heart of the Park

Site Plan



Site Design

- Parking lot to the east with access from Fessenden
- Minimal number of trees removed
- Small parking lot replaces tennis courts
- Service access from Geneva

Outdoor Amenities

- Plaza as buffer between building and parking lot
- Splash Pad visible from community spaces and Open Lawn
- Accommodates 9V9 U12 soccer field



PORTLANDPARKS.ORG | Acting Director Sonia Schmanski



Meet Me at Geneva

Site Plan



Site Design

- Parking to the south with all access from Geneva
- Minimal number of trees removed
- Open Lawn adjacent to Clarendon
- Linear Plaza connecting all elements
- Small parking lot replaces tennis courts

Outdoor Amenities

- Pavilion near Fessenden
- Splashpad separated from building and Pavilion
- Accommodates a 9V9 U12 soccer field



PORTLANDPARKS.ORG | Acting Director Sonia Schmanski



Beacon in the Park

Site Plan



Site Design

- Building nearest to Fessenden
- Parking lot to the east with access from Fessenden
- Smallest site development area
- Service access from Geneva

Outdoor Amenities

- L-shaped Plaza with Pavilion and Splash Pad
- Compact and efficient layout
- Largest Open Lawn accommodates HS soccer field



PORTLANDPARKS.ORG | Acting Director Sonia Schmanski



	Heart of the Park	Beacon in the Park	Meet Me at Geneva
1. Which parking lot location do you prefer?	48%	35%	18%
2. Which community plaza location do you prefer?	51%	31%	18%
3. Which pavilion location do you prefer?	50%	34%	15%

4. Pick your top two priorities for amenities for the community and event rooms (pick two):

- Connection to an outdoor plaza space **44%**
- Outside views to park and/or street **37%**
- Adjustable furniture that provides for flexible room layouts **36%**
- Caterer/prep kitchen amenities **28%**
- Expandable room (to accommodate a larger meeting) **22%**
- Audio and visual equipment **21%**
- Rentable equipment **12%**
- Other: **5%**: Large hall for large events/parties/celebrations accessible to the public, not increasing traffic on neighborhood streets, designated lanes for swimming at all times, good changing rooms, why would pool need this, easy access from parking lot for those with mobility issues, covered patio and balcony, organized reservation system, smaller parking area/more green space and trees, repair Columbia Pool, covered bike parking large enough for cargo bikes, affordability, spaces for quiet away from large groups like sporting events, teen space.

5. Pick the top three ways you might use the recreational pool (pick three).

- Wellness and water fitness **60%**
- Kids' play and recreation **55%**
- Lap swimming **55%**
- Adult water exercise and therapy **55%**
- Swimming lessons **52%**
- Other **4%**: lap swimming can be in competition pool so entire rec pool can be used during family swim time, cooling down on hot days, adult relaxation/play/swim, bring back Columbia Pool, relaxing and enjoy the pool, hot tub, locker rooms, dog splash pad, safe places for teens, diving board and slide, kayak rolling practice, yoga, my #1 is competitive swim program.

6. Pick the top three ways you might use the competition pool (pick three).

- Open lap swimming **84%**
- Water fitness **71%**
- Competition swimming **32%**
- Water polo **16%**
- Artistic swimming **12%**
- Other **8%**: would love to see a diving board/diving lessons, would not use this pool, aqua jogging/running in pool, kayak lessons, spectator for swim meets, physical therapy, lifeguard training / Boy Scouts merit badge class

7. Historical Context: Think about the stories you want this building to tell about the North Portland community. Below are some preferences we have heard previously from community members. Identify the top three ways you think this context can be reflected in the site design, architecture, public art, and overall design (pick three).

- Murals/walls **43%**
- Art integrated into the building design **37%**
- Design of plaza and splash pad **35%**
- Community exhibits/rotating displays **34%**
- Culturally specific art, symbols, iconology **26%**
- Outdoor performance space **26%**
- Pool ceiling and window art **19%**
- Outdoor art **18%**
- Artist in residency/maker space **16%**
- Landmark art piece **15%**
- Quiet meditative space **14%**
- Interactive digital artwork and displays **13%**
- Varied materials, textures, and artistic lighting on building exterior elevations **3%**
- Other **3%**: Native plants landscape, keep more outdoor/field space, focus on Black community, anything that will reduce noise in pools, story/wall art about Fessenden Homes (former housing project that was located at park in mid-1900s), improve safety around park, trees, design that doesn't conflict with disability access, art that children can interact with, history of Northgate Park, sustainable/healthy materials

8. If within the current project budget, Portland Parks & Recreation is not able to include every community feature shown in the draft design, what is most important to include? (pick one).

- Splashpad **35%**
- Outdoor pavilion **25%**
- Community meeting room **20%**
- Outdoor plaza **20%**

Design Selection Pick the design option that is most successful against the criteria. Pick one for each section.	Heart of the Park	Beacon in the Park	Meet Me at Geneva
Site Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports accessible and safe circulation by all transportation options (cars, bus, walking, biking, etc.) • Complements the surrounding neighborhood • Minimizes impact to trees • Preserves open recreation spaces 	49%	34%	16%
Outdoor Amenities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a welcoming plaza and splash pad experience • Locates community pavilion with good visibility and accessibility for multiple uses • Supports a variety of gathering and recreation spaces • Locates park amenities to be visible and feel safe • Separates recreation spaces safely from vehicle areas • Support simultaneous use of recreation spaces and pavilion performances with minimal disruption 	52%	31%	17%
Building Exterior Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a distinctive building design that enhances the park and neighborhood in a compelling way • Creates a welcoming and safe experience for all users • Integrates well into the park • Provides striking and exciting views into the pools and community spaces • Creates an inviting and highly visible main entrance • Stands out as a North Portland landmark 	41%	44%	15%
Building Interior Layout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides views to the outside from the recreation pool and community spaces • Supports spectator seating with clear sightlines • Creates clear internal layout and flow • Supports safe and welcoming changing rooms • Locates community rooms to be enjoyable for multiple uses 	47%	36%	17%

Select your preferred design! Rank your choice in order of preferences (#1 is your most preferred option, #3 is your least preferred option):

431 answered / 69 skipped	#1 Rank	#2 Rank	#3 Rank	Ranked Score
Heart of the Park	42% (181)	42% (183)	16% (67)	2.26
Meet Me at Geneva	39% (169)	31% (134)	30% (128)	2.10
Beacon in the Park	19% (81)	26% (114)	55% (236)	1.64

Thank you for ranking the options. To help us understand your response to the next question, please confirm what is your most preferred option:

429 answered / 31 skipped	
Heart of the Park	45% (213)
Meet Me at Geneva	38% (177)
Beacon in the Park	17% (79)

In a few words or sentences, tell us why you ranked your #1 option. Below is a summary of the comments for each design option. A full list of all comments can be found as an appendix at the end of this report.

