



North Portland Aquatic Center Phase 2 / Cycle #1 Online Survey Summary – March 2025

For the first cycle of engagement for the North Portland Aquatic Center (NPAC) design process, the design team at Scott Edwards Architecture provided three concept plans that focused on different options for:

- siting the aquatic center and parking lots within Northgate Park
- the locations of the outdoor amenities (plaza, splash pad, and pavilion) and open lawn spaces
- vehicle access from adjacent streets



Option 1:

Heart of the Park



Option 2:

Meet Me at Geneva



Option 3:

Beacon in the Park

We asked community members to give input via an online survey in English and Spanish about the building and amenities layout and the three concept plans. The survey was promoted through emails to the over 5,000 email subscribers for the project, posts on social media, and direct outreach to local schools, PTAs, and community partners. The online survey was open from March 10 – March 23, 2025. Six responses were received in Spanish, and 781 English responses were completed. A total of 787 responses were received.

It should be noted that this report reflects the opinions of those who chose to participate in this survey. It is not necessarily representative of the broader community. This online survey was part of a larger engagement effort that also included input from meetings held online with focus groups, the NPAC Project Advisory Committee (PAC), Portland Public School staff, and the Technical Advisory Committee (a group of PP&R staff who will maintain and program the future NPAC and park amenities). All input will be used in the planning and design process for the North Portland Aquatic Center.

The next round of engagement is being planned for July 2025 and will include more extensive outreach and engagement, including an in-person community meeting, in addition to the focus groups and PAC meeting.

1. Which new exterior site feature is most important to you?

- **38%: Community Pavilion:** *A versatile Community Pavilion space that offers full shade and rain protection, ideal for hosting a variety of events that bring families and neighbors together.*
- **37%: Splash Pad:** *A splash pad is a seasonal water play area, often with several water spray features and no standing water. Splash pads are a safe and fun way for people of all ages to enjoy and grow more comfortable in water during the warmer months.*
- **16%: Plaza:** *A Plaza is a large, open public space with casual seating and often public art.*
- **9%: No opinion**

2. What types of activities are most preferred at the Community Pavilion? Please select your TOP TWO activities.

- Music Performances **61%**
- Group Picnics **46%**
- Fitness Classes **43%**
- Art Installations **23%**
- Special events (such as weddings, reunions, ceremonies, memorial events) **21%**
- Dance Performances **11%**
- Other **7%:**

Comments about use of the pavilion:

- Children's birthday parties
- Community/neighborhood events such as culturally specific events, holiday activities, first day of spring/summer, ice cream social, farmers/community markets, movies, potlucks, etc. (14)
- Free performance of music AND dance
- Grassy slope for picnics while enjoying music (2)
- Limit groups
- Meditation, yoga, t'ai chi classes
- Neighbor on McKenna would prefer no loud music
- No pavilion - pavilion will not get used, current pavilion is rarely used (2)
- Regularly used in organized way to keep space welcoming for all
- Skill sharing, networking, community knowledge, and resource sharing
- Space for spectators when NPAC hosts swim meets
- Youth classes (art, music, fitness/indoor play area) and youth/family programming (summer camps, etc.) (3)

Comments about other park features:

- Casual use of green space, green space and trees (2)
- Cement games like at Hidden Park West in Hillsboro (ping pong table, corn hole, etc.)
- Children's playground
- Community garden and greenery, plant identification plaques (2)
- Covered basketball court
- Fenced dog area

- Fix Columbia Pool (3), keep community centers open (1)
- Gym
- Rugby
- Keep tennis and pickleball courts (6)
- SDC funds should not be restricted to new projects
- Swimming lessons, swimming is my only priority (2)

3. How important is it to maintain open lawn area for casual recreation activities in the park with the new aquatic center development?

- Very Important **50%** / Important **31%**
- Less important **14%** / Not important **4%**
- No opinion **2%**

4. How do you currently access the existing Northgate Park site?

- I do not currently use Northgate Park **36%**
- Car/vehicle **28%**
- Walk **19%**
- Bike **12%**
- Bus **2%**
- Scooter **0.2%**
- TriMet LIFT service **0.1%**
- Other **2%**

5. How will you generally travel to the future North Portland Aquatic Center at Northgate Park (over 50% of your trips)?

- Car/vehicle **52%**
- Bike **22%**
- Walk **19%**
- Bus **4%**
- Scooter **0.6%**
- TriMet LIFT service **0.3%**
- Other: **2%**

6. When travelling to the future aquatic center, which side of Northgate Park will you enter from?

- North (from N. Fessenden St.) **49%**
- South (from N. Wall St. Or N. Clarendon St.) **29%**
- West (from Geneva Ave.) **11%**
- East (from N. Newark St.) **11%**

7. Below is a list of different experiences and aspects of the site design concepts. Which three (3) are most important to include in the next phase of design options for the North Portland Aquatic Center? (Choose your top three).

- **53%: Connected Outdoor Amenities:** The locations of the new outdoor amenities including the Splash Pad, Plaza, Pavilion and the existing park amenities (i.e., playground) are connected and easy to access.
- **44%: Use of Open Green Space:** Open green space that can be used in a variety of ways by the broader community.
- **43%: Parking Accessibility:** The bike and car parking areas near the Aquatic Center entrance off N Fessenden and/or N Geneva are easy to access.
- **40%: Community Plaza Experience:** A versatile community plaza creates a welcoming, safe, enjoyable approach to the center's front door and provides space for distinctive and inclusive public art and a variety of different gathering spots.
- **38%: Aquatic Center Location/Visibility from Main Streets:** The location of the Aquatic Center, front door, and plaza provides visibility from the street and inspires a sense of community interest, pride, and ownership.
- **31%: Front Door Accessibility:** The proximity of the Aquatic Center's front door to the bus stops and sidewalks on N Fessenden and/or N Geneva is accessible.
- **26%: Pavilion Use and Location:** A flexible pavilion space that is located near the open green space and/or plaza designed to activate the surrounding outdoor areas of the new facility and in the park with community events.

8. Portland Parks & Recreation is committed to building a safe and welcoming aquatic center. We know that the exterior physical factors of a building contribute to a sense of safety and welcoming. Please select the TOP THREE physical features that would most help provide a safe and welcoming North Portland Aquatic Center at Northgate Park. ^[OBJ]

- **82%** Excellent lighting to create a well-lit site including the aquatic center, the parking, site paths, and the park amenities.
- **55%** Having activities that attract community members to activate the outdoor spaces.
- **53%** Having a clean and graffiti-free park space and amenities
- **36%** Clear lines of sight from the sidewalks and park paths to the building's front door.
- **31%** Reducing potential hiding spots and barriers
- **21%** Clear lines of sight to the park edges and being able to see surroundings without significant visual obstructions.
- **8%** Other

Comparing the Three Concepts

What is your opinion of the entry sequence, from the point of arrival on the site to entering the front door of the building?

	Like	Dislike	No opinion
Concept 1 – Heart of the Park	70%	14%	16%
Concept 2 – Meet Me at Geneva	40%	42%	18%
Concept 3 – Beacon in the Park	41%	41%	18%

What is your opinion on the location and layout of the Community Plaza and Splash Pad?

	Like	Dislike	No opinion
Concept 1 – Heart of the Park	56%	26%	18%
Concept 2 – Meet Me at Geneva	43%	34%	23%
Concept 3 – Beacon in the Park	32%	47%	21%

What is your overall favorite concept?

Concept 1 – Heart of the Park	56%
Concept 2 – Meet Me at Geneva	24%
Concept 3 – Beacon in the Park	14%
No Opinion	6%

We asked survey respondents to tell us what the most important factors are in selecting their favorite concept. Below is a summary of the comments for each. A full list of all comments can be found as an appendix at the end of this report.

Concept 1 - Heart of the Park: 56% of responses said they preferred this option.

Here are some major themes why:

- **Safety and accessibility** - Many mentioned a concern about children crossing parking lots or roadways when moving throughout the park. This concept provides the most access to park amenities without having to cross an area where cars will be.
- **Green spaces and layout of outdoor amenities** - People like that the outdoor amenities are close together to create a community hub of activity. However, some did express concern about the splash pad's proximity to busy Fessenden Street and suggested it could be moved more into the park or the existing splash pad could be upgraded. There also are some concerns about removing the tennis courts, although they are in poor condition.
- **Location of parking** - People prefer that parking is located away from the main part of the park. Option 1 uses the already busy Fessenden Street as a main entrance, and people liked that this option did not have as much impact on Geneva Street residents.
- **Connectivity and flow** – People felt this concept has clear, accessible pedestrian routes between all the park amenities and appreciated the overall flow and connections between different park attractions.

Concept 2 – Meet Me at Geneva: 24% of responses said they preferred this option.

Here are some major themes why:

- **Safety and accessibility** – In this concept, there is access from multiple directions, depending on your mode of transit, and good accessibility for people with disabilities including direct routes from the bus stop and parking. This concept has the splash pad further from Fessenden, a busy street, so feels safer for kids.
- **Green spaces and layout of outdoor amenities:** Would like to keep parking away from school and green spaces as much as possible. Some prefer separation of splash pad and pavilion to allow for diverse and concurrent uses, but some like them together so parents can keep an eye on kids while at an event which would be a challenge with the pavilion location in this concept. In this concept, you can enter the aquatic center without engaging with the busy and potentially noisy splash pad.
- **Location of parking** – This concept tucks the parking behind the building, so it isn't the main view when you are on Fessenden. Some appreciated that it prioritizes pedestrians, cyclists, and public transit access over a car-centric design. Don't want parking to feel like it dominates the site.
- **Connectivity and flow** – people want efficient, safe, and intuitive movement through the site. Some like the east-west building orientation for solar gain and natural light. Appreciate multiple entrances especially when they align with how people are arriving (on foot, bus, etc.)

