

## **SITE EVALUATION MATRIX—Park/Open Space Subcommittee**

The following list is from the 26/OD Task Force Charge (park/open space), County and community presentations to the Task Force, public plans and public feedback. The numbers correspond to the columns in the attached matrix. If an item is not applicable (will be indicated as N/A) the aggregate score for the item will be adjusted as needed.

1. Donaldson Run Trail Head
2. Hiking trails
3. Paved, multiuse trails
4. Plaza/seating space
5. Mulch distribution
6. Undisturbed natural open space
7. NCAA regulation rectangular athletic field/facility
8. Modified rectangular field
9. Diamond field
10. Community garden
11. Pollinator garden
12. Basketball court(s)
13. Tennis court(s)
14. Pickle ball court
15. General court(s) (bocce, futsal)
16. Volleyball court(s)
17. Bike park
18. Skate park
19. Splash park
20. Ping-pong/chess
21. Dog park
22. Park shelter and picnic area(s)
23. Playground(s)

- 24. Casual use open space
- 25. Historic references
- 26. Public art
- 27. Interpretive opportunities and observation
- 28. Viewing platform(s)
- 29. Co-located facility(s)

**0=Does not comply; 1=Could potentially comply, with reasonable mitigation; 2=Largely complies, 3=fully complies, 4=In the Charge**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>Comments</b>	
Compatible with GLUP																						
Compatible with existing County policies and plans																						
Consistent with NC/neighborhood plans																						
Compatible with public feedback																						
Use compatible with surrounding neighborhoods																						
Would not create surface water issues of runoff or flooding																						
Would not impact trees, wildlife or vegetation																						

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>Comments</b>	
Shared government/public use potential																						
Availability of adequate ingress/egress																						
Topography is compatible for siting use																						
No historic/ archeological issues																						
No security requirements																						
No easements, restrictions or covenants																						
Minimal displacement of current use(s)																						
Is the value worth the financial cost																						
Proximity to similar amenities																						
Local demand for an amenity(s)																						
Additional needs generated as part of an amenity(s)																						
Opportunities to add local habitat																						