



ARCHITECTS

Architecture

Interior Design

Landscape Architecture

Preservation

Urban Planning

DESIGN MEETING MINUTES

Project: Zionsville New Park

Ratio Project No. 03050.000

Date/Time: November 12, 2003 at 7:30 pm

Purpose: Presentation of revised Concept 3A and 3B

Held at: Zionsville Town Hall

Participants: Zionsville Parks Board, interested members of the community, John Jackson and Dave Rausch of RATIO

1. John Jackson began the meeting by introducing himself and David Rausch (as Principal in Charge of the Project) and stating the goals of the meeting, which were to:
 - a. Present what RATIO has done since the Oct 29 meeting
 - b. Receive feedback on proposed ideas
2. John briefly revisited the results of the last meeting, noting that of three schemes presented on October 29, Concept 3 was selected as the preferred layout.
3. John explained that two plans would be presented that were developments of the preferred Concept 3. Concept 3A showed how the design would be affected by setting the farmstead up to function as a somewhat independent venue within the park. In this scenario, the farm is not necessarily sealed off from the park, but the existing structures would not serve the park as storage or picnic pavilions. In Concept 3B, the farmstead structures are adapted to serve the park and the entire farmstead becomes somewhat more engaged with the overall layout. Existing structures are used for restrooms, picnic shelters, storage buildings and so forth.
4. Some of the results of setting the farm up as a complementary but more independent venue that were noted:
 - a. Two buildings would probably need to be constructed to serve as storage, restroom and pavilion facilities. These were proposed to be located generally on the west edge of the large circle walk. These are in addition to the concessions/restrooms shown on the east side of the circle in the original Concept 3 layout.
 - b. The location for ice skating was moved away from the farm to a point adjacent to one of the new structures on the west side of the circle.
 - c. Parking was shown minimized at the farm, with a provision for 10 cars. An additional parking lot was shown for consideration at the south end of the sledding hill that could accommodate 27-30 cars. This was depicted in response to fewer spaces at the farm than the original concept showed, but also to concerns expressed at the last meeting about the perceived inability for police to gain visual access to the southwest portion of the park.
 - d. The western portion of the farmstead was devoted to crop demonstration, and fencing established two areas where livestock could be kept.
5. Dave Rausch described the issues at hand and the various modifications to the farmstead that could occur if it was preserved. Some of the items noted were:
 - a. The Secretary of the Interior has standards for four distinct but interrelated approaches to the treatment of historic structures: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction. Without going into the detail of each of these, the point was made that the standards will guide the manner in which the buildings are addressed will depend on exactly what treatment method is used.

RATIO Architects, Inc.