Concept 3 – Beacon in the Park: 14% of responses said they preferred this option.

Here are some major themes why:

- **Safety and accessibility** – Prefer direct, safe, and convenient access from the parking lot to the front door, especially for people with small children, elders, and people with disabilities. Prefer to avoid long walks and crossing busy areas such as the parking lot and splash pad. Some like a design that hides the pool from general public view for more privacy and safety.
- **Location of parking** – This concept and concept #1 both keep traffic off Geneva Street, a narrow residential street by having the main parking lot entrance on Fessenden. Would like good bicycle access that is separate from cars if possible and dedicated, covered bike parking especially for cargo/family bikes. Like that parking separates building and green space, creating two different scenes or opportunities for activities.
- **Green spaces and layout of outdoor amenities** – Green buffers for neighbors/Clarendon School and for views from the pool (instead of busy road) are desirable. The splash pad should not be near a main entrance and should ensure kids are not running across a parking lot to other park amenities. People like that you can see the splash pad from Fessenden which invites you to join. Would like splash pad to be near grassy outdoor areas. Like the pavilion being distinctly separate from the splash pad area. Prefer a southern or eastern facing pool to get the most natural light.

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

Age?

- Under 16 **1%**
- Age 17-24 **2%**
- Age 25-34 **8%**
- Age 35-44 **39%**
- Age 45-59 **33%**
- Age 60-79 **16%**
- Age 80 and over **1%**

I identify as:

- Female **71%**
- Male **24%**
- Transgender female **0.4%**
- Transgender male **0.13%**
- Genderqueer/androgynous **3%**
- Prefer not to answer **2%**
- Prefer to describe: **1%**: non-binary, gender expansive

I identify as: (check all that apply)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native **2%**
- Asian **5%**
- Black or African American **5%**
- Hispanic or Latino/a/x/e **6%**
- Middle Eastern/North African **0.4%**
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander **1%**
- Slavic/Eastern European **1%**
- White **82%**
- Unknown/don't know **1%**
- 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 **25%**
- No **75%**

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 **47%**
- Mental health **39%**
- Cognitive **23%**
- Invisible **17%**
- Hearing **12%**
- Intellectual or developmental **10%**
- Visual **3%**
- Prefer not to disclose **8%**
- Prefer to describe **4%**: neurodivergent, autism (2), lung impairment, menopause, physical therapist who works with many people who will benefit from this, wheelchair user.

Regarding residence, I

- Own **84%**
- Rent **14%**
- Live with my parents **2%**
- Other **1%**

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

- Five blocks or less **15%**
- Less than one mile **25%**
- More than one mile **60%**

How many children under age 18 live with you?

- 0 **45%**
- 1-2 **51%**
- 3-4 **4%**
- 5 or more **0.4%**

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

- 0-2 years **18%**
- 3-6 years **31%**
- 7-10 years **37%**
- 11-14 years **29%**
- 15-18 years **23%**

APPENDIX – COMMENTS ABOUT WHY PREFER CONCEPT #1 – HEART OF THE PARK

ACCESSIBILITY AND FLOW

A lot of foot and vehicle traffic will come from Fessenden, so it makes sense for the main entrance to be oriented to that street. I also prefer the flow between the pool building, green space and paths/playground in design #1.

Access and flow

Access and noise pollution avoidance

Access for all

access is direct and easy to see

Access to public transportation and ease of entry

Access to the parking lot for pavilion

Accessibility

Accessibility to the park, native plants

Accessible parking

Accessible to all with accessible parking

All parts of Park are connected. Also, if you're using multiple aspects of the park, you can still be connected visually to the others.

Best accessibility

better access to all

Better entrance points

better flow with existing features and a nice flow from the school.

Building is accessible and visible from the street.

connection directly to bus lines

Connectivity.

Ease of access to parking and amenities. Clearer access to the doors.

ease of access to parking from N. Fessenden

Ease of entry

Easiest access from the parking lot

Easy access between facilities without crossing over parking lot and traffic with young children. Ease and flow of the site

Easy access from Fessenden

Easy access from N and E sides, minimal impact to Geneva residents, recreation area away from street and safer. Like the E-W orientation of the pools.

Easy access, a welcoming front entrance, green space

Easy to access for public transport too.

Entry

Flow

Flow from one recreational activity to the next (adjacencies).

Flow is the best in this design!

Front door close to bus stop.

Front facing, entrance visible to key amenities

I like the access this provides to the surrounding neighborhoods to the south and west.

Inter-connected amenities. Activation near Fessenden. Entry facing Fessenden while maintaining views into pools from the street.

It doesn't completely take over the park and it is easy to access by parking lot and street

<p>It looks as though there is more parking, so likely more handicapped parking. I have mobility issues and walk with a cane. While Matt Dishman is my "home pool". I have taken water aerobics classes at every Portland Parks and Rec site. I have also driven to every site and had to leave as there was no parking close enough. While I have a handicapped placard I try to save it for the wheelchair and walker crowd if there is regular parking close enough. Sometimes I arrive as much as 1/2 hr early in an attempt to get parking close enough. Also a person I bring to the pool regularly (does not drive because of visual impairment) has some trouble walking far.</p>
<p>It seems the most cohesive and would not require as much crossing the parking lot/car traffic to access the different areas of the park.</p>
<p>It's the most direct and easy to understand. Least confusing!</p>
<p>Larger grass space that creates a nice flow between the tree area and existing playground.</p>
<p>More inclusive</p>
<p>Most attractive and efficient</p>
<p>Nice alignment of entry points to the site.</p>
<p>One entry side for security.</p>
<p>Option 1 makes the most sense to me and seems the least disruptive to the current uses of the park.</p>
<p>Option 1 seems like it works best with the layout of the existing park. The other options seem to divide the park in an awkward way, I like that this layout allows the existing park to be off to the side without dividing in twos</p>
<p>Park layout</p>
<p>Proximity of parking to entrance and the proximity of the community pavilion, splash pad & recreation area within each other.</p>
<p>Seems less broken up by asphalt. The elements seem to flow better.</p>
<p>The flow layout of pool, parking and rec space are connected and feel as one space.</p>
<p>The flow of the space makes the most sense- park, community plaza, entering at the admin offices vs closer to locker rooms which could be hard to manage for safety.</p>
<p>The shape and location of the pavilion, parking lot and green area.</p>
<p>PARKING AND TRAFFIC</p>
<p>All three of these parks give a lot of the public recreational space over to parking. Option two and three really have the parking lot as the focal point of the park. Kids who want to move from one area to another would have to walk through the parking lots to get from one splash pad to the other for example. Gross and not safe. I understand the need for parking but people come to the parks to get some natural scenery and space to run and roam.</p>
<p>As a parent of young children, having the parking lot and roads in the center of the park (options 2 and 3) is not ideal. Option 1 prioritizes continuity of green space and walkable areas without cars.</p>
<p>Avoid traffic congestion on N Wall Ave</p>
<p>Avoiding disconnects in the park due to roads and parking lots, as well as keeping parking lots away from pavilion spaces - these park "breaks" create safety hazards and should be situated at the edges of the facility and not near foot traffic.</p>
<p>car access is to the side and not bifurcating the park, parking lot access is off the largest street, minimizing community traffic impact</p>
<p>Car access on Fessenden not Geneva</p>
<p>Cars come in from Fessenden, which is already a busy road. And no parking log between green space and pool.</p>
<p>Cars should enter parking lot from the main street and not go down a side street.</p>
<p>Does not require people to walk through parking lot from the other park.</p>
<p>Driving traffic from the Aquatic Center to areas that can handle that extra "load" is my top concern.</p>