Heart of the Park: 42% of responses ranked this option #1. Here are some major themes why:

- **Layout/site plan/overall flow** – Many felt this has the best overall layout with a good flow that is logical, appealing, and balanced and will integrate into the neighborhood and park.
- **Open recreation space** – maintains a lot of open recreation space and maintains what people enjoy about the park.
- **Parking/entry** - This and Beacon in the Park were preferred by the majority of responders because of the entry from Fessenden into the parking lot. The entrance has good visibility and access from the parking lot and bus stop/sidewalk, and there is a second entrance for competition entry and drop-off.
- **Trees** – This option was highly favored because it preserves more trees than in Beacon in the Park. Several liked the design of Beacon but were concerned about tree impacts, so rated this higher.
- **Outdoor Amenities** – Many liked the location of the splash pad and pavilion in this design for integration into the park and creating safe spaces. Some were concerned that the pavilion in Beacon was too close to the building and entries, and that the pavilion in Geneva was too far in the NE corner making it a place for negative behavior at night and hard to unload equipment for events. The curvy design of the plaza in Heart of the Park was also favored.
- **Interior Design** – the 2nd story spectator area, pool layout, and windows were mentioned.

Beacon in the Park: 38% of responses ranked this option #1. Here are some major themes why:

- **Layout** – It was noted this appears to have shortest distance from parking lot to pool which is important for people with disabilities, and overall, many liked the layout and design.
- **Open recreation space** – This rated highly because it maintains the largest open field for soccer and other sports.

- **Parking/entry** – Like Heart of the Park, a majority preferred these two options that have access to the parking lot from Fessenden and a clear entrance from the parking lot. Beacon consolidates all the parking into one main parking lot, and some appreciated that meant more parking opportunities for the aquatic center.
- **Tennis courts** – This was the only design that preserves the existing tennis courts, instead of converting them into parking, and many ranked that high. While the courts may not be in good condition, they are still used, and a small parking lot was not seen as a desirable replacement.
- **Trees** – A few noted that most of the impacted trees in this option are nuisance trees, so not as high a priority for preservation and non-nuisance species could be planted instead.
- **Building exterior design** – The distinctive exterior corner of this building and the views Fessenden were mentioned frequently, and people appreciated the windows giving views into the pool.

Meet Me at Geneva: 17% of responses ranked this option #1. Here are some major themes why:

- **Parking/entry** – This option overall was not ranked highly, but for those who did, largely it was because they favored the parking entrance on Geneva. They were concerned that Fessenden may be too busy of a street and create congestion or safety issues with people coming in/out of the aquatic center.

Please tell us about yourself. These questions are voluntary but tell us who is participating.

Age?

- Under 16 **0.4%**
- Age 17-24 **2%**
- Age 25-34 **9%**
- Age 35-44 **35%**
- Age 45-59 **37%**
- Age 60-79 **16%**
- Age 80 and over **1%**

I identify as:

- Female **69%**
- Male **26%**
- Transgender female **0%**
- Transgender male **0.4%**
- Genderqueer/androgynous **2%**
- Prefer not to answer **2%**
- Prefer to describe: **2%**: trans-masc non-binary, human, two spirit.

I identify as: (check all that apply)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native **3%**
- Asian **4%**
- Black or African American **5%**
- Hispanic or Latino/a/x/e **6%**
- Middle Eastern/North African **0.8%**
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander **1%**
- Slavic/Eastern European **1%**
- White **79%**
- Unknown/don't know **0.4%**
- Decline/don't want to answer **7%**
- Other **1%**

Do you or a family member live with a disability or identify as a disabled person?

- Yes **28%**
- No **72%**

If yes, please describe the nature of you and/or your family member's disability.

Please check all that apply.

- Mobility or other physical disabilities **49%**
- Mental health **39%**
- Cognitive **21%**
- Invisible **19%**
- Deaf or hard of hearing **9%**
- Intellectual or developmental **9%**
- Visual (blind, low vision) **6%**
- Prefer not to disclose **11%**
- Prefer to describe **9%** neurodivergent, ADHD, autistic/Asperger's, diabetes, size (many chairs, etc do not accommodate larger people), financially handicapped.

Regarding residence, I

- Own **88%**
- Rent **10%**
- Live with my parents **2%**
- Other **0.4%**

How far do you live from Northgate Park? (pick one)

- Five blocks or less **25%**
- Less than one mile **29%**
- More than one mile **46%**

How many children under age 18 live with you?

- 0 **46%**
- 1-2 **49%**
- 3-4 **5%**
- 5 or more **0.2%**

What are their ages? (check all that apply):

- 0-2 years **17%**
- 3-6 years **29%**
- 7-10 years **33%**
- 11-14 years **34%**
- 15-18 years **28%**

APPENDICES

All open-ended comments for why an option was their #1 choice:

Heart of the Park

Site Design

Layout/site plan/fit in neighborhood/flow/feels welcoming/makes sense (63 comments)

1. Overall layout
2. has a good layout
3. I like the layout of the park.
4. I like the layout
5. Best layout for multiple uses
6. Heart of the Park has the best site layout. It enhances the park and addresses the neighborhood
7. The layout makes the most sense for functionality and accessibility.
8. Best layout
9. It seemed the most logically laid out.
10. The overall layout of Heart in the Park seems the most practical
11. Overall site layout.
12. The layout is most appealing.
13. Layout of all of the different elements, pool, parking, field, trees.
14. I liked the layout and amount of outdoor space that appears to be safe from traffic
15. I like the site plan of Heart of the Park best
16. Overall design
17. Most function design
18. Best balance and most organic feel
19. It seems to have a more spacious, open feeling.
20. I think it's the best combination of features.
21. It best meets the goals of the project.
22. This is the best layout that combines functionality with neighborhood integrity.
23. It seems to me to be the design most focused on building/creating a pool in a park and not a parking lot with attached amenities.
24. Integrates best on the site.
25. Spaces feel integrated.

26. I like the way it is integrated with the current park, and that park and pool are connected without walking through a parking lot.
27. Best approach to integrating elements
28. I feel the heart of the park gives the most connection to the neighborhood
29. Best entrance and use of space

