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March 25, 2019

ARG Bull Creek Ltd.
9111 Jollyville Road, Suite 111
Austin, Texas 78759

RE: The Grove at Shoal Creek Public Parks Master Plan

Dear ARG Development Representatives:

I am pleased to inform you that the Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) approves The Grove at Shoal Creek Public Parks Master Plan as recommended by the Parks and Recreation Board on February 26, 2019. The approved master plan document, dated February 2019, includes three amendments noted in a memorandum to the Parks and Recreation Board dated February 21, 2019.

The master plan for the public parks was developed through a public engagement process that identified community priorities. The initial $1.161 million phase, to be funded by the developer, includes The Grove at Shoal PUD required amenities and the top community priorities identified in the master plan. PARD will be responsible for funding the design and permitting of the off-leash dog park located within the Signature Park from the FY20 budget.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact my office at (512) 974-6717.

Sincerely,

Sara L. Hensley, CPRP, Director
Parks and Recreation Department
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Public Parks Master Plan for The Grove at Shoal Creek is a document that was developed by the property owner in collaboration with the Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) with input from the community. The goal of this project was to develop a Master Plan for the public parks at The Grove at Shoal Creek (The Grove) including the 16.25-acre Signature Park and the Pocket Park in compliance with the City Parkland Improvement and Operations Agreement for The Grove at Shoal Creek Planned Unit Development (PUD). Portions of the Master Plan will be built at the commencement of the project while others will not. This Plan will serve as a guide for future development; but only as a guide as community needs and desires change over time.

The document is separated into the following sections:

Background
Provides an overview of the site and context, site analysis, and demographic information as well as information about the PUD Ordinance that governs the project as a whole.

Community Engagement
Provides a brief overview of the community engagement process that informed this plan, including both the community engagement that occurred prior to approval of the PUD and the three public meetings that were conducted as part of this planning process.

Vision Plan
Establishes three Vision Statements and 10 Underlying goals for this Master Plan, with specific strategies for implementing those goals, and lays out an overall Vision Plan for the project, which directly informs the Master Plan.

Master Plan
Lays out the overall Master Plan for the public parks at The Grove at Shoal Creek. This includes an overall Circulation Plan, Core Infrastructure, and 11 individual projects which collectively constitute the Master Plan for the parks.

Implementation
Establishes the Initial Phase of park improvements, which will fulfill the developer's obligation to improve the parkland per the PUD, as well as future phases. Provides an estimate of long term maintenance costs.

Appendix
Contains meeting minutes and survey results from the public outreach process.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
The following is a brief description of the roles and responsibilities, as determined by the City Parkland Improvement and Operations Agreement for the planning, design, construction, programming, and ongoing maintenance of the public parks at The Grove.

Property Owner (Property Owner’s Association)
Develop a Public Parks Master Plan in consultation with PARD and the community
Construct Improvements required in the PUD, which include the concrete Shoal Creek Trail (trail surface only), pond, pedestrian bridge, and $750 per residential unit (approximately $1 million) in additional improvements.
Publicly dedicate the public parks after required improvements are completed
Ongoing maintenance of the parks

Parks and Recreation Department (PARD)
Assist in facilitating the public outreach process
Collaborate with the property owner and the community to develop the Public Parks Master Plan
Approval of the Public Parks Master Plan
Review and Approval of subsequent site plans
Permanent Ownership of Public Parklands

Management Committee
Includes representatives of PARD, the Property Owner, The Property Owners Association, and the surrounding community
Approves Annual Management Plan for park maintenance
Approves Annual Programming Plan for programming and special events
BACKGROUND

EXISTING CONDITIONS

SITE INVENTORY

The Grove site is approximately 75 acres and is located in north-central Austin. It is bordered by Bull Creek Road on the west, residential uses to the north and south and Shoal Creek on the east. Existing established neighborhoods around the site include: Allandale and Shoalmont to the north, Rosedale to the east, Ridgelea and Oakmont Heights to the south and Westminster and the Post West Austin Apartments to the west.

Vehicular access into the site is from Bull Creek Road. MoPac Freeway is approximately one block west from the northwest corner of site and its closest major east-west connections are 45th and 35th Streets. There are existing CapMetro bus routes on Bull Creek Road with stops adjacent to the site. Additional access into the site includes existing bike lanes on Bull Creek Road and a proposed Shoal Creek Trail extension through the project site.
ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

Topography on the west side of the property has a gentle slope falling west from Bull Creek Road towards the Shoal Creek on the east. There are several existing one-story buildings and associated parking lots on site that were used by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDot). The Pocket Park will be located in this portion of the site. The east side of the property has slightly higher gradients and is dominated by a large grove of heritage oak trees and Shoal Creek. Roughly 3.5 acres of land along Shoal Creek are in the 100-year floodplain. The Signature Park will be located in the eastern portion of the site.

Habitats on Site

The habitats on-site have been largely influenced and developed through man-made impacts. While the natural habitats within the site were found to be in poor condition due to the number of invasive species and limited maintenance, this project has the opportunity to simultaneously increase their ecological function and enhance the users’ experience. There are four major existing plant communities within the project site. They are: riparian edge, vernal wetland, upland prairie/meadow and herbaceous understory. The following is a short description of these plant communities.

- Riparian Edge: this plant community is focused around the edges of Shoal Creek on the eastern boundary of the property. The canopy species in this area are dominated by Cedar Elm, Mesquite and Live Oak trees, while the riverbank is primarily covered with invasive species such as Dallisgrass, Bermudagrass and Crabgrass, as well as aggressive native species such as Giant Ragweed and Western Ragweed. Due to major flow events the riverbank is exhibiting some significant erosion in certain areas.

- Vernal Wetland: this plant community is considered an existing critical environmental feature (CEF) and is near Shoal Creek. Due to the nature of these types of wetlands, this region is covered by shallow water for varying periods of time throughout the year depending on climate conditions, typically in the winter and spring.

- Uplands Prairie/Meadow: this plant community is intertwined with the Herbaceous Understory and can serve as a natural buffer between the formal park spaces and the natural riverbank while providing additional water filtration through the soil. It is characteristically dominated by a grassland community that includes both grasses and forb species. However the primary grassland species include invasive species such as Bermudagrass, Johnsongrass and Crabgrass. There are areas in which seasonal wildflowers currently grow.

- Herbaceous Understory: this plant community is entwined with the Uplands Prairie/Meadow plant community and is typically dominated by woody vegetation. The existing understory currently consists of brushy species and younger tress such as Poison Ivy, Elbow Bush, Mesquite, Cedar Elm, Chinaberry Tree, Tree of Heaven and Giant Ragweed.
Heritage Trees

There are two large groves of heritage oak trees on the site, a smaller live oak grove located in the Pocket Park and a larger grove located in the Signature Park consisting primarily of live oak with some cedar elms and other species present. Both groves represent outstanding natural resources for the parks and will provide shade, habitat, beauty, and character to the parks. The grove in the Signature Park is particularly exceptional, including a 78” live oak and many other extraordinary specimens. The PUD agreement calls for additional protections for many of these trees, called the Signature Grove, requiring protection of the 3/4 critical root zone (CRZ) above and beyond the 1/2 CRZ protections required by City of Austin code. It is the intention of the Master Plan to protect and preserve these trees as both an outstanding natural resource and incredible amenity to the park.

Shoal Creek

Shoal Creek is a key feature of the Signature Park and provides both opportunities and limitations in how the site can be developed. The benefits include wildlife habitat, providing a corridor for both wildlife and human movement, exploration of natural beauty, and educational opportunities provided by the creek. Some of the key concerns that have been expressed around the creek are outlined below.

Bank Stabilization

The west bank of Shoal Creek at the north end of the site has experienced considerable erosion over time. If the bank continues to erode the slope will gradually lay back and reach an equilibrium where it will remain more stable. The Grow Zone and Critical Water Quality Zone paralleling the creek corridor are provided in order to allow the creek a natural space in which to find that equilibrium within its banks. While more structural bank stabilization efforts are theoretically possible and have been discussed with the city’s Watershed Department, it was concluded that the high cost of these improvements is not merited in this case. This is primarily because there are no structures at risk and the area that may erode is within a zone designed to allow the creek space to move.

Sediment Collection

There is some potential for sediment collection following storm events within the floodplain as well as in and around the pond. The pond is designed to receive a sediment load to prevent sediment from being conveyed further downstream, and will require occasional maintenance to remove collected sediment. Overall, the potential for sediment collection to considerably impact the park is minimal.

Flooding Potential

The Signature Park does include Shoal Creek and its floodplain. Both the 25 and 100-year floodplain are depicted on the Site Analysis Plan. Portions in the 25 year floodplain will flood regularly and even the 100-year floodplain has the potential to flood, so any improvements in these areas must be constructed in a manner that is resilient to the expected flooding. However, the site continues to slope up fairly quickly from the edge of the floodplain, so that flooding cannot expand into the more developed parts of the site. Additionally, the pond in the park will fill up during storm events and it’s 100-year water elevation will encompass some amenity areas of the site. The pond is designed to drain down quickly from this water surface elevation to return those areas to usability in a matter of hours or days. However, any improvements within that area must be designed to be resilient to occasional inundation.
SITE ANALYSIS

The site analysis plan included here lays out the major physical elements that will influence development of the park, including the floodplain and critical water quality zone along Shoal Creek, an additional Riparian Grow Zone to protect riparian vegetation along the creek, The wetland CEF and associated buffer, Heritage and protected trees on the site, and the anticipated alignment of the Shoal Creek Trail.