Enough parking that is close to the building and easy to access from a main road.
entering off the main road will be easier and not clog up these residential roads.
Entering parking from Fessenden.
Entrance from a main road rather than a side road.
Entrance is off the most non-neighborhood streets to reduce cars going in areas that kids might play.
Entrance should be close to parking
Entrance to parking lot from Fessenden
Fessenden access
Focus automobile traffic to N Fessenden. By encouraging traffic to enter from N Geneva, it makes N Geneva less safe for pedestrians and becomes less desirable for walking. Option 1 keeps parking lots on the edges of the space and don't create as much opportunity for using parking lots as pedestrian pass throughs.
Folks don't have to walk through parking lot to access parts of the park.
Geneva is a small street and shouldn't have to deal with all that traffic.
Having the parking lot closer to the school protects the houses on Geneva from high traffic commotion
Having the parking lot off to the side of the park as much as possible. The parking lot seems to take too much space of the park. If this pool is for the neighborhood, we should encourage taking the bus, biking, or walking as the main mode of transportation to the park/pool.
Having the parking lot on the side, so kids don't run through it.
Heart of the Parks seems to be the only design that doesn't have the main features of the park broken up by parking. Options 2 and 3 seem to place parking central, which breaks up the usable space.
Honestly it is upsetting and disappointing to see so much parking lot in these designs, way more than I remember seeing in the previous layouts. Young children like mine should not have to feel worried about crossing parking lots and car traffic to move from one part of the park to the other. One of the best things about Northgate now is the large expanse of car free space so kids can roam from field to playground freely. Is it not possible to make an agreement with PPS to use their existing parking lot on Fessenden when they aren't using it to reduce some of this new surface lot? It does not align with city climate goals and neighborhood prioritization in this design to pave over so much green space to accommodate car travel. :(
I 100% vote for number 1!!! What stands out most to me is the location of the parking lot... I don't like the idea of a parking separating different areas of the park... A "centrally" positioned parking lot would require people /children who are moving between the pool and other recreation areas to either (a) walk across a potentially dangerous parking lot to access other areas of the park, or (b) walk a longer route around the parking lot to other areas... but we all know children will take the short cut and run across the parking lot!
I like how there are fewer "driveways" that cross the walking path in the park. Options 2 and 3 have 2 driveways that cross the paths and Option 1 only has one.
I do not like the parking area on N Clarendon. It looks like it's present in all 3 site plans and I don't understand why additional parking is needed in that space. From the site plan, it looks like you'll half the tennis courts which would leave a teeny tiny court and a teeny tiny parking space - there is a house right next to and across the street from where that parking lot would be. No one buys a home next to a park then expects part of the park to be turned into a parking lot. Clarendon gets really busy with cars in the morning and afternoon for pick-up from the head start which makes it hard to get emergency vehicles and delivery trucks through the cul de sac. Adding traffic to that teeny lot will make navigating the street even harder.
I don't like the designs that have a cars drive down a "street" in the park to get to the other parking lot. It's not a good use of space and creates potential hazards. I also like how the various features are close together in Heart of the Park, donuts easy to walk from one area to the next and be able to see what's going on in adjacent areas.

I don't really love any of the options but to keep parking the furthest away from the playground would be my inclination. It looks like no more tennis courts? That's OK I never played there anyway I also was less inclined to like any of the roads that had a curve in them through the park. I just feel like it might be confusing traffic wise. I'm not sure that auxiliary parking lot needs to be there, though that roundabout is so hard to navigate already when dropping kids off for school and I know they have a lot of traffic already. I would 100% reach out to the principal of the school and the teachers who work there I bet they would have good comments.
I feel at Columbia people had to walk around from parking on the street to the entrance. I think the entrance and the welcoming of people is key. I think in the "heart" the parking seems a bit less dominate and the entrance seems better. The "beacon" has two different entrances, which one do people go to?
I like #1 because of the Main Entrance off Fessenden - Geneva could not handle that kind of traffic for such a large parking lot Option 1 also has fewer roads through the park making it less dangerous for littles who might want to run across the recreation area to the pool.
I like having the main entrance on Fessenden and the entry sequence arriving by bike or bus. It's incredibly hard to visualize from the plans the scale and impression at the pedestrian/cyclist level.
I like how Option 1 places the parking to the side, consolidating the attractions.
I like that the parking lot doesn't cut off or create a barrier between spaces within the park. Also like the service entrance being on the side street rather than on Fessenden.
I like that the parking lot is off to the side.
I like that that you don't have to cross the parking lot to enter the recreation area. It seems like it could be dangerous to place the parking lot in between the two if kids are going from activities inside to activities in the rec area.
I like the big parking lot
I like the first option because you can get to different places in the park without crossing the parking lot or driveway, so kids can roam without being hit by a car.
I like the parking lot on the outside of the park.
I live on Newark and would love to not have a parking lot as the view of the park
I really don't like that option 2 and 3 require people to cross the driveways and parking lots to get from the aquatic center to the green space and the existing splash pad.
I think entering from Fessenden instead of a street with houses will be nicer for the neighbors that live there.
I would like to access the parking lot from Fessenden Street.
I'm a close neighbor who lives on Geneva and walks in Northgate every day from the McKenna entry. I definitely don't want the Meet Me At Geneva option. I wouldn't want the parking lot there.
I'm thinking about heat island effect of parking lot orientation, so I like its long axis North/South (vs E/W)
It is more cohesive outdoor space away from parking. Also like the entry to parking from Fessenden
It seems like the parking isn't separating the other area from each other.
Keep the parking lot as separate as possible from the green space so folks outdoors don't have to inhale idling motors' pollution.
Keep the parking lot away from my home, reduce the amount of noise and exhaust that I did not purchase my house on a dead end for.
Keep the parking lot away from the play areas! The smaller the kids, the more they like to play amongst the parked cars.
Keeping higher traffic off Geneva. Not having to move a bus stop.
Keeping the main entrance on N Fessenden, but also keeping the public areas in the park open to N Fessenden (not blocked by the aquatic center) are important for site circulation, community use, and safety. Don't put the parking area in the middle of the site (option #3).

Keeping the neighborhood happy with the traffic /foot traffic
Keeping traffic on Fessenden and preserving trees
Keeps cars to the edge of where kids and park users are enjoying their space.
Large grassy area, least disruption to people on Geneva, minimal driveways between parking lots, splash pad near parking lot
Least parking lot
Least traffic disruption to nearby residents.
Less asphalt for parking.
Less disruption to the neighbors
less obstructed entries
Less traffic and lighting from aquatic building to disturb/affect Geneva Ave residents.
less traffic on Geneva, least traffic around the playground
Less traffic on N. Geneva, not the main entrance for parking lot. I lived around the corner for 8 years. We just moved, but I know the park and area well.
Limited vehicle entries off neighborhood streets.
Location of front door & distance from parking lots. Distance from front door to rec pool.
Location of parking lot. We walk in so we don't need it.
Location of pools away from parking. Traffic coming in from Fessenden rather than lesser-travelled side streets. More open space uninterrupted by parking lot(s).
Location of the community pavilion and access to parking.
Main parking lot accessible from Fessenden instead of a smaller side street
Maintaining a park feel; I greatly dislike the options that put a parking lot in the middle of the park dividing into small sections.
Minimizing the proportion of the park that is taken up by new roads.
Minimizing traffic on Geneva and main auto entrance near bus stops on Fessenden.
Most convenient to park and walk to entrance
Most of the access should be from Fessenden to reduce traffic along Geneva.
No parking lot or road to cross between the playground and green space. Main entrance to parking lot on Fessenden.
Option 1 has fewer roadways cutting through the park, creating less danger that someone will get hit by a car running from one part of the park to the next. It's got clear access to the parking lot, which is important because an indoor pool will be used during cold weather and many kids will be leaving still in wet swimsuits. You don't want that to be a long walk to the car.
Option 1 is the ONLY option that considers children and families and considers how they have used Columbia Park in the past. Families with young children who will ACTUALLY be using the park will want to play in the park before/after swimming. Option 1 is the ONLY option that allows them to access the other park areas without crossing traffic (cars/parking lot). Option 1 is the safest for families with children and children alone who will be using the park. I am honestly surprised that no one looked at the other two and saw that children will be crossing car spaces in order to get to the other park spaces. This will be happening. Do we really want a line of children crossing through parking lots/driveways to be able to play in their park?
Option 1 lays out the building and parking lot closer to Fessenden (a busier road) and keeps the remaining south portion of the park mostly undeveloped. The main entrance off Fessenden, rather than the side streets is important so that increased traffic will not be affecting the residential areas surrounding the park.
Options 2 and 3 give residents/neighbors a parking lot view and drastically more light pollution. Least disruptive parking option. Keeps main traffic flow on Fessenden. Lowest light pollution option for residents/neighbors. Most logical entry to facility. Least disruptive overall to residents/neighbors.
Orientation of the parking lots.

Orienting entrance towards busier street to avoid impacting neighborhood collectors.
Other options seem to cut up space with parking lot & driveways.
parking
Parking access from Fessenden to reduce traffic on small roads
parking and access
Parking and building are visible from Fessenden (major artery), the parking doesn't split the green area from other features, and it is least disruptive to the residential area. As a woman, the parking feels safest when visible from a major artery street.
Parking and disruption to the neighbors living nearby.
parking and pavilion location
parking and recreation placement
Parking and street access.
Parking appears significantly oversized in all options. Much, much too large.
Parking can't come from Geneva, it can't handle that level of traffic, will congest the entire neighborhood.
Parking close to pool.
Parking convenience and aesthetics
Parking entrance on main thoroughfare.
Parking entrances should minimize the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.
Parking is adequate yet preserves a big grass area.
Parking is least centralized.
Parking is least intrusive but still close by.
Parking is streamlined. There are two options for entry/exit.
Parking is to the side. If I bringing a bunch of kids, it's easier if I know they aren't crossing the parking lot.
Parking looks easy to access.
Parking lot accessible from Fessenden. It shouldn't be on a side street.
Parking lot does not split up park amenities
Parking lot is away from everything else, not in the middle of it. (Parking lot in #2 is too close to the playground.)
Parking lot should have easy access to main entrance.
parking lot should not separate the pool from the park. Not safe for the little kids.
Parking lot visibility from and proximity to Fessenden
Parking needs to be not in the center. Entrance needs to be from Fessenden, as it is a busy street. I think that kids areas need to be away from busy streets.
Parking not in the way of other activities or pass through.
Parking on the boundary of the park so it doesn't divide the park.
Parking proximity close to the inside for rainy days
Path from parking to admission is shortest and direct. This layout also reduces parking spill over into the neighborhood streets. Two entrances is good as well.
Please don't put the parking lot in the middle of the park! What an ugly use of space! So much nicer not to have community and green spaces broken up by cars and parking!
Reduce the need to cross parking from one feature. I would not want to see kids, Going from the grass area across the parking lot into the pool
Reducing interactions between parking lots and play
Reduction of overflow parking on Geneva Ave (I live across the street)
Safe separation between the parking lot and the splash pad/plaza are very important. I like opt 1 the best, but would love to see more information about what this separation looks like
Seems like it has less hard surface pavement and more efficient vehicle access and circulation.