30. Better functionality, easier park and swim access
31. It best fits a variety of the criteria.
32. It balances the elements well
33. It is a balanced and thoughtful choice for our needs
34. Seems most usable for competition. We don't need another competition pool in the area with inadequate seating, parking, and traffic flow.
35. It's not perfect, but overall it is the most pleasing layout for me.
36. Most sustainable and well-rounded option is Heart of the Park
37. The site design feels the most interesting and engaging. It enhances the outdoor space and existing park amenities.
38. Its most public face is N and E protecting the privacy of the residents on Geneva. If I lived on that street it's what I would want.
39. as a pp&r aquatics employee, heart of the park makes the most sense and makes me excited about what this can bring to the community.
40. I feel like Heart of the Park will have the least amount of disruption to the neighborhood.
41. Building placement creates a better 'room of the street' at the north. Things don't feel left out (like the splash pad being 'orphaned' in meet me at...", and the vehicular traffic doesn't bisect ped movement (like in Beacon...)
42. Safety is my biggest concern as there has been crime and shootings in the area that was ultimately chosen for this pool. I want the safest layout with limit dark or hiding spots. I am worried about the dark months especially.
43. Having the building and parking lots closest to the exterior edge of the park, leaving the largest green space.
44. Good flow
45. Good flow around the site
46. It flows well.
47. I like the flow and 'curvyness' of this design.
48. It's the least disagreeable
49. Heart of the Park makes most sense for environmental and economical reasons, has a better flow that makes most sense to the area.
50. It is rather traditional, but makes the most sense...
51. Makes the most sense for the space
52. My mom lives on Van Houton and the design makes the most sense for the neighborhood.
53. Heart of the Park is a great design to spread out traffic and centralize the amenities away from the street. As an adjacent neighbor to this development I'm excited and want to ensure we spread out traffic and keep the designed items away from the street to keep our kiddos safe:)
54. Like the name
55. It felt the most welcoming.
56. It feels the most welcoming and engaging.
57. I love the sense of community

58. Seems like a good place to meet people especially single chicks
59. I use Northgate Park for running, and I feel this maximizes my ability to keep using that feature of the park. There are no sidewalks on N Newark Street, so I am hesitant to have the entrance on Geneva Street.
60. Access
61. Make it easy ADA access. No far walk or rolling. No gravel, no dirt paths. Smooth flat paved access.
62. It seemed the most accessible. I have an issue, I heard that you considering not making stairs into the pool) only having ladders or the chair hoist. I think this idea is BEYOND TERRIBLE many of us cannot use the ladders but have no interest in the chair hoists we don't need that level of help and it is a drain on the staff. Please just give us some stairs with hand rails to allow us to enter and leave the pool(s). No stairs and having to use the chair hoist would keep me from accessing this local community center and I believe am in the majority of those who use the stairs at Dishman, East, Sellwood and used to use the portable steps at Columbia Thank you

Open Recreation Space (27 comments)

1. Takes best advantage of existing green space
2. It preserves some of the field near the playground
3. Heart of the park design makes the best use of park spaces
4. Protection of the green space, while focusing on the intent of pools, which is children. I don't know why anyone would forget that.
5. Heart of the Park feels like it does the most to preserve the things we like about Northgate Park- large grassy field to play in and lots of trees.
6. More activity space
7. I just like the outdoor layout - it's intuitive and seems to preserve a lot of the existing park while maximizing space use for the new facilities.
8. Best balance between outdoor spaces
9. Seemed like more green space.
10. Green spaces that are connected to each other and the building without crossing roadways
11. Preserves existing green area
12. There is less effect on the open rec area.
13. I like keeping the largest lawn space possible in Beacon in the Park.
14. The existing park area is preserved most.
15. Families frequently use pools and then take kids to the playground. Not having to walk through the parking lot is ideal. Similar to Columbia Pool. Just a short walk through the grass/ trees..
16. Open green space next to existing park/play area
17. Open space
18. I like the creation of the community space between the pool and the existing park
19. This preserves the most use of the park as we know of today. We neighbors who use the park daily are NOT happy you're tearing it up to put in a crowded pool.
20. In general it seems to have the most adaptable nature spaces
21. Keeps all the open space together with the existing park

22. The layout seems to put the green spaces/place spaces furthest from the busiest streets and parking lots.
23. Open space
24. Surrounds the park best
25. I like that we are keeping the playground with a reasonable amount of lawn space.
26. Outdoor space
27. Provides the most ideal green space.

Parking/Entry (58 comments)

1. Easier access with public transportation
2. access to the lot from Fessenden
3. The entrance is off Fessenden.
4. Access to parking lot from Fessenden
5. The access to parking off Fesseden
6. Parking lot should definitely be accessed via N. Fessenden. H of the P seems less impactful to local homes.
7. lots of parking spaces available
8. Location of parking lot.
9. The parking lot off Geneva would be terrible flow for residents of that area.
10. Having the parking lot pour out onto N Geneva is not great option.
11. parking entry off Fessenden
12. Parking should not be added that is only accessible through side streets.
13. Easy access to parking off Fessenden.
14. I liked the design and the area for parking. The entire presentation was very informative and well done. Thank you.
15. Good design of entry to parking minimizing adverse impact to neighboring community.
16. It seems like the best building layout with direct access from Fessenden.
17. Looks like the best access for the majority of people
18. Parking allows for access to the community center and green space.
19. Concentrated parking
20. Keeping the focus on Fessenden rather than Geneva follows the current traffic patterns in the neighborhood.
21. People don't have to cross the parking lot to get from the pool to the field.
22. I like the one visitor parking lot in Beacon in the Park.
23. I like the flow of the drop-off and where the parking is located
24. Liked the parking entry from a busier street, less disruptive to people living on Geneva St
25. Flow of access and parking makes sense
26. Parking access from Fessenden makes sense
27. I think it has a better entry sequence.
28. Nice inviting entry

29. Parking
30. The main entry off the parking lot is nice, but having a separate competition entrance on the other side of the building away from parking doesn't make the most sense.
31. I think parking should be accessible to both entrances but separate from the splashpad. I think having all of the maintenance at one end not usually accessed by the public is important.
32. Parking lot does not split park.
33. Keeps traffic lower on Geneva, which is a residential road.
34. Parking
35. I don't like the parking lot being within the design landscape. I prefer that it is off to the side.
36. I like the placement of the parking lot
37. Heart of the park design makes the best use of parking
38. The parking is more convenient at the expense of tennis courts. and so on.
39. I don't think a community space should center a parking lot
40. Parking should be at the edge, not in the middle
41. I like the direct path from the parking lot to the entrance.
42. I frequently bring toddlers to the playground for 20 minutes or less - easy parking next to the playground makes this possible. I'm less likely to use that portion of the park if it's not easy to unload close.
43. Best parking layout that won't disrupt surrounding neighborhoods.
44. Entrance on main road vs neighborhood
45. I do wonder/worry about accessing the parking lots from Fessenden, as opposed to a quieter side street (which I think would be better/slower). And I think a single large parking lot makes more sense than having the small bonus on in the corner
46. Main entrance and parking access on Fessenden, not Geneva. I like where the parking is in relation to the pool
47. Safe separation of parking facility from community pavilion/recreation.
48. Parking lot entrance on Fessenden offset to side.
49. It's not necessary to traverse the parking lot in order to get from it to outdoor recreation areas....safer.
50. As a near neighbor, I want to minimize traffic on side streets and not having parking entrance off Geneva.
51. The parking lot does not interrupt residential flow, and it is buffered between the center and the head start to reduce residential/neighborhood noise.
52. It has the best flow for traffic with less disruption of surrounding neighborhood. Less environmental impact. And the walking path doesn't run along the main road.
53. I like the larger parking lot that has access on Fessenden.
54. Parking lot access from Fessenden
55. Street access to parking lot
56. I like that both of the parking lots are tucked away from the street.
57. Ease of access to parking lot; closest main entrance to parking lot.