Figure 2-2: Site Analysis Exhibit
EXISTING AND PROPOSED UTILITIES

The only existing utilities on the site are the wastewater line running in the bottom of Shoal Creek and the Overhead Electric bordering the north edge of the Signature Park and the edge of the Pocket Park and North Greenbelt where they abut Bull Creek Road. There are also some utilities within the Pocket Park that serve the existing structures and will be removed.

New utilities proposed in the site include stormwater lines to the pond from the adjacent development and from the pond to the outfall into Shoal Creek, as well as a wastewater connection from the adjacent development to Shoal Creek. The anticipated easements for these utilities are depicted on the Existing and Proposed Utilities map below. There will also be electrical and water services to the park, the location of which will be determined at site plan. The utilities and easements depicted here are approximate and may change due to engineering constraints, additional requirements, or other factors. Additional easements not depicted here may be added in the future as required.

Figure 2 - 3: Existing and Proposed Utilities Exhibit
OppoRTuNitiess AND CoNSTrAiNTS
Based on the existing conditions outlined in the previous pages, there are a number of opportunities and constraints that have impacted the development of this Master Plan. The most important of these are outlined below.

Key Opportunities:
- Existing Heritage Trees provide recreational, aesthetic, and habitat benefits to the park.
- Portions of the park along Shoal Creek provide outstanding natural diversity and interest and an ideal location to escape into nature.
- The wetland CEF provides diversity of plant communities and natural interest.
- The wet pond that must be constructed for the adjacent development provides unique recreational opportunities and a potential focal point for the Signature Park.
- Some existing vegetation, especially in riparian areas, is native and serving a key ecosystem function.
- The site is highly accessible for pedestrians and cyclists from both the new development adjacent and existing communities surrounding the site.
- The North Greenbelt provides a gateway to the Signature Park from the highly visible corner of 45th and Bull Creek Road.
- The pocket park has excellent visibility and is highly accessible from surrounding neighborhood, especially to the south.
- The park can both add to and access the regional Shoal Creek Trail network.

Key Constraints:
- Need to preserve Heritage Trees limits grading and hardscape construction in certain areas.
- Floodplains and buffers associated with Shoal Creek limit development in some areas.
- Areas immediately adjacent to the wet pond will be inundated during storm events and must be designed to resist damage due to inundation.
- Recreational opportunities are limited in the Wetland CEF and its buffer.
- Much of the existing vegetation is invasive.
- The signature park site has limited visibility from existing public ROW. Construction of Jackson Avenue will add substantially to the visibility from public ROW.
THE LAND
The site of The Grove at Shoal Creek was owned by TxDOT prior to its purchase in 2015 by ARG Bull Creek. Prior to TxDOT, the property has had many owners and land uses ranging from agricultural in the mid 1800’s, civic in the early to mid 1900’s, and State Office in the late 1900’s. In recent years, the undeveloped portions of the site along Shoal Creek have also been used for passive recreation by nearby residents. This newest chapter will see the property transformed again into a vibrant urban community with extensive parks.

Figure 2 - 4 illustrates a brief time line of this property’s land uses and owners.

THE PEOPLE
While many people have been connected to the property over the years, two figures stand out in terms of historical significance: William Holland and Arizona Juanita Dranes. A brief biography of each is included here to establish the appropriateness of honoring these figures within the Public Parkland at The Grove.

William Holland
William Holland (W. Holland) was born in 1841 in Marshall, Texas. He and his brothers, Milton and James, were originally born into slavery on the Holland Family Plantation. Captain Bird Holland purchased their freedom in the late 1950’s. The Holland brothers were sent to Ohio for formal education through the “Albany Manual Labor Academy.”

W. Holland served in the Sixteenth U.S. Colored Troops during the Civil War. After the war he attended Oberlin College in Ohio and then returned to Texas to teach in various counties throughout the State and within Austin. W. Holland was the first African-American Commissioner in Travis County. In 1876 he was elected to represent Waller County in the Fifteenth Texas Legislature where he sponsored a bill providing for the Prairie View Normal College (now Prairie View A&M University). W. Holland sponsored another bill in 1886 to establish a public school for the deaf and mute. The bill was signed on August 15, 1887 by Governor Lawrence S. Ross who appointed W. Holland as the first superintendent for the school. This appointment made W. Holland the first African-American man in the U.S. to head a public institution. Courses offered at the “The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institute for Colored Youth” included music studies and manual labor skills built around the goals of providing students a sense of fulfillment, an ability to contribute and have a sustainable source of income after graduating.

Arizona Juanita Dranes
Arizona Juanita Dranes (A. Dranes) was born in the late 1800’s. She attended “The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institute for Colored Youth” from 1896 until 1910 where she was first exposed to music. After graduating she lived near the musically rich Deep Ellum district of Dallas. Here she learned to play the piano and developed her own distinct “sanctified” style known as “gospel beat” an arrangement of secular styles like barrelhouse and ragtime rhythms combined with religious lyrics.

A. Dranes spent most of the early 1920’s traveling throughout Texas and Oklahoma with various ministries of the Church of God in Christ, playing piano and singing. In 1926 Richard M. Jones, a traveling talent scout for Okeh Records, overheard A. Dranes and arranged a recording session for her in Chicago. Over the next three years A. Dranes would become one of the top gospel singers contracted under the OKeh label during this time. Her career ended during the Great Depression but her influence on the music industry is echoed throughout history through various gospel, blues and jazz singers.
Mirabeau B. Lamar, President of the Republic of Texas, provided a patent to George W. Spear to establish approximately 4,428 acres as the “George W. Spear League”. This land was originally developed with expansive estates and agricultural uses. It was later subdivided to accommodate the City’s growing population.

March 31, 1841
Mirabeau B. Lamar, President of the Republic of Texas, provided a patent to George W. Spear to establish approximately 4,428 acres as the “George W. Spear League”. This land was originally developed with expansive estates and agricultural uses. It was later subdivided to accommodate the City’s growing population.

February 14, 1850
David G. Adams purchased approximately 1,182 acres of the original George W. Spear League.

January 21, 1854
Abner H. Cook purchased the land from Mr. Adams.

April 28, 1858
Mr. Cook sold 150 acres of his land to Dr. W.C. Phillips.

1886
William Holland sponsored a bill in the Texas Legislature to establish a public school for the deaf and mute.

July 27, 1887
Dr. Phillips transferred the deed of 100 acres along Shoal Creek to the State of Texas in order “to establish an asylum for the deaf and dumb and the blind of the youth of the people of Color of the State of Texas.”

1896 to 1910
Arizona Juanita Dranes attended The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institute for Colored Youth.

1900

1900 to 1910
Arizona Juanita Dranes attended The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institute for Colored Youth.

1943
The State Colored Orphans’ Home was combined with the Institute and the campus was renamed “Texas Blind, Deaf, and Orphan School”. This facility stayed at this location until 1960.

1943
The State Colored Orphans’ Home was combined with the Institute and the campus was renamed “Texas Blind, Deaf, and Orphan School”. This facility stayed at this location until 1960.

1950

1950 to 1988
The facility was operated by “The Texas Board of Mental Health and Mental Retardation”.

1950 to 1988
The facility was operated by “The Texas Board of Mental Health and Mental Retardation”.

1960 to 1988
The facility was operated by “The Texas Board of Mental Health and Mental Retardation”.

1988
The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) took over the use and maintenance of the campus.

1988
The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) took over the use and maintenance of the campus.

2000

2000

2000

2000

2000

2015
Land was purchased by ARG Bull Creek to begin the planning and zoning process for The Grove at Shoal Creek.

2015
Land was purchased by ARG Bull Creek to begin the planning and zoning process for The Grove at Shoal Creek.

Figure 2-4: Property Timeline
There are several sections within the planned unit development (PUD) zoning for the Grove that impact the planning and design for public parks at The Grove:

- PART 6. Open Space and Parkland
- PART 7. Environmental
- PART 13. Cultural and Historical Measures.
- Exhibit D. Environmental Resources Exhibit
- Exhibit E. Parks Plan and Parkland Improvement and Operations Agreement
- Exhibit G. Project Design Guidelines
- Exhibit H. Tree Disposition Plan

These sections layout general requirements for dedication and calculation of parkland, restrictions on development within the PUD, required improvements within the public parks, as well as long-term operations and maintenance requirements. For additional detail, refer to City of Austin Ordinance Number 20161215-075.
Figure 2-5: Exhibit E Parks Plan from PUD Ordinance
All sizes and locations of proposed features, setbacks, and buffers shown on plan are approximate. Final location will be determined at Site Plan.
All sizes and locations of proposed features, setbacks, and buffers shown on plan are approximate. Final location will be determined at Site Plan.