separating service parking from public parking
Service access off Geneva makes sense.
Since I live on Geneva, I like the position of the parking lot and less traffic on Geneva.
spaces are not broken up by parking lots, keep the parking to the side and let the green space and pool be more connected. Like how Columbia park was.
That the parking doesn't tie up Geneva with all the cars going in and out
The entrance as you enter and separate areas for service parking and location of outdoor spaces.
The flow and cohesiveness of option 1 feels the nicest. Without the center of the park being a parking lot. That pushes any danger of vehicles to one side and feels safest.
the middle option put the parking lot front and center, yuck
the other two puts parking in the center of the park which is awful from a park use perspective. Option 1 also seems to have the least amount of pavement and does not cut through the park features with roads. the other two are much too car centric and honestly all should consider condensing the parking closer to Fessenden.
The park feels more intact in Heart of the Park rather than having the parking be a barrier between the park and the amenities.
The parking lot access off Fessenden also makes the most sense.
The parking lot area compliments the rest of the park.
The parking lot feels less intrusive in this design because it's nearer to existing lots.
The parking lot is least central and it seems like the grassy area is most prominent.
The parking lot is not in the middle of the valuable space. In Heart of the Park, the lot is to the side.
The parking lot location in both #2 & #3 bisects the aquatic center from the other park amenities. Being across a parking lot might as well be across a street especially for small children and user with limited mobility. N Geneva doesn't feel like it can accommodate the volume of traffic to be a primary entry. Service entry is probably ok. Side note: The service parking locations seem to vary with images for Option #3. Additionally the interface of this survey on my mobile device doesn't show any of my responses.
The third option has a massive parking lot between the center and the green space, which creates a danger for kids running from the center to the rest of the park
Uninterrupted pedestrian enjoyment of all features. Parking lot entry from Fessenden keeps cars out of neighborhood and permits bike path usage from neighborhood safer and children's arrivals safer.
Vehicle traffic to parking off Fessenden. Main entrance is near the center of the park.
We'll likely come via car, bus, or bike from Chautauqua, and easy access from Fessenden was a factor.
Where the parking is. There is already a path going from Mckenna into the park. LEAVE IT THERE.
Why on earth is there SO MUCH CAR PARKING??? This location already has ample street parking and off-street parking, but the new lot is more sqft than the entire building and then some. Not only that, but you're adding new car routes on the SE side that cut across and disconnect what should be prized green space. I actually greatly prefer layout 2/3 for giving the school access to green space, but not at the cost of bisecting the usable outdoor space with a dangerous car access point. This site sits at the confluence of a Frequent Service bus route and 4 major bike routes. It has enough parking already, and by adding more you incentivize large numbers of people from outside the neighborhood to drive here, creating more pollution and more danger to the very kids this facility is supposed to be serving. Cut the off-street parking in half, cut the new SE access point, and lean into serving local residents who walk, bike, and take transit. Off-street parking should primarily serve people with disabilities, not large groups of visitors who don't even live in the area. It's crazy that all of these designs place more importance on maximizing convenience for drivers than they do on making this the best community amenity it can possibly be - the thing that should be your priority #1.
GREENSPACES AND PARK AMENITIES
A big recreation area so it keeps the feel that it's still a park with a lot of green space
Ability to maintain irrigation assets!

All of these layouts involve removing the tennis courts. I see no reason for this - my spouse and I use them frequently and would like to keep them. I often see other people using the courts as well. This & maintaining as much natural green space as possible is the most important to me. McCoy Park is close by and already has a pavilion and more developed feel - we'd prefer to keep north gate as natural as possible. I'd truly hate to see any of those trees go.
Allows green space to be adjacent to trees/paths vs. having parking lot be between green space and trees/pathways.
Being able to experience the different area without having to see the parking lot
best location of the Pavilion.
Best preservation of natural space, however users entering through the plaza to reach the aquatics facility could be disruptive to anyone trying to use the plaza.
Best use of open space, walkways, foliage
Better use of green space
buffer of the plaza between the parking and facility. also the large green space on the south side of the building, allows the facility to breath and not feel closed in and become part of the park. the building can reach out to the green space: indoor/outdoor whereas the other two facilities options are surrounded by the parking
building is connected to the green space visually.
Central location while allowing for large green space.
close proximity of the lawn and pavilion to the playground
Community recreation area south of pool blending into treed natural area and existing splash pad.
Community spaces are close to each other.
Connected elements not interrupted by the parking lot
Connection of play areas and green space
Connectivity of park spaces. It's easy for the parking lot to cut these spaces up.
Continuity between existing park and splash pad and recreation area
existing playground & splash pad aren't cut off due to parking / driveways
Existing splash pad is not cut off from the new park design
Grass space. I want our neighbors from southwest see more grass and make sure the parking space is farther near the busy street and school. Keep the core of outdoor space near the current playground.
Green space adjacent to building rather than parking lot.
Green space is separated from the parking area.
greenspace flows to park and not boxed in by concrete, roads, buildings
Groups outdoor recreation spaces together and a toddler on the run between those spaces will be safest in this scenario.
Having a connected green space/playgrounds/splash pad option that minimizes kids/people/pets running into the parking lot to go between these areas has been given minimal attention in options 2 and 3. Option 1 gives the most cohesive feel, minimizes congestion on Geneva and maintains a loop around the building to all parts of the center and park without crossing the main parking lot or driveways.
Having all the active features clustered together will allow people to easily access and discover features that they may have not come there for. This layout is the best option for helping the overall area feel activated (even when one area may not be). Having more bodies within one space and clear sight paths to the various section will feel safer. Minimize isolation of any of the areas.
Having the outdoor park area away from the busy street.

I cannot see this aquatic center as a replacement for Columbia Park Pool. My first choice would be restoration of Columbia Park Pool. If adding a second site, I would choose Heart of the Park because I like the union of the center, green space, splash pad, and community center space. Beacon in the Park separates the community space from the center with a parking lot. Meet Me at Geneva seems to sacrifice parking for more road area into the park.
I like big green space on the south side of building. I wish that the splash pad were on south side of building between aquatic center and green space so it's not close to major streets for running little kids. In all the options it seems exposed. Will it be fenced?
I like having green spaces closer together and some of the other options looked like it was taken up alot by parking and concrete.
I like keeping the south recreation area connected to the existing playground and splash pad versus breaking it up with the parking lot.
I like keeping to building and outdoor amenities close to each other and the parking lot separate.
I like option because it leaves the most green space of Northgate park. (The SW part would still have beautiful trees and a place to have picnics, and a short walk from the existing playground to the pool.
I like option one because it doesn't separate the amenities.
I like that during the hottest times of day, the splash pad and plaza on the NE side is shaded by the building in the hottest afternoon so the splash pad surface wont be lava hot. I like the opportunity to place trees along the southern boundary to cast max shade onto the park during summer peak use. Climate change is real and our heat events will be much worse by completion (if ever). NoPo gets no pool/no love for another generation.
I like that everything is together, and you don't have to cross the parking lot to access another area of the space. I would like to see a little more distance between the splash pad and the road though.
I like that in heart of the park the existing playground, recreation area, and plaza are all more connected
I like the big lawn connecting the playground to the pool building, removal of fewer big trees
I like the placement of the splash pad and community plaza.
I love all the greenery and trees preserved close to the building. This neighborhood needs more canopy coverage, not less!
I love the amount of nature and trees in the park currently. Adding a parking lot does not sound ideal. I would rather save that space for green space or recreational space A pool is very important to us. We grew up in California and Florida and the fact that there are hardly any pools in Oregon is really quite devastating and makes us want to move back sometimes
I prefer Option 1 and Option 2 since they appeared to have the least amount of disruption between the pool, plaza, and lawn.
I think it's important to have the primary entrance/activities centrally located within the park.
I think less parking lot and more green space. We currently use the park for our dog as well as use the tennis courts. I don't see why we need a huge parking lot plus an additional parking lot that gets rid of the tennis courts. Why are we losing one of the few perks we have in the neighborhood (there are no tennis courts in Portsmouth) for a parking lot? That sucks. I don't mind the aquatic center, it serves a purpose but why do the rest of us have to suffer by losing our loved amenities? I know it isn't in the greatest shape, but we use it and want to keep it.
I think that locating the splash pad towards the NW portion of the site will activate that corner while having a desirable surrounding green space rather than a view of the parking lot and potential safety issues with children playing in an area closer to a parking lot.
I think the parking lot should be out of the way, so that the park and the pool can be highlighted as recreational and green space, not concrete
I would like the splash pad located away from the entrance.