58. The other two options create more unfortunate pedestrian circulation that overlaps with vehicular movement than the first- these two types of travel need to be separated for safety.

Tennis Courts (3 comments)

1. I feel strongly that the tennis court should not be removed. As a local resident this is a heavily used resource. The one thing I didn't like about this option is the conversion of the tennis courts to additional parking. This feels like overkill to me and I don't think many folks will use this area to park and instead it could turn into a nighttime hang out spot. Lots of people use those tennis courts, I'd hate to see them turn into infrastructure to support cars.
2. The one thing I didn't like about this option is the conversion of the tennis courts to additional parking. This feels like overkill to me and I don't think many folks will use this area to park and instead it could turn into a nighttime hang out spot. Lots of people use those tennis courts, I'd hate to see them turn into infrastructure to support cars.
3. The only thing I don't understand is why the tennis courts need to be demolished.

Trees (30 comments)

1. I like the trees left as a buffer with the Pool building and the street. It feels like the building and the parklands are coexisting, while the other designs feel more like a building plunked down in a park.
2. less trees killed
3. Doesn't remove all existing trees.
4. This design removes the least amount of trees at this location
5. I like that this option retains the most trees on the property
6. Preserves trees
7. Beacon in the park loses almost double the amount of trees.
8. Best treatment of trees of the three proposals.
9. Least amount of trees removed
10. More trees are preserved than in option 3.
11. Least impact to trees
12. Minimal tree removal.
13. It was a tie between Heart of the Park and Beacon in the Park. 21 trees removed is what is troubling me.
14. I like the minimal tree removal
15. Preserves many of the existing trees while providing the greatest diversity of resources in and around the center.
16. I really don't want the large trees cut down for Beacon in the Park.
17. It seems to have the least impact to the trees in the current space while being accommodating enough for the goals of the community.
18. I like the Beacon design as well but ranked it lower because of the impact on the trees
19. There is less effect on the trees.
20. I like the fact that it requires fewer trees moved than Beacon in the Park.
21. Removes least trees.

22. Removing lots of trees (Beacon) is not a great option.
23. The ample tree cover surrounding the park increases this sense of a protected community space.
24. Retains more large trees along Fessenden.
25. I want to keep the most park and trees
26. The least amount of trees removed
27. Removes only one tree
28. I think it's the most equitable to the trees and plants.
29. The fewest trees are affected by this option.
30. Preserves trees

Outdoor Amenities (23 comments)

1. Best layout for community needs and use of the park
2. It has the most continuity with the existing park areas on site.
3. This keeps the splash pad off of Fessenden, which is a busy street and should not have kids playing next to it.
4. I liked the location of the splash pad.
5. The plaza feels most integrated with the outdoor space.
6. I prefer its curvy outdoor design, and the entry plaza looks spacious and welcoming.
7. Great use of open rec lawn area and pavilion
8. Best use of park amenities
9. Largest plaza, large pavilion
10. I like the flow of the plaza space
11. Felt less rectangular. Plaza space had organic flow.
12. Location of the pavilion
13. Plaza and Pavilion in desirable locations.
14. Plaza buffer
15. Location of pavilion & splash pad in relation to community building.
16. Heart of the Park allows for the more separate uses [splash pad / pavilion / lawn could all be occupied at once without disturbing the others].
17. Nice splash pad and pavilion
18. Layout of splash pad
19. I like the Splashpad close to the new building and parking.
20. Splash pad integrated in safe space
21. Outside spaces are far enough away from one another to be useful. I also think the splash pad will go unused most of the year and would be nicer to have a community art statement piece instead.
22. I do not think a splash pad is a good idea. It would be more maintenance and a wasteful use of water. An interesting art piece that small children could safely engage with year round is better.
23. The splash pad feels like a safe distance away from cars, and faces the existing park. I also think keeping the pavilion at a distance to the building makes it feel more open and usable for anyone, not just people who use the center.

Building Interior Design (22 comments)

1. Most appealing interior design
2. pool interior is the best option
3. Best building layout.
4. I like the interior design
5. Interior layout makes sense.
6. I like how you can see the pool from the lobby. I like the 2nd story for spectators to keep them off the pool deck.
7. I like the upper-story spectator and rentable rooms.
8. Spectator area is at a higher level; the recreation pool is not so narrow as the Geneva design, which can potentially accommodate more programming during non-open/play swim. I just wish the slide design for the Heart of the Park was more like the other option. Slide does not look as fun.
9. The viewing area of the competition pool is also best in Heart of the Park.
10. Raised spectator seating & splash pad.
11. Spectator seating on the second floor.
12. Nice curves on rec pool.
13. Heart of the park design makes the best use of building space
14. I like the pool layout, direction of light and prioritizing of windows
15. This design prioritizes the swim facility above other tradeoffs, and the swimming facility is more important to me than any other consideration. for example the second story observation deck maximizes space and visibility.
16. Interior flows and circulation from lockers to both pools looks confusing.
17. I will be honest, the renderings were hard to decipher what the inside of the building would look like and how the layout would be for staff so I can't speak to that.
18. The building interior doesn't seem the most ergonomic of the three, but I think that's less important than the exterior layout.
19. More aquatic center space
20. I like the interior layout.
21. Upper level spectator space that is parallel to competition lanes will make this more usable as a competition pool. May even make up for the lack of a 50m pool slightly.
22. Largest pool spaces

Building Exterior Design (25 comments)

1. Distinct features
2. Most appealing exterior design and good sustainability
3. However, I think the building itself isn't great inside and out. Beacon in the park building is so much better. It was very hard to decide to rank the site first or the building first. I went with site, but maybe round #3 will have an option combining the two.
4. Low profile of building

5. Skylights
6. Strip windows break up mass along Fessenden.
7. Best transition from human-made to nature.
8. Terraced roof (ideally acting as a skylight) and exterior window design allowing to maximize natural light.
9. I like the faceted roof
10. Unique but functional design
11. It was a close call between Heart of the Park and Meet Me at Geneva. I like the building design better for Heart of the Park.
12. Beacon definitely has the most striking view from Fessenden, with the slide right there for all to see, but in general, Heart of the Park is the best overall design.
13. The look of Beacon in the Park is better.
14. It feels more landscape-forward, as though it will feel green no matter what part of the interior or exterior you are located. The exterior feels most classic and timeless, as well as most likely to fit within the neighborhood (without dominating the neighborhood).
15. I feel that more effort was put into the design, and the other options fall flat.
16. You had me with the waterslide that projects outside.
17. The design seems the most organic/aesthetic
18. Architecture
19. The overall design aesthetic
20. I do not like the building in this option, however.
21. However from the outside I love how Beacon in the Park has that giant front window. I feel like Heart of the Park should take inspiration from that as currently it kind of looks like a church rather than a place for community fun.
22. All three need more thought on the exterior design. Look like generic industrial sheds.
23. Visually, it is very noticeable from Fessenden.
24. The only thing I like better about my second choice is the entrance view into the pool.
25. The other two options create more unfortunate pedestrian circulation that overlaps with vehicular movement than the first- these two types of travel need to be separated for safety.
 - a. It also appears to be the most structurally feasible. As details are developed, many of the architectural gestures of the other two will prove to not be possible.
 - b. This is the only place to leave open comments, so here are some concerns i have about the project goals. Using a CM/GC model is not a goal, that is a process. It can be a valuable tool to get immediate pricing and constructability feedback during design, but it can also be used to "value engineer" down to conventional, unsustainable building methods. And while a GMP is provided, it is poorly enforced, so the accountability promise of the model is undermined.
 - c. I also take some exception to the idea that "high performance sustainability" needs to be balanced with "long-term operational success". Sustainability implies and requires long term success; to set them up as conflicting goals is absolutely the wrong way to think