Mitigation Calculation

Mitigation Required: 76,230 SF
Detention Infiltration Feature: 10,000 SF
Wetland Fringe: 2,500 SF
Upland Infiltration Feature: 5,000 SF
Riparian Grow Zone: 58,730 SF

TOTAL MITIGATION PROVIDED: 76,230 SF

Figure 2-7: EXHIBIT D Environmental Resources from PUD Ordinance
PLANNING CONTEXT

DEMOGRAPHIC MAKEUP

Austin In General
- 2017 estimated population is 949,587, at a density of 3,494 people per square mile
- 2.68% population growth from 2012-2016
- 11th largest city in the United States
- 3.3% job growth per annum
- $57,689 median household income

POPULATION OF SURROUNDING ZIPCODES
78703, 78705, 78712, 78731, 78752

CONCLUSIONS

- The population continuing to grow in this part of Austin, increasing by an estimated 42% from 2000 to 2040.
- All age groups are represented in the area, so the park system will need a wide range of amenities targeted at all ages.
- Only 10% of the population is under 15. This user group has a strong need for parks and playgrounds should be provided, but this is not the dominant demand for the park.
- 16% of the population is over 55. This indicates a strong need for passive recreation including trails, and seating areas.
- More than half of the population is between 15 and 24. Trails, active recreation, and social spaces are needed to serve this group.
This Page Left Blank Intentionally
In order for a project to be successful it needs to fit into the existing fabric of a community. The current land uses and population around a site can significantly alter the design and programming of a space. Because of this, soliciting feedback from community stakeholders has been a core component of the design for The Grove from the beginning. Prior to the initiation of the parks master planning process, The Grove project went through approximately two years of planning, public outreach, and public hearings during the zoning process. This process started in January of 2015 and ended with the approval of a PUD by the City Council in December of 2016. During this time there was constant public input, including a community visioning workshop, three master plan presentation meetings and multiple public hearing appearances at the City of Austin’s Parks Board, Environmental Commission, Bicycle Advisory Commission, Zoning and Platting Commission and City Council. Additionally there were over forty small scale meetings held with citizens groups, organizations and other various stakeholders. While most of these meetings focused on The Grove development in its entirety, the parks within the project were a core topic for many of these meetings. Additionally, the developer conducted three more targeted workshops focusing on bicycle infrastructure, housing, and, in December of 2015, a workshop was held focusing exclusively on the parks.

Surveys were conducted at many of the meetings to quantify community input. Surveys results from the initial Visioning Meetings conducted in January 2015 and the Parks Workshop conducted in December of 2015 are included in the appendix of this document and served as a starting point for the public outreach conducted as a part of this Master Planning Process.
Three public input meetings were held to solicit feedback from the community regarding the goals and programming priorities for the public parks at The Grove, to discuss a vision plan and design alternatives for those parks and to present the resulting Public Parks Master Plan. The resulting master plan is the result of that process and will be presented to the Parks Board for recommendation and to the Director of PARD for final approval. The following are summaries of the public input meetings. Detailed meeting summaries may be found in the Appendix of this document.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING SUMMARIES

First Public Meeting
On March 21, 2017 the first of three public meetings for The Grove Public Park Master Plan was held at Bryker Woods Elementary. This meeting was focused on analyzing the existing conditions of the site, reviewing park precedents that could be used as inspiration for elements throughout the parks, and the stakeholders participating in a brainstorming workshop. The goal of the workshop was to identify the biggest needs and desires for the parks in The Grove. Stakeholders then categorized their needs and desires into three piles: Goals, Amenities, and Programs. The goals, amenities, and programs identified through this process were used to shape the Vision and Goals statement for the parks at The Grove.

Second Public Meeting
On April 24, 2017 the second of three public meetings for The Grove Public Park Master Plan was held at Bryker Woods Elementary. The second meeting began by discussing the results of Workshop 1 from the first public meeting; the discussion was followed by an initial review of the draft vision and goals statement compiled from the Workshop 1 feedback. Once the statements were reviewed participants were given a worksheet on which they could comment on the vision statement as well as comment on, add to and rank the goal statements. Next two alternatives, option A and option B, for the Vision and Park Plans including zones of intensity and program elements for each were presented to the stakeholders. Participants were referred back to the worksheet they were given earlier in the evening, and were encouraged to evaluate how well the alternatives fulfilled the goals. The contents of the worksheet were developed into an on-line poll for stakeholders who could not attend the meeting.

Third Public Meeting
On May 30, 2017 the third and final public meeting for The Grove Public Park Master Plan was held at Bryker Woods Elementary. The third meeting began by updating the stakeholders on the Workshop 2 results. A final draft of the vision and goal statements was presented to the stakeholders. Next a final Vision and Park Plan that depicted the long-term vision was presented. Stakeholders were given a worksheet on which they could read a description of the Core Infrastructure recommendations and the ten recommended projects broken out by geography. The worksheet included cost ranges as well. These costs were intended to inform participants of the relative scale of each project, which could impact final phasing of implementation. The worksheet asked participants to state high, medium or low priority for each project. The contents of the worksheet were developed into an on-line poll for stakeholders who could not attend the meeting. Additionally, there was considerable input provided at this meeting encouraging the inclusion of a dog park in the Parks Master Plan. A dog park had been previously excluded due to spacial and environmental constraints, but some participants expressed a desire to see a dog park of any scale included in the project. For this reason, a dog park was added as an additional project option to the online survey.)
VISION PLAN

OVERALL VISION

The Vision Plan for the Public Parks at The Grove at Shoal Creek begins with a series of three Vision Statements. Each of these statements consists of underlying Goals with supporting strategies for achieving those Goals. These Vision Statements and Goals were crafted based on input received in the first Public Meeting as well as input from the Parks Department, other City departments and the property owner. They were evolved and finalized based on public feedback at the Second Public Meeting.

This Vision is then developed into an overall Vision Plan for the parks, which broadly envisions 4 zones within the parks. These zones include the North Greenbelt and Pocket Park, as well as the Park Zone and Natural Zone, both within the Signature Park. Each of these zones speaks to specific elements of the goals and strategies laid out under the Vision Statement, and careful attention was paid during the planning process to properly balance the amount of the park dedicated to each of these zones to best reflect the overall Vision.

The Vision Plan is intended to inform the outcome of the Parks Master Plan, and the connection between the two is clear. The Vision Plan is also a useful reference point during implementation of the plan. While a Master Plan document can only achieve a certain level of specificity and must by necessity provide some flexibility, the Vision Plan can be utilized to ensure detailed design elements and choices made as the plan is implemented are true to the intent of the Master Plan.

A master plan is necessarily imprecise and significant changes are to be expected during detailed design and implementation. The Vision Plan provides a reference point of intent to ensure flexibility in implementation of the Master Plan.

Vision Statement 1
A refuge from the urban environment anchored by majestic live oaks, diverse natural habitat, and Shoal Creek

Goal 1: to preserve, protect and enhance the natural character and distinct natural features of the site
- Preserve heritage trees
- Provide a buffer for Shoal Creek's riparian edge
- Minimize impacts on Shoal Creek's erosion hazard zone
- Protect and buffer the site's unique wetland
- Use vegetation that supports urban wildlife (i.e. birds, bees and butterflies)

Goal 2: to provide opportunities for exploration, escape, and connection with nature
- Provide a network of trails; large and small, hard and soft, throughout the site
- Welcome pets while protecting the environment and experience of other park users
- Create opportunities for children to interact with nature through play
- Welcome exploration of the site's more natural areas
- Distribute passive uses throughout the site
- Design the wet pond to support wildlife and invite interaction

Goal 3: to celebrate the site's unique geology and ecology
- Design the wet pond to enhance and recharge the wetland
- Provide educational materials regarding the unique relationship between the wet pond, wetland, and creek
- Create creek overlooks and wildlife watching locations
Goal 1: to provide opportunities for active recreation for all ages and abilities
- Create imaginative play environments for children of all ages
- Distribute multi-generational spaces across the site
- Encourage structured and unstructured fitness activities
- Provide walking loops
- Create wide, level open lawns for unstructured recreation where feasible
- Design spaces and signage to emphasize pedestrian and bicycle safety

Goal 2: to ensure infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate anticipated use
- Welcome and accommodate pets in the parks by integrating pet comfort stations
- Accommodate sufficient parking for off-site users
- Build trails and pathways to accommodate regular use and expected traffic
- Provide ample bicycle parking
- Provide ample waste collection and regular maintenance

Goal 3: to create a vibrant complimentary interface with the adjacent urban district
- Accommodate many active uses outside the public park area in the adjacent urban plaza
- Blur the lines between public and private realm to ensure that the adjacent plazas and streetscapes feel like an extension of the public park
- Encourage park-compatible uses on adjacent private land including restaurants, food stands, splash play features, public restrooms, farmer’s markets, etc.