I'd prefer the splash pad be further back in the park from the street to avoid potential safety hazards.
Important to have grassy area, community gathering area for events, etc., and splash pad that will attract young families.
It gives more separation from Clarendon
It has more space for waiting that's outside the "splash zone" of the splash pad than Option 2 has.
It might be the same amount of green space, but in these images it seems bigger.
It seems like there's larger areas of green space and the entrance is more focused.
It seems to preserve the most contiguous greenspace
Just remove and replace the street trees for the long term function of the park.
Keeping green space, not creating more traffic on Fessenden and safe open space for community members. I would like to see the community garden stay.
Keeping the green space adjacent to the existing playground. No need to cross the parking access to get from the existing playground to the green space.
Keeping the green spaces and pavilions connected and visible so you could picnic or do an event and still be aware of your kids running around
Keeps green space together rather than seemingly smaller separate spaces.
large green space contiguous with existing playground, clear entry point that lines up with center of parking lot
large open grass space kept mostly together
Large open space and lawn for outdoor activities.
Large recreation lawn.
larger community plaza space, close proximity of community pavilion to parking, and what appears to be a larger recreational green space.
Larger recreation area.
Largest green space while also having main vehicle entrance off of Fessenden.
Layout 1 keeps open green space, community plaza, splash pad and existing playground connected, not disrupted by parking.
Like that it preserves a more contiguous open green space to the south where the most sun will land.
Like the green space located near the building and plaza.
location of green space.
Location of Open park space
Locations for locker room and splash pad
Maintaining continuous green space
Maintaining current tree cover and field access
Maintaining field space for recreation. Providing covered seating and an area for events and music/dance performances.
Maintains the beautiful trees already on the property, lots of open grass near the trees and I like the splash pad area bracing closest to the building entries.
More cohesive "venue" cluster. Retains park views and green space for existing neighborhood and community uses.
More field space and preserves some of existing park.
Most natural and attractive.
No need to traverse the parking lot to get from recreation space, splash pad, pavilion or plaza.
Not breaking up the green space and existing park areas
not having a splash pad next to a loud street
Not having to walk through the parking area to get to and from the amenities

Number 1 is the only one that doesn't put the parking lot in the center and allows for the most green space. Option 3 has very cut off green space that feels like an afterthought or generous parking strip. Number 2 is better than 3 but still makes the parking lot the main feature.
Number 1 retains the most green space and trees.
Open space near trees and away from the road
Open space seems larger. Though I prefer splash pad location in #2 best.
Option #1 has the splash pad, community pavilion, green space and pool area all connected. I really like the flow and interconnectedness of the space. Option #2 has no splash pad so I dislike this option. Both of my kids love splash pads! Option #3 has the community pavilion & pool separated by the parking lot. This creates a disconnect between the two spaces.
Option #1 is the best. It does not have a parking lot breaking up the SW wooded park area and path. This path is nice to walk and will not be destroyed in this option. But options #2 & #3 have too much blacktop in the wrong spots.
Option 1 appears to keep more green spaces uninterrupted by parking or parking access. I like that it seems to keep the most amount of existing green space intact.
Option 1 doesn't break up the green space. Looks like a smaller environmental impact.
Option 1 has much more green space and significantly less driveways/concrete for accessing parking. Would prefer splash pad was further away from entrance to reduce wet/slippery surface and kids by accident running into folks going into building. Option one is furthest away but not enough, in my opinion. Also need some type of stools or blocks around splash pad for parents to sit on...but not so large that people would lay down and sleep on them.
option 1 is the best because the aquatic center, green space and pavilion are all adjacent to one another, and not broken up by parking lot.
Option one leaves the largest area of 'untouched' park space
Overall I like the green space.
Plaza, Recreation Field, and existing park amenities are all connected. Not separated by road or parking. Would like the splash pad to be further from the street though, closer to other park attractions.
please consider moving the pavilion a bit deeper into the park and not immediately next to the paved areas. Think about how it can start to feel more immersed in the park, while still retaining clear visibility and reasonable accessibility.
Plenty of open green space and accessibility to doors from the street
Pool building and green space are not separated by the parking lot
Prefer to maintain the most amount of green space and smallest amount of new paving.
Preservation of green space
Preserving green space in the interior of the park
Preserving green space.
Protecting the green space from the roads and streets. Increase sight lines from green space, pavilion and splash pad. Parking is too big. Like to walk encourage alternative transportation for those in the neighborhood
Proximity and accessibility from existing playground to recreation lawn, new splash pad and pavilion. With kids, I like the fact that they don't have to cross any traffic lanes to get to the plaza, and that the playground is buffered from the parking lot. The large recreation lawn is also preferred. We have played in that open space quite a bit, and would miss it if it were broken up into smaller parcels.
Recreation near building
Retaining some amount of the playing field/open area.
separate service and parking spaces, more green space. good spacing of pavilion and splash pad.
South facing green space with connections to other park amenities.

south facing lawn and amenities protected from cars, with good connection to building.
southern light for the open grassy area, amenities are easily seen from each other and connected.
splash pad and community pavilion aren't too separated.
Splash pad and pavilion are within eye line of each other
splash pad and the community pavilion should be somewhat near each other and not having the park cut in half by a parking lot
splash pad being near Fessenden is a bad idea in all concepts.
Splash pad in more welcoming location. Community pavilion directly adjacent to parking and within sight line of facility entrance.
Swim meets are long and hot and humid. It is critical to have access to outdoor spaces with amenities.
That the usable park area outside of the aquatic center is connected to the building, and not dissected by parking and driveway.
the corner greenspace, placement of splash pad a community pavilion bookending the entry
The existing playground and splashpad is not cut off by a new parking lot. It provides a large contiguous park space activated by the aquatic center and surrounding amenities.
The green space is less chopped up in Option 1
The green space seems safer and protected from moving cars in 1 and parking to get to the pool makes more sense.
The line of vision from the Pavilion to the Splash Pad is important so I can see my kids playing on the Splash Pad if we're picnicking or playing around the Pavilion or in the green space. However, I am concerned about how close both the Pavilion and the Splash Pad are to the parking lot. I do think the ability to see both spots from each other is more important though.
The location of the green space and community space to the building and parking lot
the majority of the green space remains uninterrupted with fewer roads running through it. I also think it would be a good option for easy bike parking.
The most trees and nature and the least parking lot obstruction
The open field and remaining green space. The open space is a key part of the park and is heavily used.
The open grass area is adjacent to the pool. People could play or lie on the grass and easily move to the pool.
The park options are centralized together.
The park space is a large chunk altogether.
The splash pad and lawn area feel like they should have a party association. Elizabeth Caruthers Park in South Portland is a great example.
The splash pad should be closer to the green space and not right next to the parking lot
The splash pad, aquatic center and the pavilion are all visible from the parking lot and feel accessible to get to easily.
Thinking of summer swim meets. Swimmers can safely sit outside in the grass while waiting for races.
To me, option 1 does the best job of reserving the rest of the park for the neighbors who will use it. Options 2 and 3 send the pavilion and rec area to the other side of the parking lot from the playground.
Uninterrupted green space.
Visibility to whole community.
Western exposure for green space.
Will there be outdoor restrooms available for the splash pad or will people have to enter the facility?
You can't put a splash pad close to a busy road. Also, I would much rather have a hot tub / therapy pool than a splash pad. The splash pad seems redundant right? I mean people are going to play in the pool. Duh.

In option 2, the entry into the admin area (where I assume you go first to check in) isn't readily visible from the parking lot and seems like it would be confusing to find. I don't that the plaza and open greenspace are separated. In option 3, I don't like that the building and the open green space are separated by the parking lot, that seems like a safety hazard for if a family is there to enjoy the park and splash pad - but those two features are separated by a driveway that little kids will want to run across. Option 1 is my favorite because it puts all of the functions that people will want to engage with on one side of the parking lot so kids are more free to run between them, but I would prefer the splash pad be closer to the open green space so it's more visible from the pavilion and lawn where families would lay out a blanket for a picnic, rather than having to walk all the way to the north side of the plaza to supervise their young kids while they play in the water. In fact, the whole building plan feels like it could flip so the entry nook which is at the northeast corner now could be at the southeast corner, and the plaza could maybe extend further south to get the splash pad closer to the lawn and give the pavilion a connection to the other hardscape on the site.
It feels welcome, inviting people into the park rather than staying on the periphery
It preserves the current open green space where community members play sports. I like the location of the splash pad and community space - it seems that the noise could be more insulated for Geneva Street residents with this site layout.
LIKE: southern exposure of green recreation area; main parking access from Fessenden; sightlines from Fessenden to building entrance, plaza, and pavilion; amount of green space along pedestrian perimeter path. DISLIKE: plaza area shape and location is unappealing, feels like an after thought, the space left over after the building and parking lot were sized and located. Suggest borrowing the building orientation from Option 3, shifting some of the parking lot area from the south to the east, and bisecting the parking lot with a tree-lined ped path running east to west connecting the perimeter path to the building.
The new splashpad close to N Fessenden is unfortunate - why not upgrade the existing splashpad and incorporate that into the overall design? I'd like option #1 (parking location and vehicle entrance) if it combined the community plaza from option #2, and swapped the location of the community pavilion with the splashpad (and just upgraded the existing splashpad...do we really need 2 on one site?). The building layout (recreation space and competition orientation of the pools inside the building) is my preferred scenario, when combined with the locker room and administration layout from option #1.
The Plaza connects the street with the large open space and existing development of the park.
The spacing of the event areas
Limits removal of big trees
SAFETY
I feel the building makes a barrier from Fessenden. I would love to not have the splash pad right off or Fessenden due to previous drive by shootings. Similar to McCoy splash pad that's had several drive by shootings.
I think safety is a HUGE factor. If you have families, kids, dogs, bike, elderly, etc. trying to cross a parking lot to go between pavilions, grass and a pool, that seems like a terrible design. So does taking over a small street to be bombarded with new traffic all to use a parking lot. I like the buildings and splashpad location of Option 2, but with the parking and grass area of Option 1. That way it is more neighborhood friendly and still utilizes the new bus stop and parking next to the academy.
Safe and plenty of space for children to be free
Safe space for kids
Safety of children playing at splash pad with busy street nearby and parking lot/s
Safety, access to/from the park during early morning hours and evening hours
the location of the locker rooms disconnects the natatorium from the park and the blank wall is a safety concern - consider developing the design so more transparency faces the park.