about sustainability and suggests it is an "extra" thing. There is no good design that is not sustainable design, full stop. This is a particularly important consideration for a aquatics center that will have an extremely high demand for water and energy.

- d. Please encourage SEA to lose the impossible, wafer-thin roof profiles and ribbons of glazing and opaque materials that ignore the realities of proper envelope detailing, structural systems and energy code. It does no one any good - residents, PP&R or anyone else - to sell a vision that cannot be executed. We all know better, even in schematic design, and regardless of prescriptive or performance path OEEESC compliance.
- e. Daylighting analysis would be a valuable next step for these designs. The options include big gestures of clerestory and monumental curtain wall glazing - these can be very problematic for glare when the sun is shining directly in your eyes while swimming, or make it impossible to see the flags for backstroke. It doesn't appear to be well-distributed light in many of the options.

Beacon in the Park

Site Design

Layout/site plan/fit in neighborhood (33 comments)

1. It has the shortest distance from the parking lot to the pool, which is crucial for people with mobility issues.
2. I think Beacon is most accessible
3. Visibility to see multiple area
4. I like all the features
5. Layout seems the most ideal
6. Best overall layout.
7. Best layout
8. I just like the layout
9. I like the design the best
10. I really like the design of the space both inside and out.
11. Location of the building on the site makes the most sense
12. The beauty, placement, flow, accessibility, parking lot situated to the NE and the open space facing south.
13. I like the beacon building design, but the parking for heart of the park. I'd prefer (strongly) less taking up green space. I wish you'd bought the eagles lodge or some property on Lombard for this instead of building on one of the few parks on the north side of Lombard.
14. The layout appears to be the most inviting.
15. Appears to be the one that is most "community use of space" friendly
16. Minimal impact on the site
17. Appears to prioritize ease of use.

18. Beacon in the Park is a thoughtful and complete design that feels well thought out and connected as a whole rather than separate elements in a semi connected space. It is the best design.
19. I find this option to be the best compromise between exterior space, interior space, parking lot and pavillion placement and building aesthetics
20. I feel that Beacon strikes the best balance between overall layout and accessibility.
21. It keeps the pool near the main road, and the green space furthest from the main road. Since it's an indoor pool, that feels like the safest option given traffic patterns.
22. Beacon maintains the most integrity of the park for users, residents and habitat, while minimizing light, noise and traffic pollution inherent in this facility.
23. I feel like is the least impact to existing neighborhood and park.
24. It seems to be best use of space.
25. I think the maximum space is being used properly here.
26. Takes better advantage of the full site
27. I feel this layout overall prioritizes the use of the park alongside the aquatic center
28. Seems most efficient, which probably means a more affordable option
29. Smallest foot print, less paving of our Northgate Park
30. This keeps priorities and existing benefits on-site (neighbor access, outdoor recreation, tennis courts, large rec fields) whirl adding an easily accessed and connected aquatic center. The spaces feel connected and respecting past with present reasons for North Portlanders to be in this location.
31. Compact/efficient layout
32. Smallest development area
33. Building and parking layout.

Open Recreation Space (51 comments)

1. Allows for HS soccer field
2. Green space stays next to school
3. Nice side by side relationship of the building and the outdoor park space
4. Full size soccer field
5. I like the outdoor field for playing
6. I like everything about Beacon in the park, including that it maintains the larger soccer field, which is important to the community. All the other outside areas seem to work really well in Beacon in the Park, and it's beautiful from the outside and and inside.
7. Maintains large amount of usable green space outside of building
8. It preserves the most green space. I like the location of it being up against the busier street since it is not as peaceful to be in an outdoor space next to a busy road, so the building placement works well that way.
9. Quiet tree side to just sit
10. Preserves large green space and least amount of pavement.
11. Least amount of paving, opportunities for outdoor activities and adding trees
12. Has the largest rec lawn.
13. It has the largest outdoor recreational space

14. Also biggest soccer field. However - this is a bad location for outdoor air quality.
15. Preserve a good amount of the field.
16. Maintains most variety of outdoor recreation activities.
17. I like the larger availability of the outdoor space.
18. Extra green space
19. I like how much rec space is left with this one.
20. Maximizes the space optimally. more continuous open lawn space. minimal lawn space on the north side of the building which will be very difficult to maintain and will likely eventually end up as a mud and moss plot. will be very difficult to grow a thriving lawn and trees on that side.
21. Least amount of paving, and highest square footage of lawn.
22. Largest outdoor space preserved for recreational sports like NoPo Soccer
23. I like how much recreation space is left in the park.
24. It retains a lot of green space
25. Low environmental impact, keeps existing park amenities (e.g., playground, tennis courts, trees), adds a splash pad and pool
26. Like the outdoor field layout
27. Attractive park surroundings
28. I found it most appealing and it leaves more of the open park for other recreation activities.
29. Biking access, less parking lots, more fields and tennis and outdoor spaces
30. It allows the best open space for a large soccer/sports field.
31. It leaves the other park amenities in place.
32. It keeps a lot of the outdoor spaces open and accessible from all ends of the park. I think the outdoor space is just as important as the aquatic park itself.
33. Maintaining large space for soccer is extremely important to our North Portland community.
34. The field will be big enough for soccer and other recreational activities.
35. I love the design, and having the most space for outdoor amenities, while having access to transit
36. I honestly don't think this project should happen. We want to keep as much green space as possible. We don't want parking. And we want a dog park. I speak for everyone on my street, 3 blocks away.
37. Bigger field space for activities.
38. Largest open lawn.
39. I like the larger soccer field.
40. Preserves the most open space (trees grow back), allows for a full HS-size soccer field.
41. Keep soccer field
42. I appreciate that this design allows for a soccer field that can accommodate HS Soccer as well.
43. The park is currently heavily used by soccer players. I like that this option maintains the largest field for continued soccer use
44. I like that it preserves the largest field space
45. Less impact to the current park fields, rugby, etc.
46. Does not remove soccer.
47. Like the pool close to the road to preserve as much park as possible.