Goal 4: to develop programming and amenities that build community
- Accommodate events and community programs
- Provide places for small events and gatherings
- Create ample shaded seating and picnic areas
- Encourage community stewardship of site’s natural resources

Goal 1: to build a critical link and destination in Austin’s Shoal Creek Trail system
- Build the Shoal Creek Trail through the parks from Jefferson Street to the corner of 45th and Bull Creek
- Build a bridge across Shoal Creek and a connection to Shoal Creek Boulevard
- Develop nodes where key views can be appreciated

Goal 2: to create a place that feels open, welcoming and comfortable for all
- Provide identity, wayfinding, and interpretive signage in the park and along trail corridors
- Accommodate the existing and future pet owners that will use the park
- Ensure that at least 705’ of public frontage exists along the park’s edge
- Ensure the restaurant area adjacent to the park is designed to create an open, welcoming gateway from the adjacent plaza to the park
- Ensure site’s amenities are accessible and accommodate users of all abilities
- Provide good visibility and lighting in more active areas of park
- Buffer surrounding residential areas from high activity areas

Goal 3: to celebrate the site’s unique cultural history
- Develop features to inform the public and celebrate the unique history of the site
- Provide opportunities for public art

Vision Statement 2
Active, vibrant parks that serve the needs of the surrounding neighborhood, new and old, and all Austinites

Vision Statement 3
Open spaces that integrate with the fabric of Shoal Creek and the surrounding neighborhoods
Figure 4-1: Vision Plan Areas
PARK ZONE

The Park Zone covers the more frequently used and amenitized portions of the park. It is composed of two sub-zones: the Active zone and the Passive Zone.

ACTIVE ZONE

The most developed and programmed part of the park, the active zone, comprises portions of the park zone located closest to the proposed mixed-use district. It may include pathways, spaces and amenities that extend across the boundary between the mixed-use district and the public park. This area will anticipate the greatest number of visitors and will thus have more paving, more reinforced and maintained landscapes, and ample seating, shade, and amenities to the extent feasible within the budget. Heritage trees in this area should be protected with decks where appropriate to avoid excessive compaction of their root zones.

Typical Amenities
- Active creative playscape
- Splash pad
- Open plaza for farmers’ markets and community gatherings
- Games (ping pong, chess, bocce, etc.)
- Vending/restaurants (not permitted in public parkland)
- Public art
- Ample seating and shade
- Publicly accessible restrooms
- Bike parking
- Performance space/amphitheater
- Dog waste and watering stations

Typical Programming
- Farmer’s markets/Marketplaces
- Concerts and live performances
- Community festivals and parties

PASSIVE ZONE

The passive zone will make up the majority of the park zone and will serve as a transition between the more heavily used active zone and the natural zone. This larger area will feature lower intensity amenities such as trails, picnic areas, and soft surface playgrounds. The key features of the passive zone are large areas of open, unprogrammed lawn for general play, relaxation, picnicking, gathering, etc. Shade is provided primarily by trees rather than hard structures and paving is primarily hard surface with soft surface possible in lower traffic areas.

Typical Amenities
- Open lawn
- Soft surface playground and/or natural play
- Trails and walking paths
- Shoal creek trail
- Pollinator garden
- Picnic and seating areas
- Natural landscape area
- Interactive wet pond
- Dog waste and watering stations
- Fitness equipment
- Event Lawn

Typical Programming
- Fitness and exercise groups and classes
- Movies in the park/lawn performances
- Small gatherings, birthday parties, etc.
NATURAL ZONE
The natural zone will cover a large portion of the eastern part of the site and seeks to preserve and enhance the site's unique natural character. This zone will feature preserved and restored natural landscapes with opportunities to watch, explore, and interpret the surrounding habitats. The natural zone will also provide protection and buffering for Shoal Creek and a wetland located on the site.

Typical Amenities
- Natural/restored landscape
- Wet pond and wetlands
- Shoal Creek Trail
- Walking Paths
- Creek overlooks and wildlife watching stations
- Soft surface where practical
- Nature play
- Educational features
- Picnic and seating areas
- Dog waste stations
- Dog Park

Typical Programming
- Environmental education classes
- Community maintenance/restoration days

NORTH GREENBELT
The north Greenbelt serves as a critical gateway into the site's park system, a front door for the Signature Park, and a buffer for the homes north of the site. It extends the presence of the Signature Park out to Bull Creek Road and provides a key link in the site's trail network, while also offering small scale seating, lawns, and other passive amenities.

Typical Amenities
- Shoal Creek Trail
- Small open lawns
- Picnic and seating areas
- Project and park identity signage
POCKET PARK

The Pocket Park is an important recreational destination within The Grove. More easily accessible for many residents in and around The Grove, this will be a common daily destination for play, gathering, and relaxation. This park is also located near a retirement community and provides an excellent opportunity for multi-generational recreation and interaction. Its location along Bull Creek Road makes it a visible and fitting place to honor the site's unique history.

Typical Amenities
• Open Lawn family play area
• Walking paths and strolling garden
• Bike trails
• Picnic and seating areas
• Historical marker/educational feature
• Dog waste and watering stations

Typical Programming
• Small gatherings, birthday parties, etc.

Pocket Park Character Images
The Master Plan includes both an overall circulation plan and series of 10 Master Plan Projects. The Master Plan Projects provide a detailed description of the core infrastructure and 10 individual and geographically determined projects, which collectively detail the desired improvements, amenities, programming, maintenance levels, and lighting levels in these distinct areas of the parks. These projects can be constructed individually or collectively and facilitate phasing of the overall park improvements. Collectively, the core infrastructure and 10 Master Plan Projects constitute the Public Parks Master Plan for The Grove. The boundary of the Public Parks at The Grove is indicated by the dashed white line in the exhibit below. In some cases, improvements on areas outside of this boundary are shown, including streets, a signage lot at the corner of Bull Creek Road and 45th street, a mixed use lot adjacent to the Signature Park, and the Central Greenbelt. These areas are shown for context only. Improvements on property outside the boundaries of the public parkland are governed by The Grove at Shoal Creek PUD Ordinance; this document does not influence what is permitted to be built on adjacent private property or public right-of-way.
CIRCULATION

The circulation system that runs through The Grove's parks consists of three different hierarchies, primary pathways, secondary pathways, and the Shoal Creek Trail.

There are a series of loops that have been identified as a result of how the circulation system was designed. A 1/2-mile accessible loop in the Signature Park provides a recreational loop for users of all ages and abilities. The 3/4-mile loop provides a more diverse experience within the Signature Park, directing users across hard and soft surface trails and through all zones of the park. Finally, a potential 1¾-mile community loop is identified that would span between the parks and other trails planned for the larger community. The trails shown outside the Public Parkland are not intended to be controlled by this plan but are generally requirements of the PUD zoning and associated Design Guidelines.

The circulation system depicted in the Circulation Plan is not intended to be an exact representation of the final park circulation system. Many factors including grades, trees, significant existing vegetation, phasing, and final alignment of surrounding roads and buildings can impact the final layout, which will be determined at the time of detailed design. Additionally, the circulation system is shown in areas outside the Public Parkland is to show desired connections as well as connections required by the PUD Ordinance. These areas are shown for context only and are not governed by this document.

Figure 5 - 2: The Grove at Shoal Creek - Circulation Plan

Note: Trail alignments depicted on the Master Plan are conceptual in nature and minor adjustments may occur in the final design of the park.
The Grove Master Park Plan is broken into the following projects:

- Core Infrastructure
- Project A - Gateway Park
- Project B - Shoal Creek Trail Enhancements
- Project C - Casual Play and Fitness
- Project D - Great Lawns
- Project E - Active Hub
- Project F - Natural Zone Enhancements
- Project G - Passive Park South
- Project H - Dog Park
- Project I - Pocket Park Play Zone
- Project J - Pocket Park Gardens
Core Infrastructure represents the portions of the park that must be built per the PUD and are not included in the minimum cost the developer is required to expend on park improvements. For this reason, the cost of improvements shown as core infrastructure are not included in the cost estimates included in this document. These elements are required to be in the first phase of the park and their cost does not contribute to the overall park budget.

1. Jefferson Street Connection
2. Preferred location for Pedestrian Bridge (Final location will be determined based on feasibility and easement location and may vary substantially from location shown below)
3. Possible alternate location for Pedestrian Bridge
4. Perimeter sidewalks and trees
5. Wet Pond, terraced retaining walls, boardwalk, wetland habitat restoration, sloped event lawn
6. Shoal Creek Trail (pavement only)

Figure 5-4: The Grove at Shoal Creek - Core Infrastructure Projects
The wet pond is the centerpiece of the park, providing recreational and educational opportunities for users. The pond is also a functional element in the stormwater management system of the property.

- **Zone(s):** Passive Zone, Natural Zone
- **Primary Amenities:**
  1. Boardwalk
  2. Event Lawn on west edge
  3. Natural riparian banks on east edge
  4. Terraced retaining walls to improve pond access
  5. Wetland and habitat restoration
- **Programming:** Educational programming
- **Lighting:** Low
- **Maintenance Requirement:** High
The corner pocket park serves as the front porch of the project. It should invite people in, while providing a great vantage for relaxing and watching the world pass by.

- **Zone(s):** North Greenbelt
- **Primary Amenities:**
  1. Park signage/interactive signage
  2. Welcome lawn with seating, approximately 0.25 acres
  3. Access to Shoal Creek Trail and Bull Creek Road Trail
  4. Community shelter (“Front Porch”), shelter may be a structure or provided by planted trees
- **Lighting:** Moderate light level
- **Maintenance Requirement:** Moderate
The 12' concrete trail is a key part of the site’s and City’s pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and should be designed as a complete park facility. The concrete paving of the trail itself is included in the Core Infrastructure, but no additional improvements such as lighting, seating or signage along the trail are included there. All items below (and the budget for Project B) are enhancements and improvements along the trail not included in the core infrastructure.