This layout is the best option for helping the overall area feel activated (even when one area may not be). Having more bodies within one space and clear sight paths to the various section will feel safer. Minimize isolation of any of the areas.

LAYOUT / VISIBILITY / BUILDING DESIGN

A handsome facility, visible and well lit with maximum use and versatility of surroundings

Better sightlines

Consider mirroring the entire plan about the east-west axis, so that the lockers land up on the north with the entry volume more along Fessenden (though the entry would be coming in from the south part of that brown volume). This would allow the pools to connect visually with the open grass area of the park to the south, creating a fun connection and a dramatic view out of the pools looking outside. This will also bring in more natural daylight into the pool area, with the unobstructed southern exposure. This would also help the overall building mass to step down to the north with a presumably lower locker room volume, helping to soften that edge and reduce shadow lines over the path and sidewalk to the north.

I like that the pool windows in option 3 are open to the green space instead of to the busy road, but it feels like you lose a lot of the open space of the park, so I chose option 1.

I like the east-west orientation for solar,

I like the pictures/inspiration - the style of architecture and the less blocky/cement forward.

I liked the sample buildings for option 1

I prefer buildings that maximize south facing aspect, which this one appears to do.

orientation of site plan

Orientation of swimming pools

Sense of openness and visual connections across the site.

Solar panel efficiency

the layout of the two pools with windows to Fessenden Street will also improve the look of the entire neighborhood.

Use of space and layout.

view from the lap pool.

visibility and space for other attractions

Visibility of path from parking to the front door (you can watch your kid go in)

Visibility of pools from Fessenden.

OTHER

Honestly I live near Columbia park and it's sad they are not designing this for that location more centrally located

I think it should be at Columbia Park

I'm not sure, but I studied all of them carefully and number one just feels right.

looks like nicest design

Please make the competition pool cooler than the recreation pool. I am a long-time master's swimmer and former competitive swimmer and most indoor pools in Portland are too warm for competition.

This better of three good options.

APPENDIX – COMMENTS ABOUT WHY PREFER CONCEPT #2 – MEET ME AT GENEVA

ACCESSIBILITY AND FLOW

Access but it's hard to visualize and assess the pros and cons. It would be more insightful if the team could inform the population which site prioritizes access, public safety, community areas more rather than needing to trying to guess which is which.

Access from both sides so you don't have to cross the entire complex from the west side.

Access from the west to the parking

Access to aquatic center and open field.

Access to existing bus stops, parking entrances off of Fessenden, rec area not separated by parking

Accessibility

Accessibility for pedestrians and folks arriving via modes other than automobiles.

balance of features; flow of recreation with parking and surroundings

best flow

Ease of access

Ease of access

Easy access from parking to pool entrance. More hours and lanes available for lap swim and more times available for open swim for kids.

Easy access to main pool and locker rooms with entry from the corner of Fessenden and Geneva.

easy accessibility via Fessenden

Flow feels better

Flow from parking lot to building and park, although the parking lot is in the middle, it has the best flow and usability.

Front door within clear site of parking lot. No barriers or obstruction to front door. Don't want to go around a corner to front door.

General site layout.

I like Meet Me at Geneva best because of how all the aspects flow together.

It gives a full display of the aquatic center from the street thus inviting the community in.

It is important that the entrance is accessible from a bus stop.

Pathways with no pools and standing water to navigate through.

Paved, well lit, pathways from bus stop to main building.

People with mobility challenges and/or physical disabilities have the least amount of distance to travel from drop off at the front entrance to the front door itself. Many people with physical disabilities will use the pool multiple times a week. Making it as easy as possible for them to get in and out safely is paramount.

Proximity of entrance to bus stop

Site 2 has the best flow. Thinking of future large events and swim meets being held-having the parking lot close to the pool entrance will help with safety (kids not running around the splash pad and into the parking lot). Also having accessible overflow seating in the rec area/green space will be important as well.

Sun on the outside and welcome facing with easy to access entry

The one I chose looks the most inviting of the options

PARKING AND TRAFFIC

As someone who can see my home in these options, please consider your neighbors. Placing a parking lot anywhere other than the back of the building creates issues to consider - noise, more pollution near homes, etc.

Bike Accessibility and bike parking. Having the parking lot farther away from the school next door

Don't split the activity options with the parking lot. Children will constantly run through the parking to transition to the different areas. Only having entrances on one side of the building, particularly the parking lot, forces all drop-offs into the parking lot and makes bikers and walkers go around the building.

Early Learning Academy kids don't have to cross a parking lot to get to grassy area. Greatest number of parking spaces next to the pool. Least point of contact between parking lot and grassy recreation area.
Entrance should not be off busy street like N. Fessenden, more difficult to make left turn and traffic etc.
Feels more integrated into the space- the parking around the back puts emphasis on the community space and building rather than space allotted to vehicles
good access from parking for mobility impaired folks; good exposure of parking lot to the most wide part of the building.
hide parking lot
I don't like the placement of the service parking though i would nest it in-line with the main parking
I like the orientation of the parking lot better and feel it would be used better with the new aquatic center and the existing playground area than the other options. I don't like the bike path crossing the main driveway in option 2 as much as the option 1 bike path routing. I think there will be enough line of sight so that crosswalk isn't dangerous with the kids though.
I like the visual of the building in the front and the parking in the rear off of Fessenden
I think in option two you should swap the service parking and the recreation; keeping all parking south of the amenities.
I dislike the idea of a large parking lot being the "front door" to the center. Placing the parking to the side of the center is nicer.
I like that driving down Fessenden you mainly see the park, recreation, pavilion and the pool.
I like that the entrance is off Geneva
I like the Geneva one because it feels like it has multiple approaches, from both Fessenden and Geneva
I like the parking lot behind the building and set away from Fessenden.
I like the parking where it is located
I like the vehicular access off Geneva / service off Fessenden.
I like where the parking lot is located to the side
I prefer the option of turning into the parking lot off of Geneva. I think turning off of Fessenden will create too many traffic issues.
I really don't like how the parking is right up against the community gathering spaces in some of the options. This feels very unsafe for small children at play in these spaces. I also understand we want to consider access for elders - but I wish Americans would take more of a cue from other cultures in this regard. Americans and known globally for our over-reliance on cars and obsession with having close-by parking to everything. We're also wildly overweight and immobile relative to other cultures and relative to human history. All over the world, such as in Mexico where our family previously lived, elders - even those with limited mobility - use public spaces EXTENSIVELY. There often isn't easy drive up access to many public spaces and the ground might be uneven - but there are usually a lot of places to sit and rest and a family member's arm to hold for support. I don't intend to devalue or dismiss the discomfort or pain that folks feel with age - and of course there should be drive up areas where folks can drop off loved ones to wait with someone while someone parks the car (we do this all the time for disabled folks in our family). But I also believe elders in other cultures are out and about in dramatically higher numbers because both the culture and the infrastructure invite them to keep moving. I think sometimes building excessive features that enable immobility is a cultural disservice.
I think having parking access not open to Fessenden is important. I think it will increase congestion and bike/pedestrian accidents on Fessenden
I think walkways to the pool is important for different ways to exit to car quickly and safely especially with littles
less congestion in exiting the parking lot and better options for pedestrians
Location of parking