Suite 100

107 S. Pennsylvania St.

Indianapolis, Indiana

46204-3684

317 633 4040

Fax: 317 633 4153

www.RATIOArchitects.com

- b. Dave reiterated that the composition of the buildings is recognized as one of the most important elements when evaluating the farm – in short; the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.
 - c. Returning the farm to a particular period of time would suggest that some modifications to the buildings would be appropriate. For example, additions to the house *appear* to have occurred later than the 1930's-1940's. Should a time period of the early '30's be established as the date to which the farm is restored would suggest that these later additions be removed. Similarly, the silo and drier at the west edge of the farmstead along SR 950 would be removed along with the tool shed and some later additions to the primary barn (the one with "Maplelawn" painted on it.)
 - d. Dave shared a website of an organization devoted to Farm preservation/restoration called Barn Again (<http://www.agriculture.com/barnagain/about.html>). The website could be a good resource for the ongoing discussion about what do to with the farm. Dave noted one project in particular that successfully restored a barn that now houses a gift shop.
6. John presented Concept 3B, which considered the farm as playing a more active role supporting other uses in the park. Some of the highlights of that concept included:
 - a. Using the western edge of the farmstead (between the buildings and SR 950 East) as picnic/passive rec space.
 - b. Setting up pathways that reinforce some of the historic organizational structure of the farmstead.
 - c. Using the Maplelawn barn as a picnic pavilion (this would entail cleaning up the interior, pouring a concrete floor, and adding lighting in addition to restoration of windows, siding, roof, etc. The concept depicted the removal of the later additions noted in 5-c above.
 - d. Using the corncrib as a storage building for sports equipment.
 - e. Using the eastern barn as a restroom/concessions/picnic pavilion.
 - f. Relocating the chicken house and re-using it as a playhouse in a toddler playground.
 - g. Locating a sand volleyball court adjacent to the chicken house and Maplelawn barn.
7. Dave reviewed several precedents for adapting the farm structures to other uses, including a park project in Olympia Fields, Illinois near Chicago.
8. John pointed out that regardless of where the community ultimately decides to go with the farmstead, further consideration suggests that the splash park and playground components are probably better located toward the eastern edge of the park, and this notion showed up in Concepts 3A and 3B. RATIO's feeling is that these elements belong together, and that they should be closer to parking than the farm would allow. As a result, the skatepark moved to the north of the wooded area, in a location more visible from Whitestown Road and Ford Road.
9. Another element common to both schemes was the provision of a drainage way that would convey water from properties west of 950 East across the southwest corner of the park toward an inlet located on the Middle School property. This situation exists currently and improvements would have to accommodate it. RATIO underscored that a hydraulic analysis was not part of the scope of the project, but the master plan *can* note the issue and *generally* describe the need to make accommodations for the water.
10. **Costs** - RATIO shared the results of a preliminary pass at the cost estimate. The bottom line was that the park, if fully developed as pictured in either scheme would likely cost at least \$2.5 million. The potential costs of several of the elements were stated, and this list is included as an

attachment. Further consideration and revision will be made to the list prior to completing the plan. George Tikijian asked if the cost estimate included design fees, was told that it did not, and at that he requested that these estimated fees be included in the final estimates.

11. The meeting was opened to questions and discussion at that point. Some of the highlights of the discussion were:
 - a. Zionsville Middle School representatives underscored the school's desire to use the park as a means of relieving some of the traffic congestion that occurs on Ford Road in the morning and afternoon. George Tikijian expressed appreciation for the concern, but also noted that he had reservations about bringing cars through the parking lot. The concern is that safety within the park may be diminished as result of more vehicular activity. *(Note: RATIO chose to remain silent on this issue at this meeting, having stated at the October 29 meeting that our general philosophy is that we do not feel parks should be used to resolve traffic congestion problems. RATIO did ask whether any consideration had been given to modifications to Ford Road to take care of this problem, and the school officials answered that this had been explored but was dismissed as an option due to the cost.*
 - b. A field representative from the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana was present. He emphasized the importance of the farmstead and encouraged the community to preserve it. He concurred that the buildings noted above have received additions more recently than the period of significance (which he felt was probably late 30's - early 40's), and that it may be appropriate to remove some structures or additions pending further study.
 - c. In a conversation after the meeting, George Tikijian asked RATIO whether any consideration had been given to providing room for baseball fields in the revised layout (they were not depicted graphically on the plans). John shared that the *grading* of the large open space will be challenging since fields overlap in order to get several kinds of fields (rugby, football and lacrosse) into the area. One of the results of the final grading of the fields is that areas that may *appear* unencumbered by other uses in plan will be sloping too severely to allow play to occur on them. It is probably not prudent to plan for fields to be located in these areas (occurring primarily in the southwest and southeast corners of the playfield area.)
12. There was not a decision reached regarding the use of the farmstead. RATIO was directed to show both of the ideas presented in the final plan as options.

Any additions or corrections to these Minutes should be submitted in writing to Ratio Architects, Inc., within ten (10) days of receipt. Otherwise, these Minutes stand as correct.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Jackson, ASLA
Associate Principal

cc: Al Smith – Zionsville Parks and Recreation Department
Zionsville Parks Board
Dave Rausch, Brian Bishop - RATIO Architects, Inc. / CF 03050.000 III

Attachment: Preliminary Cost Estimate