- Zone(s): North Greenbelt, Passive Zone, Natural Zone
- Primary Amenities:
  1. Signature park entry, directional and way finding signage
  2. Benches, waste receptacles, pet waste stations, hydration stations, bike repair stations along length of trail
  3. Lawn and tree plantings in North Greenbelt
  4. Tree and restoration plantings in Natural Zone immediately adjacent to trail
  5. Buffer Plantings
  6. Buffer Plantings area between trail and southern property line shall be a natural area with native trees and shrubs
- Lighting: Moderate in North Greenbelt and Passive Zone, low in Natural Zone
- Maintenance Requirement: Moderate
The northern area of the Signature Park is characterized by low-impact play for all ages, including playgrounds, trails, and fitness equipment, woven into a majestic grove of trees.

- **Zone(s):** Passive Zone, Natural Zone
- **Primary Amenities:**
  1. Nature play area (approximately 3,000-5,000 SF)
  2. Walking trails and fitness loop (5-8 stations)
  3. Picnic and seating areas at regular intervals
  4. Buffer Plantings
- **Programming:** Fitness classes
- **Lighting:** Low light level
- **Maintenance Requirement:** Moderate
The upper lawn is a flat, multi-purpose field for a wide range of activities. The larger central lawn is an area for relaxing in the grass, small informal gatherings, and playing catch with friends. To ensure that a relatively flat multi-purpose field is included in the initial phase, approximately 60% of Project D will be constructed in the initial phase and the remainder in a future phase.

- Zone(s): Passive Zone
- Primary Amenities:
  1. Upper lawn/Multi-purpose field, approximately 0.5 acres
  2. Lower lawn, gently sloping, approximately 0.8 acres
  3. Ring of paths and natural landscaping
  4. Formal and informal seating opportunities
  5. Low walls for tree preservation and leveling of lawns
- Programming: Community gatherings, fitness classes
- Lighting: Low light level
- Maintenance Requirement: Moderate
This area is expected to be the most intensely used part of the park, with a destination adventure playground, a large community deck full of activity, and a shade pavilion overlooking an event lawn. To ensure that an active recreation element is included in the Initial Phase, a portion of this project will be construction in the Initial Phase and the remainder will be constructed in a future phase. Phasing will require this area to be split into two phases.

- **Zone(s):** Active Zone
- **Primary Amenities in Initial Phase:**
  1. Adventure Playground and signature play feature, approximately 5,000-8,000 SF
  2. Pathways to access playground
- **Primary Amenities in Future Phase:**
  3. Community deck with movable furniture and game tables built around existing trees, approximately 2,000-4,000 SF
  4. Pavilion/Shade structure overlooking lawn and play area, approximately 1,000-3,000 SF
  5. Picnic area under shade trees
  6. Open lawn area
- **Programming:** Movies in the park, live performances, community gatherings and socials, birthday parties
- **Lighting:** High light level
- **Maintenance Requirement:** High
The natural zone is an escape from the surrounding city, an urban refuge. It also provides an important buffer for Shoal Creek and the site's vernal wetland.

- **Zone(s):** Natural Zone
- **Primary Amenities:**
  1. Soft surface trails with intermittent seating areas
  2. Overlook/wildlife watching stations along Shoal Creek
  3. Small outdoor classroom
  4. Buffer Plantings
- **Programming:** Educational programming, community prairie maintenance days
- **Lighting:** None except along Shoal Creek Trail
- **Maintenance Requirement:** Low
The southern area of the Signature Park is not as actively programmed, but provides ample unprogrammed lawn, paths, and gardens while also addressing some challenging grade transitions. To ensure that access to the Shoal Creek Trail is included in the Initial Phase, an accessible trail connection will be constructed in the Initial Phase and the remainder will be constructed in a future phase. Phasing will require this area to be split into two phases.

- Zone(s): Passive Zone
- Primary Amenities in Initial Phase:
  1. Pathway (with steps) from street to Shoal Creek Trail
- Primary Amenities in Future Phase:
  2. Open lawns
  3. Pathways
  4. Buffer Plantings
- Programming: Educational programming
The Dog Park will serve residents in The Grove and from surrounding neighborhoods. It will provide a safe and secure area for owners and their pets to run and play in an unleashed space, while still being surrounded by the natural elements that the site has to offer. Existing heritage trees must be preserved, and other smaller trees and understory vegetation should be preserved where feasible within dog park boundaries. To ensure that access to the Shoal Creek Trail is included in the Initial Phase, an accessible trail connection will be constructed in the Initial Phase and the remainder will be constructed in a future phase. Phasing will require this area to be split into two phases.

- Zone(s): Natural Zone
- Primary Amenities Initial Phase:
  1. Accessible pathway from street to Shoal Creek Trail
- Primary Amenities Future Phase
  2. Iconic sculptural element at entry/street terminus
  3. Terrace garden / Pollinator garden
  4. Water quality treatment measures as required by the city
  5. Dog park, approximately 0.25 acres
- Lighting: Moderate light level
- Maintenance Requirement: High

Figure 5-13: Project H - Dog Park
The Pocket Park will provide a family play area convenient to the southern portion of the site and surrounding neighborhoods to the south. Shaded by live oaks and a large pavilion, this will be a daily destination for families in and around The Grove.

- Zone(s): Pocket Park
- Primary Amenities:
  1. Park gateway
  2. Playground, approximately 800-1500 SF
  3. Pavilion and seating area on edge of trees, approximately 300-600 SF
  4. Small Lawns
- Programming: Birthday parties
- Lighting: Moderate light level
- Maintenance Requirement: High
This portion of the Pocket Park is characterized by shady gardens under existing oaks surrounded by open lawns and is populated with paths, small gathering spaces, and a historic marker or monument.

- **Zone(s):** Pocket Park
- **Primary Amenities:**
  1. Strolling garden around oak trees
  2. Large open lawn, approximately 0.5 acre
  3. Sidewalk and seating around park perimeter
  4. Art/Educational installation honoring site history
  5. Secondary lawn area
  6. Pathway access to south of site
- **Lighting:** Low light level
- **Maintenance Requirement:** Moderate

Note: Adjacent residential units are required to comply with Section 4.4.3 of the Grove at Shoal Creek Design Guidelines.
IMPLEMENTATION

INITIAL PHASE

Per Exhibit E, Note 11 or the PUD ordinance, “$750 per residential unit shall be provided for parkland improvements.” In addition to that, construction of the concrete surface of the Shoal Creek Trail (trail only, not including lighting, furnishings, landscaping, or amenities) and the wet pond with associated amenities must be constructed and are not credited toward the $750/unit. Together, these elements will constitute the Initial Phase of the project, construction of which will fulfill the developer’s obligations for park construction from the PUD.

Based on the number of units approved in the PUD, the Initial Phase budget will be $1.161 million ($750 x 1,548 units). The developer is obligated to construct only the value of improvements outlined by the PUD ($1.161 million). In no way should the initial phase priorities outlined below be construed to modify that requirement, regardless of whether final construction costs are lower or higher than estimated here.

The Initial Phase was determined as follows:

1. Per Exhibit E, Section IV.D, The Shoal Creek Trail and Wet Pond with associated amenities must be constructed and are not counted toward the Initial Phase Budget. These elements are described under the Core Infrastructure project and are not included in the $1.161 million budget for the Initial Phase.

2. Certain elements are required by Section IV.D of the Parkland Agreement, specifically active recreation equipment and an open lawn area. For this reason, approximately 65% of Project D: The Great Lawns has been included in the Initial Phase to provide turf, surrounding pathways and seating, and lighting for the largest lawn area in the park. Approximately 25% of Project E: Active Zone Improvements has also been included in the Initial Phase to provide for the development of a playground and associated pathways, lighting and seating.

3. For the remaining budget, the highest community priority projects were selected. The top community priority was Project B: Shoal Creek Trail Enhancements. The second highest priority was Project F: Natural Zone Improvements. It is estimated that all of Project B and most or all of Project F may be accommodated within the Initial Phase budget. If actual costs exceed those estimated, this project may be reduced in scope as necessary to match the budget.

4. It is anticipated that the above improvements will utilize the entire Initial Phase budget. If actual construction costs are lower than what is estimated, larger percentages of projects D and/or E should be completed to meet the Initial Phase budget requirement.