Meet me at Geneva has the least potential parking lot crossover of kids heading from the school to the park. considering likely movement of children from greenspace>parking lot>aquatic attraction feels most important. the parking lot should be the most out of the way of people's greenway walking patterns to access site facilities, while still prioritizing accessibility for disabled community members
Not having to go through the parking lot to get to another area of the park. I do not see bicycle parking which could significantly reduce the need for vehicle spaces and make the park safer for everyone.
Parking
Parking
Parking & splash pad tucked away a bit from Fessenden
Parking entrance.
Parking entry on Fessenden is going to create traffic issues. Don't like the splash pad near the busy street.
Parking exit location, connected green space to pool building
parking hidden from street view (Fessenden)
PARKING is not immediately adjacent making it much more appealing! It makes far more sense to me than either of the others!
Parking is separate from splash pad
Parking location Community Space Entry
Parking lot location in proximity to the school. I imagine certain aspects would be highly favored by the Early Learning Center. I don't like the idea of the parking lot being so close to the school.
Parking not adjacent to splash pad and community pavilion separate from splash pad.
Parking, and the amount of traffic flowing in and out of the parking lots throughout the day. Will access to the lots be closed off during times that the center is closed, or will anybody be able to use the lots as a pass through from Fessenden or Geneva to Clarendon? Or from Clarendon to Geneva or Fessenden?
Protection from the very busy Fessenden. People speed like jerks on that street.
Providing space for parking, large aquatics events like swim meets and water polo events.
Put the service off the busy street and the plaza and entry off a less busy street. Don't face service court to neighborhood houses.
Safe parking and traffic entry and exit
safe/secure bike parking
safer for people to park and not be noticed while exiting and arriving at the pool.
Safety for children in relationship to cars, turning off the main street I don't love.
The entrance being on Geneva I think will help alleviate traffic issues since Fessenden is such a busy street.
The last thing Fessenden needs is a massive parking lot.
The location of the main parking lot. It keeps cars away from the splash pads and it also reduces visual access to the early learning center.
The most important issue for me is to not have a parking lot right next to Clarendon school because of air quality issues that will be created. Overall I think all proposals include too large of a parking lot.
The parking lot has two large paths of egress for visiting cars in the event of an emergency .
The parking lot is not visible from Fessenden.
The view from the street (Fessenden) isn't of a massive parking lot.
tucked away parking area that's not super visible from street
Where the parking entrance is because of traffic on Fessenden.
GREENSPACES AND PARK AMENITIES
Arrangement of Greenspace to Clarendon.
Child safety, don't locate the splash pad too close to the street or parking. Kids run amok!
Children's safety and utilizing more space for people and not prioritizing car parking.

Don't split the activity options with the parking lot. Children will constantly run through the parking to transition to the different areas. Only having entrances on one side of the building, particularly the parking lot, forces all drop-offs into the parking lot and makes bikers and walkers go around the building.
don't want to have to walk through the splash pad to get in the front door
Fessenden is a high traffic road. I don't think a children's splash pad should be so close to that road
"Good neighbor" green space without having to cross parking to get to pavilion. More intimate feel around splash pad instead of it being front-and-center in the design & in direct sunlight.
Green area and east facing entrances
Green space east of the facility.
Green space is preserved in the NE corner of the park, next to the school.
Greens area close to the school
I like all the trees
I like that the community pavilion and splash pad are next to each other because parents will likely want to see both. The entrance is easy and the lawn area is nicely located.
I like that the pavilion is a bit distanced from the parking area, but I don't have a strong preference.
I like that the splash pad is further away from Fessenden
I like the adjacency of RECREATION to the EXISTING PLAYGROUND and the LEARNING CENTER. I like the COMMUNITY PLAZA facing the residences on Geneva (and that it is west-facing for afternoon sun).
I like the location of the splash pad and community pavilion.
I like the splash pad and community pavilion area is surrounded by greenery and doesn't feel connected to a building making it another park and play area
I think the splash pad should be further away from the parking lot or have a physical barrier to prevent kids from running into parking lot.
I want the community space and recreation space to be in full view of the public along Fessenden.
If a family is having a birthday party at the pavilion, it would make sense to have the splash pad nearby or within the line of site. I think the 3rd option is worst for this since it looks like the entry driveway needs to be crossed to get from the splash pad to the recreation area.
Isolating the screaming kids at the splash pad to a corner to make the park as a whole more accessible to people who are sensitive to noise.
Keeping as much green space as possible while also having a bit of separation of the plaza and splash pad from the parking lot.
Kid area
larger field areas in Option 1 and 2 are preferable.
Maximize green space.
More connected green space, clear entry from two directions, splash pad not directly in front of entrance to building (ie we don't *have* to get wet or interact with loud energy
neighborhood connections of the plaza - specifically on the corner!
Not having the community plaza and splash pad so directly adjacent to the parking lot.
Not putting program between the lot and building (ie splash pad) but allowing the program to be connected with parking off to the side
Not setting two splash pads side by side/directly in line with each other. Not cutting the park/green space off with a parking lot. Would like to limit likelihood of kids running from splash pad into street or parking
Option 2 integrates the entrance, splash pad and plaza together in a more coherent way. It looks larger and less elongated. On a side note, I do think a couple of outdoor bathrooms [like at Pier Park] would be appropriate in the Pavilion/Recreation area. I do think asking about cleanliness and graffiti is bizarre! That should be a given and NOT something we have to choose over the other options! It's an insult to the community that it's even listed as a choice!
option 2 is the only of these designs that doesn't have a children's splash pad directly adjacent to a parking lot, which seems like a dangerous option to consider.

Pavilion and splash pad more visible and close to entrance
Pavilion right next to parking is convenient, but not very private and traffic noise can be invasive. Also, a splash pad right next to parking not exactly safe for the smaller children.
pavilion located along walking path, having plenty of space to hang out outdoors that's NOT right next to a parking lot
Place to be outside covered from sun and rain, picnic and public restrooms outside building.
Plaza and splash pad has trees around it, not just parking & building. Learning center still has adjacent access to open green space.
Plaza, splash pad, and pavilion all feel more separated from the parking lot.
Preserving park/amenities access for adjacent Clarendon school. Keeping park/pedestrian feel, not visually featuring parking lot/car access
Safer access to Pavilion and Splash for children. They don't need to cross a parking lot or car entrance to go back and forth.
Safety for my child at the splash pad in proximity to moving cars
Safety, no hiding spots, no congregation spots for people to camp or deal. I am exceedingly concerned about the violence potential given the history of that park. I implore you all to please mitigate the known risks.
Safety. I do not like the idea of the splash pad or gathering place right next to the parking lot
Separation of splash pad and community plaza from parking, for aesthetics and safety.
Small children will likely be playing in the splash pad and in the pavilion. These structures should not be close to the parking lot or the drive way. Safety dictates they should be constructed with some distance from each other.
Splash pad and community plaza not next to the parking lot. Also, I like the orientation of both pools for recreation and meets.....access, visibility.....
splash pad away from parking!!
Splash pad being further away from the street
splash pad distant from parking, shape of grass area (option 3 too skinny).
Splash pad is in a safer space
Splash pad is not directly next to parking, parking is not directly next to learning center
splash pad is not on Fessenden; building location helps to create a better public space environment on Fessenden
Splash pad isn't butted up against the sidewalk/street.
Splash pad not adjacent to parking lot, entrance not off the parking lot but rather facing out to street
Splash pad not right next to the parking lot. Entrance on Fessenden or Geneva.
Splash pad set apart from swimming facility and community pavilion so there can be separate activities occurring at the same time. I appreciate a direct route from the parking area to the front entrance of the swimming facility without having to navigate a splash pad or other obstacle. The Meet me at Geneva is by far the most user friendly of the concepts of the each activity having its down space and the parking having direct access to the front entrances.
Splashpad getting the afternoon sun, because it'll be too cold in the morning with the splash pad on the east side.
That the splash pad is away from the parking lot and somewhat obstructed from Fessenden road traffic. Splash pad = lots of running and possibly some naked babes, let's protect them!
the better uses of the land and improvement of surrounding area.
The location of the splash pad being visible from the admin area as well as the community brings the space together, and isn't directly adjacent to the parking area.
The placement of the splashpad near the playground makes more sense
The recreation sites are all together in option 1 rather than being broken up by a parking lot like in options 2 and 3
the splash pad and community are safely distanced from parking

The splash pad and community pavilion are removed from streets and parking areas.
The splash pad by the parking lot doesn't seem like the best idea since small kids usually play in that type of area.
There is an existing school and looking out to a green space is preferable to a parking lot. I also like the separation from the existing park facilities making for the feeling of two unique park experiences.
SWIM MEETS
As a swim coach looking at this for hosting competitive swim meets for youth and adults, I like that this option has two entrances for the community pool and competition pool. It makes it a lot easier to have multiple events going on at once. Additionally having the parking and green space near the competition pool gives more places for people to be during a crowded swim meet.
Providing dry land space for aquatic teams that use the facility often. Providing good staff and player locker rooms.
LAYOUT/BUILDING DESIGN
East-west layout for solar.
i like the east/west orientation to take advantage of solar panels
I like the East facing windows of Option 3, which would add more natural warmth and light to the facility.
Minimizing west facing glazing into the natatorium due to heat gain and low angle glare during swim events, sight lines from competition pool out to parking lot and to broader green space for overflow seating during competition events which always happens during swim meets.
Morning sun hitting the comp pool first. Waking up with some laps.
North facing pool
I actually prefer the layout of the pool building in option 3, I don't love windows to/from Fessenden from the pool itself.
OTHER
Option 1: Safer connectivity with plaza, splash pad and pavilion, but space feels like activities are all very insulated inside the park with no street activation. Design feels "efficient and engineered" versus playful. Also concerned about street activation on N Geneva if the west wall is a solid. Option 2: Site planning to with main entry toward the street corner is great. This one is almost there, but the area of impervious surface seems excessive. Confused why there is a 2nd service driveway to the parking lot when the other options do not have that. This extra driveway to the main parking lot doesn't seem necessary. The public driveway access on N Geneva could be shifted south (to where the service driveway is being proposed) to provide a more generous "play space" around the plaza and splash pad. This would create more street activation along Geneva. Option 3: Programming of spaces seems too fragmented, disconnected, and inefficient, with lots of impervious surface for vehicular use. This is not about the site planning, but can the aquatic center also consider a wellness pool? This is very helpful for seniors and especially for people who have a fear of swimming. See example from Lynnwood Recreation Center. https://www.lynnwoodwa.gov/Community/Play-Lynnwood/Swimming-Pool-Schedule Wellness Pool: 93 degrees Ramp entry Balance bar Underwater bench 3-4.5 feet.
I do hope you're not getting rid of the tennis courts.