48. Like that there's less concrete & more open space for Beacon in the park
49. Least amount of paving, allows for high school sized soccer field
50. Less paved area, smallest footprint
51. Largest open space area

Parking/Entry (49 comments)

1. Entrance is off the main street
2. Liked the entrance
3. Parking access from a busier road makes it a better choice for local residents.
4. Convenience of parking to building and all services
5. Parking lot entrances, facility entrances.
6. Parking easily accessible from the street.
7. Parking lot is accessible and will create minimal problems.
8. The parking lot would have the least impact on the surrounding neighborhood and school.
9. Better size parking lot.
10. I like the parking set up, the entrances, bus drop off
11. Provides an easier entrance/exit to the center reducing traffic congestion
12. Parking layout
13. The parking relates to all the park amenities, plus accessible off of Fessenden
14. Maintains usable rec field vs more parking, which is not a priority. Small parking lot at Charles Jordan has always been fine! Competitions should expect to use surrounding neighborhood parking, not sacrifice other park amenities.
15. It doesn't have a parking lot by the Head Start on Clarendon. It's already a mess getting around the cul de sac before/after school and adding a parking lot would make that worse.
16. It shelters the majority residential neighborhoods from the commotion that a community pool will bring to the area. It keeps the main thoroughfare of the pool to the major street (Fessenden) and add walkways and trees to Geneva.
17. I like the single parking lot in the park
18. I think parking entrance on Geneva is a bad idea.
19. Traffic stays off Geneva.
20. More parking, parking entrance ONLY on busy street
21. Best parking and use of space
22. The Beacon provides a better parking option and access for buses.
23. Parking and entry off Fessenden makes the most sense.
24. More park spaces. Bus stops. Sad this is taking so long to finalize
25. Parking lot access on Fessenden is better than on the side street as well.
26. Parking and location entrance off of Fessenden
27. The only thing I would change would be to put the Competition drop off and entry at the location shown on the Heart of the Park design
28. Separate entrances. Lots of parking.
29. Parking lot entrance on Fessenden. Distance from parking lot to front desk/pool shortest.

30. Least amount of pavement/parking lot (maximum park amenities of the three designs)
31. Its easy accessible to bus and parking.
32. One parking lot, entrance on Fessenden.
33. Main access on Fessenden rather than Geneva
34. Traffic stays on thru street not side neighborhood street.
35. The parking lot is all in one space
36. Ensures N Clarendon doesn't become an access route to the pool; all parking is accessed from Fessenden
37. Parking all in one lot.
38. Provides the most parking
39. The layout of the parking lots is important to me, to preserve spaces in the park for pedestrians and dogs without cars or crossings.
40. This makes the most sense when parking. Takes in account the traffic flows of the existing community.
41. Having all visitor vehicle traffic access on Fessenden with only service vehicles on Geneva is most logical; Fessenden is all rental properties at site
42. Clarendon traffic could be minimized with driveway access by extending Newark west of Van Houten to Clarendon rotary
43. Competitive entrance located by the parking lot
44. The parking lot is convenient to the pool which will likely be the biggest drive to cars.
45. The parking lot maximizes the existing tree cover and field space, and it allows for easy parking access without causing jam ups on Geneva.
46. I also like that the main parking entrance is on Fessenden and that both competitors and recreational users enter from the same side of the building.
47. The option with the most parking. One main problem with pools in the city is parking and having to park blocks away and walk. When coming for water fitness classes because I have bad mobility this is an issue and stops me from coming often. Having plenty of parking for all those who will use the pool is important for the surrounding neighborhood as well. Also, if you are having competition swimming you will be having a large number of people come from far away, so parking is needed.
48. Largest parking lot and bus drop off accessed from Fessenden (most limited traffic on Geneva)
49. The location of the parking lot as to Fessenden (lower impact on neighbors on Geneva).

Tennis Courts (32 comments)

1. Parking away from current neighborhoods as to limit traffic. Especially the designs that will add more traffic to N Clarendon Ave and remove the current tennis courts.
2. It has tennis courts in the design, providing another recreation access to folks who don't swim. North Portland has few good outdoor tennis courts.
3. It maintains the tennis courts.
4. Preserves the existing tennis courts which if renovated, would be significantly used. Can you put this into the scope of work?
5. Only option to keep tennis courts.

6. Keeps the tennis court
7. I like Beacon because it preserves the tennis courts
8. It keeps the original tennis court in place.
9. Preserves the tennis courts.
10. Preserves the existing tennis court
11. Leaves the tennis courts.
12. Maintains tennis courts.
13. I like not losing the tennis courts - lots of people use those courts and it would be a loss to the park.
14. I live less than a block away from the park. Turning the existing tennis courts into a parking area would be a huge mess at the end of the street.
15. Need to keep park tennis courts.
16. I think the biggest reason I chose Beacon in the park is that it is the only option that keeps the tennis courts. In the last survey, all 3 options got rid of the tennis court, and the heart of the park was easily the best option. But now, while I think the design is the best for heart of the park, I value the tennis court over everything, which means Beacon in the park is the my #1 choice. However I don't like how many trees it has to cut down. What if there was a way to incorporate both heart of the park and beacon in the park? What if we went with Heart of the park, but kept the tennis court? As someone who lives less than 5 blocks away, these are my only tennis courts. Columbia Park and Roosevelt aren't good options. Please keep the tennis courts. There is no reason we need an extra parking lot. there is tons of parking on Fessenden and in the neighborhood.
17. This is the best compromise of keeping the integrity of the current park (like keeping the tennis courts) and not disrupting the Geneva neighbors while still adding a lot of value.
18. Leave the tennis courts alone. Less cost. Save money.
19. Our community cannot lose more tennis courts!!
20. I love that there is an option to be able to keep the tennis courts.
21. This layout retains the existing tennis/pickleball courts.
22. It maintains existing playground and tennis courts.
23. I like beacon in the park because it keeps the tennis court.
24. Avoids removal of tennis courts
25. Preserves the tennis courts
26. Existing tennis/pickleball courts remain
27. I like that it keeps the tennis courts for future use or reuse.
28. Among other things, I appreciate that Beacon leaves the existing tennis courts in place. They're used heavily by neighborhood families and it would be a shame to lose them!
29. Less impact to the current tennis courts
30. Does not remove tennis.
31. Adding parking in place of the tennis courts is also OK - they are never used/maintained
32. If tennis courts are not going to be improved, replace with small parking lot for better accessibility to existing playground and future pavilion

Trees (11 comments)