FUTURE PHASES

All improvements not included in the Initial Phase are included in Future Phases. These improvements may be constructed in whatever order or priority is desired by those who acquire or dedicate funding to their construction. The developer may elect to construct all or part of these improvements if desired, but is not obligated to do so.
ESTIMATED COST BY PHASE

Estimated costs for each project are provided below. Costs only reflect dollars that are credited toward the Initial Phase Budget and thus do not include the Shoal Creek Trail or the pond and associated amenities. These costs are approximate and may vary based on a number of factors. Actual final costs for any one Project may be significantly lower or higher than the costs estimated here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Phase</th>
<th>$1,161,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Infrastructure</td>
<td>(not included in $1.161 million budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B Shoal Creek Trail Enhancements</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project D - Great Lawns</td>
<td>(approx. 65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project E - Active Hub</td>
<td>(approx. 25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project F - Natural Zone Enhancements</td>
<td>(approx. 50% - 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project G - Passive Park South (trail connection only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project H - Dog Park</td>
<td>(trail connection only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Phase</th>
<th>$2,549,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project D - Great Lawns</td>
<td>(Remaining approx. 35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project E - Active Hub</td>
<td>(Remaining approx. 75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project F - Natural Zone Enhancements</td>
<td>(Remaining, if any)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project A - Gateway Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project C - Casual Play and Fitness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project G - Passive Park South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project H - Dog Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project I - Pocket Park Play Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project J - Pocket Park Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $3,710,000

Note: Inclusion of cost estimates in this plan is not a modification of the Parkland Agreement and does not expand the developer’s obligations thereunder. They are provided for information and planning purposes only. The developer’s obligation in the Parkland Agreement shall remain as set forth therein, notwithstanding any proposed improvements identified herein.
PHASING PLAN

Figure 6-1: The Grove at Shoal Creek - Phasing Plan
LONG TERM MAINTENANCE

Maintenance of the parks at The Grove at Shoal Creek is the responsibility of the Property Owners’ Association. Requirements for this maintenance are spelled out in Exhibit E, Section V of the PUD Ordinance. Approximate annual maintenance costs are estimated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INITIAL PHASE</th>
<th>FUTURE PHASE SIGNATURE PARK</th>
<th>FUTURE PHASE POCKET PARK</th>
<th>TOTAL ANNUAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Tree Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 56,550.00</td>
<td>$ 30,450.00</td>
<td>$ 18,500.00</td>
<td>$ 105,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Inspection and Repair</td>
<td>$ 5,200.00</td>
<td>$ 2,800.00</td>
<td>$ 1,800.00</td>
<td>$ 9,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Service and Supplies</td>
<td>$ 36,000.00</td>
<td>$ 12,000.00</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
<td>$ 57,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Replacement and Decor</td>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
<td>$ 6,500.00</td>
<td>$ 1,750.00</td>
<td>$ 11,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 10,200.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 10,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Utilities</td>
<td>$ 7,800.00</td>
<td>$ 4,200.00</td>
<td>$ 1,200.00</td>
<td>$ 13,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Water</td>
<td>$ 34,450.00</td>
<td>$ 18,550.00</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
<td>$ 63,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Inspections and Repairs</td>
<td>$ 4,800.00</td>
<td>$ 3,200.00</td>
<td>$ 1,500.00</td>
<td>$ 9,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 8,100.00</td>
<td>$ 2,700.00</td>
<td>$ 1,200.00</td>
<td>$ 12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 166,600.00</td>
<td>$ 80,400.00</td>
<td>$ 44,950.00</td>
<td>$ 291,950.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Inclusion of cost estimates in this plan is not a modification of the Parkland Agreement and does not expand the developer’s or HOA’s obligations thereunder. These estimates are provided for information and planning purposes only. The developer’s and HOA’s obligation in the Parkland Agreement shall remain as set forth therein, not withstanding any proposed improvements or maintenance guidelines identified herein.
MAINTENANCE PLAN

Precise maintenance requirements for the park are spelled out in the Parkland Agreement and will not be repeated in detail here. That document defines standards for Level 1 Maintenance in high use areas of the public parks. The map below attempts to anticipate where Level 1 maintenance will be appropriate in the park upon construction of improvements in those areas. This document is intended as a guide only and precise maintenance requirements will be determined in accordance with the Parkland Agreement.

Figure 6-2: Level One Maintenance Plan
The below chart estimates lifespan and approximate replacement costs for major park improvements. Actual lifespan of improvements may vary and should be assessed when needed by a qualified professional. These costs represent additional capital costs, not maintenance items, and are not part of the developer’s or HOA's obligations under the PUD Ordinance and Parkland Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ESTIMATED LIFESPAN</th>
<th>COST AT PRESENT</th>
<th>ESTIMATED INFLATION RATE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST AT FIRST REPLACEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Paving</td>
<td>30 YEAR</td>
<td>$493,500.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$893,906.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation System</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
<td>$235,400.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$349,792.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>17 YEAR</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$294,050.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>50 YEAR</td>
<td>$152,000.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$410,467.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk Decking</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
<td>$21,800.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$32,393.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td>25 YEAR</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$39,913.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decking</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
<td>$128,000.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$190,201.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>40 YEAR</td>
<td>$162,750.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$359,358.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Furnishings</td>
<td>25 YEAR</td>
<td>$228,500.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$374,878.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Fencing</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
<td>$28,600.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$42,498.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park Drainage</td>
<td>10 YEAR</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$80,453.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park Fence</td>
<td>40 YEAR</td>
<td>$26,600.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$58,733.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,567,083.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Parks and Recreation Board

FROM: Charles Mabry, PLA, Park Development Coordinator
Parks and Recreation Department

DATE: February 21, 2019

SUBJECT: Amendments to the Grove at Shoal Creek Public Parks Master Plan

On November 19, 2018, the Grove at Shoal Creek Public Parks Master Plan was presented to the Land, Facilities and Programs Committee and received a recommendation to move forward to the Parks and Recreation Board for consideration for recommendation to the Director for approval of the master plan. Based on public feedback following the Land, Facilities and Programs Committee, the Parks and Recreation Department (PARD) is recommending the following amendments be added to the master plan.

1. PARD will prioritize the development of the off-leash dog park following the initial phase funded by the developer as required by the PUD and public park master plan. PARD will commence with design, permitting and construction of the off-leash area as designated in the master plan when funding becomes available.

2. The southern edge of the Signature Park near the Shoal Creek Trail switchback will be designated as a natural area and be planted with native trees and shrubs to maximize screening from the adjacent homes of the Ridgelea Neighborhood.

3. A note will be added to the master plan that reads: “Trail alignments depicted on the master plan are conceptual in nature and minor adjustments may occur in the final design of the park.”

Should you have any questions, please contact my office at (512) 974-9481.

cc: Sara L. Hensley, CPRP, Director, Parks and Recreation Department
Liana Kallivoka, PhD, PE, Assistant Director, Parks and Recreation Department
Workshop 1: The Grove Public Parks Master Plan
Meeting Summary
March 21, 2017

Introduction:
Charles Mabry, PARD
Marilyn Lamensdorf, PARD

Charles introduced the master planning process for the public parks within the Grove at Shoal Creek. Marilyn updated stakeholders on decisions made during the PUD process and what the roles and responsibilities of PARD and the developer would be moving forward.

Existing Conditions Review:
Caitlin Admire

Caitlin updated stakeholders on site conditions that will have some influence on the outcomes of the master plan such as existing and planned edge conditions, drainage and heritage trees. Members of the public asked for clarification about the pond – what is its purpose, what is driving its size and shape and how does it relate to the overall watershed hydrologic dynamic? The size and design of the pond are determined by engineering considerations. The pond will provide water quality and detention for a large portion of The Grove property including the park and must be designed in compliance with the Environmental Criteria Manual and Drainage Criteria Manual of the City of Austin. Final design will be reviewed and approved by the Watershed Protection Department and will also be reviewed by a third party engineer per the PUD agreement.

Precedent Park Review:
Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek

Rebecca reviewed a number of parks that could be used as inspiration for elements in the Signature Park. Members of the public suggested the designers find less urban parks that will more directly relate to the scale of the commercial around the park. The designers will bring more imagery of parks to the upcoming meetings.

Stakeholder Brainstorm:
Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek

Rebecca asked the stakeholders to work in pairs or tables to identify the biggest needs and desires for the parks in The Grove.

Members of the public asked for a summary of the information the designers collected at previous meetings for the PUD. PARD and the developer expressed that the previously collected information will be considered when developing the master plan, but there was a desire to provide the opportunity for newcomers to the process to have input. Survey results from both the original survey conducted in January of 2015 (regarding the entire development) and a subsequent survey conducted in December of 2015 (regarding the parks in particular) are attached here.

Brainstorm Organization/ Categorization:
Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek

Rebecca asked the stakeholders to work together at their tables to categories their sticky notes into three piles: Goals, Amenities, Program.