APPENDIX – COMMENTS ABOUT WHY PREFER CONCEPT #3 – BEACON IN THE PARK

ACCESSIBILITY AND FLOW

Accessibility.

Access from Fessenden and ability to drop off kids

Access to all areas by parking lot, separation of all areas

Access to the green space as well as flow of traffic from Fessenden.

Access to the parking lot and front door.

Access, flow & beauty.

Accessibility to get kids in and out of the car and into the building or engaged. Ideally this would be a more robust aquatic center like those in East Portland, etc. with waterslides and other indoor water recreation attractions but it seems as though there is still an equity issue even when building something new.

Accessibility, especially for cars and safety/visibility, especially at night.

Easy access to indoors while it's dark and cold out in winter and I'm taking my kid to swim lessons

Easy access without having to drive on Geneva Street which is narrow.

don't want to walk across the plaza to get to the building (option 1)

multiple access locations

Since I will be walking to the aquatic center via Fessenden, I would prefer the entrances to be near there. I don't like the idea of walking behind the building to enter. Honestly 1 or 3 would work, just not 2.

PARKING AND TRAFFIC

I feel like a parking lot entrance in Geneva would create too much additional traffic and be difficult to navigate by car as the street is very narrow.

As an elder I need the parking lot to be close to the entrance and locker rooms. I also am nervous about safety. With all the crime in that area and car races you should have chosen Columbia Park due to safety issues. It's going to prove to be a terrible choice you made.

clear view from parking lot to front door

Distance from parking and asphalt

Easy access from Fessenden without having to look at an ugly parking lot

Entering from Fessenden and right into parking. Geneva is a small street and doesn't red any more traffic

Entrance from Fessenden and there's a green space between Clarendon and the parking lot.

Entrance off Fessenden, limiting the number of trees removed, and covered bike parking.

I believe the event/drop off lane would be a huge benefit and greatly reduce traffic in the main parking lot and next to the front door. Event and swim practice drop off is often an issue at Matt Dishman, which I attend multiple times a week.

I don't want parking to take up park space and honestly the most important thing to the neighborhood is a dog area. Seriously. We've activated this space to use as a dog park and that's what we want - more so than an aquatic park!

I find it to be more ideal to have parking between the center and green space, providing two different scenes while still being in the same location. I can imagine picnics and people reading on the lawn while also having the option to go for a swim.

I like that the parking is better hidden from view in option 3. No matter how I enter the park, I can see green spaces and plazas versus parking. With the other two options (especially option 1), that parking lot is likely to become a hazard with people hanging out there (drinking, using drugs, setting off fireworks)

I like being able to pull into the parking area from Fessenden.

I like the parking entrance is on Fessenden. Feels cleaner and easier than having to turn down a side street and matches better with current traffic flows.
I live on N Geneva, it's a narrow residential street and adding a large parking lot will only make congestion and safety worse.
I live on Newark and don't want bright lights shining on my house too much at night.
I would like it to be easy to bike to without being bothered with cars. Please don't make the parking lot the important aspect of design.
It's not clear to me in these designs where bike parking would be. We would be approaching via the Peninsula Crossing Trail. The bike bus program at James John Elementary is actively creating more young bikers in the neighborhood, including events to give out bikes to kids. I would like to see in the designs an intentional and thoughtful consideration for the approach and parking of bikes - including cargo and bucket bikes that parents with small children use. Would there be a possibility for a separate bike parking entry / area that is completely separate from the car parking? Primary car entry from busy Fessenden and bike entry from calmer Geneva? What if the pedestrian loop around the park is updated to be a bike and pedestrian loop such that there's a place for parents to take their kids to practice biking off-street? At the elementary school we just got additional bike parking added, but it's on the street compared to the better bike parking that is off the street and covered from the rain. But it's a good sign that bike use is increasing! Or how about a wild idea of having bike parking indoors: a bike parking garage. Maybe with a direct entrance into the aquatic center. Consider a family of four arriving by bike, that's 4 bikes. Now multiple families coming by bike, how many families with kids would have bike parking available? I would like to see the designs call out how many bike parking spots are available, and show the calculation for how many families with kids that would support. Biking brings the community together, especially biking with kids.
Keep traffic off residential street of Geneva
parking
Parking entry from Fessenden makes the most sense. Would like to see splash pad and community Pavilion off of Fessenden - traffic is noisy and busy- let people get away from that.
Parking lot accessible from Fessenden.
plenty of parking close as possible to the entrance.
Public parking entrances. I currently access the park for park activities but utilizing the park for the pool I'm more likely to drive and traffic focused on Fessenden is better than Geneva.
Recreation space next to the school, entrance to parking off of Fessenden NOT Geneva, that would be a hardship for people living on Geneva and it's not even a through street, easy entrance from parking to the pool and from the bus stop to the pool.
Respecting my neighbors on N Geneva by voting against main parking lot entry in their street.
I like how the parking lot is sandwiched between green space. Also, keeping the main entrance off Fessenden, and the vehicle traffic that is sure to come with the aquatic center, hopefully will help slow down traffic on Fessenden.
Tough call as all three options seem good and I've never been on Geneva St so don't know what to think about entry from there
2 is the worst, worships the parking lot. 1 & 3 are much better.
GREEN SPACES AND PARK AMENITIES
I like the "good neighbor" aspect. Currently, I do not believe Clarendon has a decent play area, and this would create one for them.
Accessibility of green space and splash pad. I don't want kids running across a parking lot to get to these things. Entrances should not be all on one side. Splash pad should not be by a main entrance.
clear splash pad view from Fessenden to invite the community in

Entrance from Fessenden and there's a green space between Clarendon and the parking lot.
green space between Clarendon and aquatic center, fewer trees removed, do not have to move through splash pad and community plaza in order to access aquatic center
Having the splash pad more connected to the recreation green space
I don't want parking to take up park space and honestly the most important thing to the neighborhood is a dog area. Seriously. We've activated this space to use as a dog park and that's what we want - more so than an aquatic park!
I don't like the splash pad being so close to the entrance of the building, however, I like the idea of it being close to the grassy outdoor area.
I find it to be more ideal to have parking between the center and green space, providing two different scenes while still being in the same location. I can imagine picnics and people reading on the lawn while also having the option to go for a swim.
I like the community pavilion being distinctly separate from the splash pad area,
Not putting the splash pad RIGHT in front of the front door, and not pushing the pavilion out of the way as an afterthought.
outdoor space
Green space away from pool.
Surrounded by green space, safety
The community plaza is close to the existing playground (note: as a frequent user of the park, the hope is the playground will get updated as well).
VISIBILITY / VIEWS
Swimming pools used to be visible in communities. With what few we have they are invisible. Grand entrance is important.
I like that the pool is not visible from Fessenden, and not immediately/directly viewable from Geneva. I want people enjoying the pool to be able to look out onto nature, and I very much want people from the street to not be able to see *in*. It gives... "shady" people less of an opportunity to peer in/take photos and/or videos of kiddos (and adults!) without someone noticing (which I have actually witnessed *several* times in my years here).
I can't vote for any layout where the window wall is north-facing, which is going to deprive the pool of natural light year-round but especially during the fall and winter. Enjoying as much natural daylight as possible while I swim in the winter is VERY VERY important. Therefore ideally a southern window wall, but an eastern will work for me since I have flexibility to visit in the morning.
I also prefer looking out at the park/N Geneva from the pool than looking out over Fessenden. It seems a little weird to be exposed to Fessenden (a busier street) in your bathing suit.
I feel like the pools will have more greenery visible vs the street
Views from the pool
Visibility from the admin building. In case of an emergency, the splash pad should be visible by staff inside the center. And also it should be close so that a parent or bystander can access help faster if they need to get help from staff inside the center.
LAYOUT / BUILDING DESIGN
I like that the swimming pools are not facing Fessenden. I like the extra space between the pool and the early learning facility.
I like the idea of a "good neighbor" green space
I like the green space between the school and the parking lot.
The layout of the aquatic center looks more inviting.
I like the PNW building style inspirations on option 3.
3 is the most stunning.

Photo inspiration. Needs to mimic nature.

Seemed to flow better

The relationship to all sides of the park to the existing neighborhood.

OTHER

Safety for everyone

No - I will tell you about my opinion on the competition pool. It is ridiculous and a waste of money not to have a 50-meter, deep water pool in this space. Long course pools are few and far between, and with water polo, diving, and artistic swimming being as prevalent as they are in this part of Oregon, it is a serious misstep not to have a deep water pool available for these tournaments. The only viable option, practically in the state, is the Tualatin Hills Aquatic Center, and they have jacked up the prices to the point that it is not feasible for a lot of families to participate. If you want to create an inclusive space, it is strongly recommended that you adjust the pools and create a space in North Portland to attract athletes from all over the country—who then come here to spend their money and provide resources to the local community—instead of sending them over the river.