1. The part I like least about Beacon in the Park is that so many trees will be removed, but it feels like the parking lot solution for Heart of the Park could be used with Beacon in the Park to minimize tree loss.
2. Would hope to retain as many trees as possible.
3. Though it removes one special value tree, it also removes 20 nuisance trees which might have been an additional expense down the line.
4. I vote to take down the nuisance trees have them kiln dried and use as interior finishing materials. Mitigate with planting the trees approved by city of Portland to go between the street and sidewalk.
5. Even though it takes the most trees, it leaves the most rec space untouched.
6. It removes the most trees, but more trees can be planted with future landscaping.
7. I love that it paves the least but removes the most trees. If I wanted trees I'd go to Columbia Park! Which I never do because I'm adamantly anti-tree, which is a lonely stance to take among Portland Parks and Rec survey respondents. Hey, if you're the arboricidal genius who designed Beacon in the Park, wanna hang out some time? Maybe go on a walk through a recent clear cut, or set off some fireworks in the Gorge together?
8. Gets rid of the most nuisance trees
9. Please add tall evergreen trees on the south end of the Beacon parking lot to mitigate light, noise and air pollution to neighbors and habitat.
10. Wish there was a way to keep important trees, though.
11. Trees to be removed are lower quality/not worth saving

Outdoor Amenities (8 comments)

1. Splash pad is away from busy streets
2. Nice treatment of plaza space
3. However it might not have the best pavilion. Might a temporary event stage be used?
4. The plaza area is great welcome
5. Keeping the pavilion close to the building is good.
6. The plaza, splash pad and pavilion are functional, though won't get much use, so they don't need to be extensive or elaborate.
7. Like the pavilion location.
8. I'm between Heart & Beacon, but Beacon gets the vote because it has the best outdoor amenities. The pavilion, roundabout drop off, and slide that goes outside and back inside from the Heart are things that should be blended into Beacon if possible. Especially the pavilion, I don't see why you can't copy the heart in the parks layout for that and paste it into the beacon layout.

Building Interior Design (23 comments)

1. Seating is pool side for parents with children in swim lessons!
2. Heart in the Park slide could be hard to maintain because it extends outside. Safety issues/privacy.
3. Good placement of spectator seating for competition pool

4. Office locations
5. The interior design allows way more light in pool. Beacon blocks too much South light as far as I read the plans. We're going to want light in winter months.
6. Recreational pool does not face the street.
7. Great viewing for competition swimming
8. Intuitive interior layout with easily accessible parking (particularly for those with disabilities). Love that there are views to the park from the pool with daylight streaming in over the bleachers from the south.
9. Better recreation pool design (more swim space).
10. Entrance for competition and regular on same side, location of splash pad and lockers
11. The interior layout and flow is the most import to me. The Heart of the Park has the best exterior flow, but the walk from entry to changing rooms appears very long. I think that Beacon in the Park has the best example of an open and welcoming entrance and lobby and have a great flow.
12. I like both #1 and #3 but with the exterior slide, I fear that it will succumb to vandalism in this neighborhood. #3 has a good entry layout without a single long hallway used to access locker rooms that will be crowded/congested.
13. Largest pool area. However, I wish we could just fix the roof at Columbia Park pool.
14. For spectators location, I think you need the competition and the parents watching swimming lessons POV, but I suspect overall more people will spend more time watching lessons, and it's helpful to be able to see the lane your kid is in better, so Meet Me at Geneva / Beacon in the Park are probably better vs. Heart of the Park where it's harder to see what's going on, especially in the farthest lanes.
15. For spectators location, I think you need the competition and the parents watching swimming lessons POV, but I suspect overall more people will spend more time watching lessons, and it's helpful to be able to see the lane your kid is in better, so Meet Me at Geneva / Beacon in the Park are probably better vs. Heart of the Park where it's harder to see what's going on, especially in the farthest lanes.
16. Like the locker room design better for Heart of the Park / Meet me at Geneva
17. Interior wayfinding is not obvious for rec pool access if not via locker room.
18. Exterior views from pools should not be prioritized over minimizing light disruption to neighbors/habitat; visitors/spectators are more focused on pool events and participants inside the building
19. I'm between Heart & Beacon, but Beacon gets the vote because I like the interior layout more
20. The layout of the pools is optimal
21. Interior space layout and separation of programs. Second level viewing to pool would be amazing and an ADA lift to the slide.
22. I think it has a solid looking floor plan.
23. Largest and most flexible community room/rentable spaces. Recommended change: incorporate 2nd floor spectator seating. Explore option to add a mezzanine of seating with view of competition pool like a glass wall.

Building Exterior Design (50 comments)

1. Interesting architectural exterior with natural light
2. Ability to see the building from the street
3. I love seeing the slide through the window! It is so special and will add visual value to the neighborhood, North Portland deserves pretty, shiny buildings that other neighborhoods have!
4. Elegant exterior building design
5. Most visually compelling design
6. It is the most interesting and pleasing exterior design. The water slide view from the outside is great.
7. View from Fessenden
8. Showcases the pool and water features.
9. They all look like mental hospitals or prisons. I hate all 3.
10. Beautiful exterior to building.
11. Modern architectural design.
12. Signature facility.
13. Has a nice exterior design
14. I want Beacon building on Heart site design.
15. Architecturally the beacon creates the most interesting space from the outside and maximizes the utility of the indoor spaces and has straightforward way finding. The only thing I cannot determine from the presentation is what the bike parking is like in each of the designs, so I cannot give feedback about what the experience would be arriving by bike.
16. It provides a clear frontage along Fessenden.
17. Interesting building design
18. It is the most visually striking
19. Most visually stunning exterior from Fessenden
20. More modern looking
21. The facade is closer to the street and the design is superior.
22. Beautiful design
23. More visible, more iconic
24. I like the building design it looks inviting
25. The big windows in front
26. More dramatic place making. Clear visual connection from the surrounding area to the function of the building.
27. I chose beacon in park as my #1 option because I feel the exterior design and interior design both fit the criteria and meet the needs of the community. The exterior will bring community members in by catching their eye.
28. The slide highlighted in the corner window is beautiful and will remind folks to go swim!
29. Best exterior design to draw people towards the building
30. I like the way it shows the pool and water slide off, I believe it will draw people in.
31. I like the exterior design of Beacon in the Park

32. The glass windows into the pool from the front of the building are attractive.
33. Best exterior look.
34. I don't like the building design. Geneva is my favorite building design.
35. Distinctive exterior building design.
36. It's design is more inviting because the tall windows are showing the interior.
37. Has the best building aesthetic
38. I think the entrance/view of the pools for Beacon in the Park is best.
39. Even though more trees (nuisance) on Fessenden are removed, Beacon affords the facility a good presence and identity, and some street trees have been added. Please consider down-facing, dimmable exterior lighting (and interior lights that may be on overnight) and tall evergreen tree barriers to benefit and buffer residents and wildlife year-round (this is basically a shopping mall being added to a robust park and residential ecosystem).
40. Residents would appreciate seeing renderings of all exterior walls at the October meeting to understand and evaluate facade features, including lighting, materials and plantings, etc. Thank you for including community input.
41. I prefer the exterior design of the Beacon in the Park and I like the interior design of Heart of the Park
42. The large corner windows facing Fessenden feel much more welcoming and vibrant to the neighborhood. I think it blends more seamlessly into the neighborhood and feels like an exciting landmark.
43. I like the idea of the pool windows' placement
44. Prefer architectural style
45. Integrates well with Fessenden
46. The building design itself looks best
47. One story, best exterior
48. Interesting façade and good access points.
49. Iconic architecture.
50. I like the bold corner look.