Next Steps:
Rebecca Leonard

Rebecca and Charles informed stakeholders about the schedule and next steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Back: Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each table was given an opportunity to state their top goals, top amenities and top programs. A common goal that was heard throughout the evening was an emphasis on nature, whether that be retaining the natural landscape that can be found on this site, incorporating native trees and vegetation into the proposed plan, designing natural playscapes that blend with the existing surroundings, or creating nature and wildlife programs that community members can get involved in. There are various ways in which community members would like to retain the aesthetic qualities of the current site while still showing a desire for amenities and programs that lead to a park that will be inviting to all age groups of the surrounding community. The following is a recap of the most common themes from the tables:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep more natural areas and less hardscape.</td>
<td>Natural, native planting areas.</td>
<td>Farmers market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make this a quiet, natural escape for the users.</td>
<td>Soft trails and bicycle access.</td>
<td>Environmental education classes (i.e. birding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide pedestrian access to the park and natural areas within.</td>
<td>Open lawn</td>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve natural landscape, particularly the trees.</td>
<td>Amenities for off-leash dog usage</td>
<td>Entertainment (music, movies and storytelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for active and passive recreation</td>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a multi-generational park</td>
<td>Children's spray area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders: Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each table was given an opportunity to state their top goals, top amenities and top programs. A common goal that was heard throughout the evening was an emphasis on nature, whether that be retaining the natural landscape that can be found on this site, incorporating native trees and vegetation into the proposed plan, designing natural playscapes that blend with the existing surroundings, or creating nature and wildlife programs that community members can get involved in. There are various ways in which community members would like to retain the aesthetic qualities of the current site while still showing a desire for amenities and programs that lead to a park that will be inviting to all age groups of the surrounding community. The following is a recap of the most common themes from the tables:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep more natural areas and less hardscape.</td>
<td>Natural, native planting areas.</td>
<td>Farmers market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make this a quiet, natural escape for the users.</td>
<td>Soft trails and bicycle access.</td>
<td>Environmental education classes (i.e. birding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide pedestrian access to the park and natural areas within.</td>
<td>Open lawn</td>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve natural landscape, particularly the trees.</td>
<td>Amenities for off-leash dog usage</td>
<td>Entertainment (music, movies and storytelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for active and passive recreation</td>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a multi-generational park</td>
<td>Children's spray area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brainstorm Organization/ Categorization: Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each table was given an opportunity to state their top goals, top amenities and top programs. A common goal that was heard throughout the evening was an emphasis on nature, whether that be retaining the natural landscape that can be found on this site, incorporating native trees and vegetation into the proposed plan, designing natural playscapes that blend with the existing surroundings, or creating nature and wildlife programs that community members can get involved in. There are various ways in which community members would like to retain the aesthetic qualities of the current site while still showing a desire for amenities and programs that lead to a park that will be inviting to all age groups of the surrounding community. The following is a recap of the most common themes from the tables:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep more natural areas and less hardscape.</td>
<td>Natural, native planting areas.</td>
<td>Farmers market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make this a quiet, natural escape for the users.</td>
<td>Soft trails and bicycle access.</td>
<td>Environmental education classes (i.e. birding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide pedestrian access to the park and natural areas within.</td>
<td>Open lawn</td>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve natural landscape, particularly the trees.</td>
<td>Amenities for off-leash dog usage</td>
<td>Entertainment (music, movies and storytelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for active and passive recreation</td>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a multi-generational park</td>
<td>Children's spray area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Workshop 2: The Grove Public Parks Master Plan**  
Meeting Summary  
April 24, 2017

**Introduction:** Charles Mabry, PARD  
Charles introduced the master planning process for The Grove Public Parks Master Plan, updated stakeholders on decisions made during the PUD process and what the roles and responsibilities of PARD and the developer would be moving forward.

**Previous Input Review:** Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek  
Rebecca updated the participants on Workshop 1 results and results from park-focused meetings during the PUD process as requested at the last workshop.

**Finalize Vision and Goals:** Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek  
Rebecca reviewed draft vision and goal statements compiled from prior feedback. Participants were given a worksheet on which they could comment on the vision statement as well as comment on, add to and rank the goal statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goal in Order of Ranked Importance</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>% Rating</th>
<th>% Rating</th>
<th>1 or 2</th>
<th>10 or 11</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1 or 2</th>
<th>10 or 11</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preserve and enhance the natural character and distinct natural features of the site.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Build a critical link and destination in Austin's Shoal Creek Trail system.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create a place that feels open, welcoming and comfortable for all.</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for exploration, escape, and connection with nature.</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for active recreation for all ages and abilities.</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ensure infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate anticipated use.</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Celebrate the site's unique geology and ecology.</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Create a vibrant complimentary interface with the adjacent urban district.</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop programming and amenities that build community.</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Celebrate the site's unique cultural history.</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Goals</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full comments are included after this summary.*

**Next Steps:** Rebecca and Charles informed stakeholders about the schedule and next steps.
Workshop 2: The Grove Public Parks Master Plan
Combined Paper and On-line Poll Results
April 24, 2017

Vision Statement Comments

- It would be good to have a large playground, splash pad, & restrooms. Larger active zone, & an amphitheater would be great.
- Larger than 3 acres for all building areas. Over design to derive space.
- In my city, parks land is for parks, not parking lots. Need a larger park.
- Larger park is needed to create a larger park for the needs of Austin.
- Natural environment is good. Too small. Too small could create a less needed if it is not big enough.
- Love this!
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- It's hard to imagine a park plan that will work for everyone. It's hard to imagine a park plan that will work for everyone.
- Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
- I don't consider this an urban area, just a bit too far north. The second one is good. The third is forced. I don't think this development is a fabric of Austin, it's a new and exciting Austin, but don't try to make it something that is not true.
- Other than residents at the Grove, that will be the connection to the rest of Austin. One of the jewels along the Shoal Creek corridor.
- To say no park land used for parking sounds nice, but the reality is to create a lot of problems, traffic, space, & safety. Not wise.
- Seems like just a snapshot from limited inputs. Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint is good. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Not clear.
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
- I don't consider this an urban area, just a bit too far north. The second one is good. The third is forced. I don't think this development is a fabric of Austin, it's a new and exciting Austin, but don't try to make it something that is not true.
- Other than residents at the Grove, that will be the connection to the rest of Austin. One of the jewels along the Shoal Creek corridor.
- To say no park land used for parking sounds nice, but the reality is to create a lot of problems, traffic, space, & safety. Not wise.
- Seems like just a snapshot from limited inputs. Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint is good. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Not clear.
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
- I don't consider this an urban area, just a bit too far north. The second one is good. The third is forced. I don't think this development is a fabric of Austin, it's a new and exciting Austin, but don't try to make it something that is not true.
- Other than residents at the Grove, that will be the connection to the rest of Austin. One of the jewels along the Shoal Creek corridor.
- To say no park land used for parking sounds nice, but the reality is to create a lot of problems, traffic, space, & safety. Not wise.
- Seems like just a snapshot from limited inputs. Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint is good. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Not clear.
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
- I don't consider this an urban area, just a bit too far north. The second one is good. The third is forced. I don't think this development is a fabric of Austin, it's a new and exciting Austin, but don't try to make it something that is not true.
- Other than residents at the Grove, that will be the connection to the rest of Austin. One of the jewels along the Shoal Creek corridor.
- To say no park land used for parking sounds nice, but the reality is to create a lot of problems, traffic, space, & safety. Not wise.
- Seems like just a snapshot from limited inputs. Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint is good. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Not clear.
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
- I don't consider this an urban area, just a bit too far north. The second one is good. The third is forced. I don't think this development is a fabric of Austin, it's a new and exciting Austin, but don't try to make it something that is not true.
- Other than residents at the Grove, that will be the connection to the rest of Austin. One of the jewels along the Shoal Creek corridor.
- To say no park land used for parking sounds nice, but the reality is to create a lot of problems, traffic, space, & safety. Not wise.
- Seems like just a snapshot from limited inputs. Good luck!
- Natural viewpoint is good. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Not clear.
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Good
- Natural viewpoint would be great. Treehouse with slide sounds like a great idea but could create too much if it is not big enough.
- Very nice!
- Great plan!
Preserve a peaceful place of natural beauty that is undisturbed by development, bikes, restaurant food, trash, concrete and other infrastructure.

Activities that are difficult to duplicate (and difficult to find) like a swimming pool and tennis court would be the best overall improvement to the plan. I do not at all understand the goal of an amphitheatre. All this creates is noise complaints.

Enhance the uniqueness of the neighborhoods.

Preserve the uses of the site that have been in place for many years – walking trails, access by adjacent neighbors, dog friendly.

Recognize historical significance of site.

Additional heritage, protected and non-protected tree preservation.

I would like to see a designated off leash dog park area. When it mentions creating a space for all, to me that includes our four legged friends. When it mentions preserving the natural character, it being a unique and wonderful dog park to a tremendous number of people for many (over 20) years, that’s become a huge part of its character.

Provide dog park with off leash area.

Large lower field for dog park will be very attractive to residents in such a crowded area. Midlevel wildflower field, trees and bushes fenced off for people to view and walk around but not on; will permit some aspects of natural world to continue to exist: fence off before construction begins.

Splash pad!!

The #1 request on the original survey of the surrounding neighborhood was a dog park. Are there designs honoring that request – even if it's created through a retail proposition, similar to the Yard Bar on Burnet Rd?

Other Goals Provided:

- Dog Park
- Dog Park
- Tennis Courts
  - Help mitigate flooding along Shoal Creek.
- Off Leash Dog Park
- Emphasize pedestrian and bicycle safety
- Keep it natural
- Provide a small place for performance art - small amphitheater. The city is severely lacking outdoor community performance spaces. Zilker Hillside is the only one I can think of.
- I did not use this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>% Rating 1 or 2</th>
<th>% Rating 10 or 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preserve and enhance the natural character and distinct natural features of the site</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Build a critical link and destination in Austin’s Shoal Creek Trail system</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create a place that feels open, welcoming and convivial for all</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for exploration, escape, and connection with nature</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for active recreation for all ages and abilities</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ensure infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate anticipated use</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Celebrate the site’s unique geology and ecology</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Create a vibrant and complementary interface with the adjacent urban district</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop programming and amenities that build community</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Celebrate the site’s unique cultural history</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Goals:

- 27% of residents provided “Other” goals. These included requests for dog parks, tennis courts, bike path safety, small amphitheater, community performance spaces, peaceful place of natural beauty, create a park that enhances the uniqueness of the neighborhood, preserve the uses of the current park, recognize historical significance of site, and splash pad.
Signature Park Option A Comments

Key Question is where is splash pad in this option? I recommend this option due to larger amount of open lawn.

