Master Plan for R Park

Parks & Trees Committee Recommendation to Council

02/06/2017
Current State

- Benches
- Bike rack
- Drinking fountain
- Handicapped swing
- Infant bucket swings
- Picnic tables
- Recycling receptacle
- Trail
- Trail markers
- Trash receptacles
- Trees
Pro Bono Estimates: 2015 rate @ $23.56

(http://independentsector.org/resource/the-value-of-volunteer-time/)

- 7 members, 12 2 hr meetings @ $23.56: $ 3,958
- Bench selection: >200 hrs @ $23.56: $ 4,712
- Drinking fountain: >50 hrs @ $23.56: $ 1,178
- R Park Design Services (see attached R Park Time Estimate.xlsx): $ 30,301
- Tree markers 50hrs @ $23.56: $ 1,178
- Handicapped swing 30 hrs @ $23.56: $ 706
- Infant bucket swings 10 hrs @ $23.56: $ 235
- Citizens’ Fundraising Initiative: $140,810

(see attached CFI_Feb2014-Dec2016.xlsx)
Future State

- Why do we need a Master Plan for R Park?
  - cohesion
  - planning & budgeting
- Why now?
- But we’ve had others before
Parks ranks #2 in Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
#### City of Roeland Park
#### Major Categories of City Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS, 10-20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of streets, buildings &amp; facilities</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1355</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation programs &amp; facilities</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1328</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of codes &amp; ordinances</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1135</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1044</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; 10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow &amp; congestion management</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0761</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of communication</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater runoff/stormwater management</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service from City employees</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks ranks #2 in areas that should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next 2 years.
Q10. Which Three Parks and Recreation Issues Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Number of walking & biking trails: 40%
- Maintenance of City parks: 39%
- Overall appearance of City parks: 32%
- Quality of the Community Center: 26%
- Quality of the Aquatics Center: 18%
- Number of City parks: 17%
- Quality of Art in public places: 15%
- Quality of playground equipment: 14%
- Fees charged for memberships, recreation programs & facility rentals: 13%
- City-sponsored special events: 12%
- How close neighborhood parks are to your home: 6%
- Ease of registering for programs: 4%

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Q11. Top Five Most Important Improvements You Would Like to See Made to City Parks

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top five choices

1. Add shade structures at R Park - 53%
2. Add benches and picnic tables - 47%
3. Add permanent restrooms at R Park - 46%
4. A combined-use hiking and mountain biking trail - 42%
5. An off-leash dog park - 37%
6. Replace tennis courts in R Park - 32%
7. Add an outdoor performance pavilion/theater - 31%
8. An arboretum - 23%
9. Add Frisbee golf course - 16%
10. Add sand or turf Volleyball - 15%
11. Add soccer fields - 13%
12. Add ice skating - 11%
13. Add Bocce Ball - 9%
14. Add horse shoes - 5%
15. Other - 11%
16. None chosen - 6%

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Q25. Level of Support for the Following Community Investment Areas

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (Excluding “Don’t Know”)

- Maintaining streets, sidewalks & storm sewer systems: 79% Very supportive, 15% Somewhat supportive, 5% Neutral, 1% Not supportive/not at all supportive
- Maintaining existing buildings: 58% Very supportive, 31% Somewhat supportive, 10% Neutral, 1% Not supportive/not at all supportive
- The City planting more trees on City property & preserving existing “green space”: 61% Very supportive, 25% Somewhat supportive, 9% Neutral, 5% Not supportive/not at all supportive
- Attention to environmental issues, such as the energy efficiency of the City’s vehicles & buildings: 39% Very supportive, 36% Somewhat supportive, 17% Neutral, 7% Not supportive/not at all supportive
- Adding attractive elements to major roadways: 37% Very supportive, 34% Somewhat supportive, 15% Neutral, 14% Not supportive/not at all supportive

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Q26. Which Two of the Community Investment Areas are Most Important for the City to Pursue

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices

- Maintaining streets, sidewalks & storm sewer systems: 67%
- The City planting more trees on City property & preserving existing "green space": 37%
- Adding attractive elements to major roadways: 29%
- Maintaining existing buildings: 27%
- Attention to environmental issues, such as the energy efficiency of the City's vehicles & buildings: 19%

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
See Master Plan
Soccer/Multi-use field

- groups that use the current field for practice
  - boys team from St. Agnes (6th grade?)
  - girls team from Westwood View Elem (5th+6th grade)
  - girls team from KCK (not sure the name of the team or exact grade)

- groups that have shown interest in using the field
  - i9 Sports: they are interested in bringing a soccer program to kids in R Park; use for practice, maybe games
Shade Structures

- Citizens’ Fundraising Initiative (Shelter)
- AAD grant: $8K
- First National Bank Grant
- Task force
Tennis courts

- Parks obtained information from McConnell & Associates (Kansas City; Leawood; Lee’s Summit; North Kansas City; Olathe; Overland Park; Prairie Village; Raytown)
  - lifespan: 50+ years
  - $160K is a good budget figure (McConnell & Associates communication, May 2016)
  - $17K allotted for tearing out existing courts, picking up the backfilling and reseeding
  - post tension concrete over the asphalt is an option
  - dual use: option to paint pickleball lines for $350 per court – currently no free outdoor pickleball courts in Johnson County
7 Principles of Universal Design
To include as an addendum to the R Park Master Plan

1. **Equitable Use:** The design does not disadvantage or stigmatize any group of users.

2. **Flexibility in Use:** The design accommodates a wide range of individual preferences and abilities.

3. **Simple, Intuitive Use:** Use of the design is easy to understand, regardless of the user’s experience, knowledge, language skills, or current concentration level.

4. **Perceptible Information:** The design communicates necessary information effectively to the user, regardless of ambient conditions or the user’s sensory abilities.

5. **Tolerance for Error:** The design minimizes hazards and the adverse consequences of accidental or unintended actions.

6. **Low Physical Effort:** The design can be used efficiently and comfortably, and with a minimum of fatigue.

7. **Size and Space for Approach & Use:** Appropriate size and space is provided for approach, reach, manipulation, and use, regardless of the user’s body size, posture, or mobility.

Copyright © 1997 NC State University, The Center for Universal Design. The principles of Universal Design were conceived and developed by The Center for Universal Design at North Carolina State University.