Meet Me at Geneva

Site Design

1. I like the simple plan layout of the building.
2. Most practical and logistically sound
3. It had a few more +'s than the other options but could benefit from some elements from other options
4. Better layout, feels more communal than the others
5. Best for visibility and people who live nearby
6. Building is up by the street

7. Overall best design, good job
8. Because it fits the area
9. I like it the most

Open Recreation Space (5 comments)

1. 2 soccer fields
2. open rec area/playground
3. I feel like it creates more continuity with the existing park.
4. Provides a soccer field
5. Meet me At Geneva preserves greenspace between Clarendon school and proposed building.

Parking/Entry (31 comments)

1. Parking and maintaining less chaos on the street I live on
2. This is the best design to preserve the peace and road safety for residents living on N Berkeley, Cecelia, and Clarendon.
3. The parking lot placement appears to be least likely to negatively impact N Berkeley, Cecelia and Clarendon with further through traffic.
4. The parking lot in Heart of the Park is better (main access should be of Fessenden).
5. Parking
6. I prefer this design for many reasoning, esp. parking lot location
7. I don't want to accommodate parking and cars - would rather encourage people not to bring a car somehow.
8. Having an open field visible to Fessenden instead of a parking lot makes it SO much more inviting... and much more enjoyable than walking out the building to a sea of cars.
9. Having the parking lot off Fessenden is going to create a lot of traffic issues.
10. I prefer parking to be off the side street rather than off Fessenden. I feel like it'll help with traffic, plus it will encourage some people to head south on Geneva rather than every car dumping out onto Fessenden.
11. Appreciate the parking being off a busy street which eliminates dangerous left turns into the parking lot.
12. Parking lot location
13. Because of parking lot location
14. Visibility and access
15. Less parking traffic on Fessenden
16. I like the parking being located off the main street
17. Fessenden is a busy street and having the main entrance to parking there could snarl traffic. I like deprioritizing cars and having Fessenden be all park view. I like the structure design of Beacon better but having parking off Geneva seems better.
18. I think they're all fine, but I'm really just looking at the parking situation.
19. parking lot is easily accessible to the center

20. Traffic concerns on Fessenden for coach and school buses (especially) trying to park for Competition Days / Events. At least, will back up traffic. Having the main parking lot on Geneva can alleviate regular traffic.
21. Entering the parking lot off of president is just asking for accidents, yes entering from Geneva is probably gonna upset the neighbors but overall, it'll be safer.
22. I like the parking between both spaces, so it's easier for people to access both equally - loading and unloading for events, etc.
23. My main concern, outside of getting an indoor pool back in North Portland, is minimizing the impact on the Clarendon Early Learning Center. I strongly prefer separating the pool and its parking from the school as much as possible, for the safety of the kids.
24. The space provides off street parking, but the park is connected to the building and the street.
25. Parking lot is furthest from Clarendon. Overall, the parking lot is way too big. But the priority for locating within the park is not to put a parking lot right outside of Clarendon because of the air quality and heat island issues affecting all but especially young children.
26. I like that the parking lot isn't right on Fessenden, so it would make it look nicer driving down the street. I feel like it's more inviting to have the swimming center and the big park accessible right from bus stops and walking past, and more welcoming.
27. Prefer the parking lot less visible and less central to the park, this location doesn't cut off Clarendon from the park and you don't have to cross a parking area to move between recreation areas.
28. The parking lot does not divide the open and green spaces which is critical for kid safety. I do prefer the entrances on Fessenden though in the heart option, just not the design of the building itself.
29. Better incorporates the new center into green space, specifically when viewed from Fessenden. Moving parking to the "back" of the building preserves the view and accessibility of the community spaces to pedestrians and cyclists.
30. Separation from Fessenden St is crucial to maintain a safe feeling in this neighborhood. It would also be helpful to have a traffic signal for bikes and autos to safely enter and exit onto Fessenden.
31. I like that the parking lot does not cut through the park or is near the splash pad where kids are running around and families are not paying attention to their surroundings. I also like that one could submerge themselves in a park setting without annoying cars buzzing around.

Tennis Courts (0 comments)

Trees (9 comments)

1. Meet me at Geneva preserves the trees on Fessenden, which are an important part of the community.
2. Trees
3. I prefer this design for the tree preservation
4. Least amount of trees removed
5. Want more space for trees.
6. Less harm to trees
7. Less tree impact

8. The trees
9. Protects the most trees

Outdoor Amenities (12 comments)

1. Want designated play spaces for kids
2. Pavilion
3. Pavilion located at the corner of the field
4. Splash pad and pavilion
5. I like the design of the plaza.
6. Keeps the splash pad away from the street & parking lot for safety.
7. Best splash pad
8. The splash pad being closer to the playground-much easier for parents.
9. I like that the splash pad is visible from the street, but you don't have to walk close to it to enter the building.
10. Layout of plaza to building
11. I like that the splash pad is close to the playground, kids like to move between those areas, and it makes it easier to watch multiple kids. The parking lot is closer to the play areas, but looks like it could be reasonably isolated from those spaces by landscaping.
12. It looks like it has good covered outdoor area. For me being in Portland my whole life, I opt for quality covered outdoor spaces.

Building Interior Design (11 comments)

1. I like the location of the spectator seats.
2. Interior
3. Separate slide
4. Community/locker layout
5. I like the layout of the pools and slide better.
6. Design of lazy river is most dynamic.
7. Larger rec pool
8. Want a legitimate sized pool
9. The women's locker room is closest to the rec pool.
10. Meet Me at Geneva has the best spectator seating for competitions that also preserves the depth of the pool. For the record, the pool MUST be at least 25m in length and 12m in width with a 12m x 12m area at least 2.5m in depth to be AQUA compliant for competitive youth deep water sports (artistic swimming, water polo).
11. For competitive swimming, Meet Me at Geneva allows for simultaneous programming with access to parking etc. it would be the best layout for hosting swim meets, which has the potential to expand the visibility of competitive swimming across Oregon and provide revenue to the local community while also allowing other programming to continue with the most ease.

Building Exterior Design (9 comments)

1. Most welcoming feeling, doesn't look like an Amazon warehouse
2. I think that Meet Me at Geneva meets all the needs the best. However I like the front view of Beacon in the Park better. I wish they could be combined.
3. Most appealing
4. This design is all inclusive from young to old. It is inviting for the whole community.
5. Suitable design
6. View of slide from Fessenden in Beacon is attractive.
7. The approach to the center seems more welcoming and open.
8. It has a little of a mid century vibe.
9. It's the best for safety and accessibility while also having nice aesthetics, minimal impact to neighbors and managing to have as many amenities as possible. It's the cleanest and most inviting all around with attention to accessibility.