Option A Preferred!

Bridge at southern end of property is problem, but it is better than option B

Outdoor Exercise Area?

There is no detail about supportive infrastructure & neighborhood interface.

You need plenty of accessible trails. No need for a bridge at the south end, as you're already connecting into the Ridgelea trail.

Déjà vu: trees that may harm trees vibrancy. Hate that proximity to restaurants means trash and food will be in the park. Bike speed should be limited through this area to make it safe for people and dogs. I wanted to leave blank #9, 10, 11 my point being do not do these at all!

This plan is the better of the two, but there is still so much park lost. The pond takes up too much space. The cul-de-sac at the north end is unnecessary. Why can't Jackson Avenue naturally end in an east-west street rather than have its own large circle drive that creates additional traffic close to the homes on 45th?

Prefer Option A - concentrate recreational amenities near public plaza, focus rest of the site on preserving natural areas, trails.

Southern bridge location feels too close to existing houses on 4100 block of Jefferson. The height of bridge and switchback trail is very close, please keep the existing natural vegetation in that area.

Option A is overbuilt, pushing too close to the creek edges that will be washed away over time.

This does not have enough fun places for kids and families.

More play area.

Signature Park Option B Comments

I like the splash pad - playground would be better if it were bigger.

I think all ages playground/giggle pad should be located on town square. The splash pad would require more concrete & is only used part of the year. There is a really close/underutilized splash pad at Bailey Park walking distance.

If off-leash dog area is provided, it should be fenced.

Seems more fluid

I prefer this option w/ more active zones

Envisioning a heart shaped walking/biking trail on this map.

It could use a larger playground and a public pool as well.

Option B is too busy - needs to be more peaceful, more natural.

Potential problem with active recreation in areas that are environmentally sensitive.

The southern bridge connects to 45xx Jefferson back yards, also work/traffic is very close to tennis courts. Please keep a planting vegetation.

Very overbuilt, few open spaces, more of a commercial area than a park.

This looks fun for all ages.

More play area.

Dog park.
Pocket Park Option A Comments

- Design is OK for all seems community input/refinement is generally limited to items like where the playscape is.
- I recommend this option due to larger open lawn.
- Like the flat open space in NW corner. Prefers seating deck with view over Plan B's active deck. Like Amphitheater.
- These two concepts are so similar that the choices are not significant.
- I don't know the best location for outdoor exercise area.
- No Amphitheater. These two concepts are so similar that the choices are not significant.
- Like the flat open space in NW corner. Prefer seating deck with view over Plan B's active deck. Like Amphitheater.
- Could the pocket park have a couple of tennis courts?
- Outdoor Exercise Area?
- Tennis Courts?
- Much better, I can see this map.
- Needs more seating areas. Needs more access from surrounding areas. It shouldn't look like a private park.
- Terrible location. There could be more seating and a bigger playground.
- Why isn't there room for an off-leash dog area here?
- Include prominent educational memorial to commemorate former state school for blind and deaf.
- These questions don't feel appropriate. The area feels very small & constrained. Make it larger for better score!

Pocket Park Option B Comments

- Don't like less passive use. Like No Amphitheater.
- I prefer this option. I am very concerned about the amount of cars going to and from this area as I live nearby.
- Also needs more seating. Needs more accessibility.
- Maintain existing ecosystems, keep Austin green.
- The most important thing to me is the placement of the playgrounds. They should be sheltered from the street but close to other amenities.
- Not enough.
- The case for no dog park was weak. There is PLENTY of space to include a fenced in dog park. It was the NUMBER ONE thing people wanted.
- The playground could be larger and more seating available.
- Too many roads in Option B.
- Include prominent educational memorial to commemorate former state school for blind and deaf.
- These questions don't feel appropriate. The area feels very small & constrained. Make it larger for better score!

Pocket Park Option B Comments

- I prefer this option. I am very concerned about the amount of cars going to and from this area as I live nearby.
- Also needs more seating. Needs more accessibility.
- Maintain existing ecosystems, keep Austin green.
- The most important thing to me is the placement of the playgrounds. They should be sheltered from the street but close to other amenities.
- Not enough.
- The case for no dog park was weak. There is PLENTY of space to include a fenced in dog park. It was the NUMBER ONE thing people wanted.
- The playground could be larger and more seating available.
- Too many roads in Option B.
- Include prominent educational memorial to commemorate former state school for blind and deaf.
- These questions don't feel appropriate. The area feels very small & constrained. Make it larger for better score!

Pocket Park Option A Comments

- Design is OK for all seems community input/refinement is generally limited to items like where the playscape is.
- I recommend this option due to larger open lawn.
- Like the flat open space in NW corner. Prefers seating deck with view over Plan B's active deck. Like Amphitheater.
- These two concepts are so similar that the choices are not significant.
- Like no lengthy green space & more access to playscape.
- Could the pocket park have a couple of tennis courts?
- Outdoor Exercise Area?
- Tennis Courts?
- Much better, I can see this map.
- Needs more seating areas. Needs more access from surrounding areas. It shouldn't look like a private park.
- Terrible location. There could be more seating and a bigger playground.
- Why isn't there room for an off-leash dog area here?
- Include prominent educational memorial to commemorate former state school for blind and deaf.
- These questions don't feel appropriate. The area feels very small & constrained. Make it larger for better score!
Overall Online Survey - Additional Comments

This park should not just turn into yet another concert venue. Any farmer's markets should not adversely affect surrounding neighbors with noise, traffic, cut through traffic and parking. The park should be kept as natural as possible, but include a combination of soft and hard trails. All parts should be accessible.

It would be good to have bigger playgrounds and a public pool/spalshpad

I hate that the suggestion for soft surfaces on a trail was immediately rejected. Why was the need for an "urban trail" that requires concrete predetermined before input? I believe there cannot be a dog park on site, and even a dog friendly park will be difficult. Between owners and neighbors, there will be too many dogs and not enough land here.

It needs to preserve as much the open space nature of the area.

As I stated in the meeting, it needs to be made clear that existing homes on 45th can maintain access to the park through our back gates, especially if we are to use the Shoal Creek Trail to travel east/west in lieu of a sidewalk in front of our homes. At the meeting, Mr. Oregan said this "could be discussed." Frankly, that's not good enough. Also, as the owner of 2623 W. 45th Street, we are the "ONLY" home on 45th that does not get at least 50' of distance from our property line to the development. The cul-de-sac for Jackson Avenue is closer than 50' to our house, as currently drawn, which in turn pushes the trail closer to our house than it will be for others. The 50' "Northern Greenbelt" needs to consistently run across the northern edge of the project.

Preserve and protect natural areas and heritage trees, concentrate active recreation closer to developed areas in Grove. Thanks.

Prefer a bridge which "collects" users in the center area of the 16 acre park. The southern bridge location on west bank feel overbearing to Ridgelea neighbors. Move it to middle or north with more pedestrians / commuters will be.

The plans are extremely difficult to see on this survey. Had I not attended the meeting I would have no idea what the questions were asking. Another ARG bait and switch.

If a dog park is in the works, but hasn't been communicated yet, please do so. Honoring the #1 request of the surrounding neighborhoods will demonstrate so much good will on your part.

Looking forward to family fun at this new park!!!!!

Please have a splash pad
Workshop 3: The Grove Public Parks Master Plan
Meeting Summary
May 30, 2017

Introduction: Charles Mabry, PARD
Charles introduced the master planning process for The Grove Public Parks Master Plan, updated stakeholders on decisions made during the PUD process and what the roles and responsibilities of PARD and the developer would be moving forward.

Previous Input Review: Rebecca Leonard, AIG Bull Creek
Rebecca updated the participants on Workshop 2 results. Rebecca reviewed a final draft of the vision and goal statements with changes tracked from prior feedback. Although, there was concern that the online poll after Workshop 2 wasn’t kept up long enough, there was general consensus about the changes made to the vision and goal statements.

Parks Plan and Potential Phasing: Robert Deegan, Norris Design
Robert reviewed a revised Vision and Park Plan that depicts the long-term vision. Participants were given a worksheet on which they could read a description of the Core Infrastructure recommendations and the ten recommended projects broken out by geography, amenity type, and logical construction sequencing. The worksheet included cost ranges as well. These costs were simply there to inform participants about the relative scale of each project and may have some bearing on the final phasing of implementation. The worksheet asked participants to state high, medium or low priority for each project.

Questions or Concerns raised at the meeting are as follows:

- Illustrate the row of trees that buffer the edge of the park along the homes on Idlewild Rd.
- How will this park feel open to all?
- Concern with maintenance. Are there examples of public parks maintained by property owner groups?
- Consider playscapes that engage the child’s full brain. Researcher at UT is a national leader in this.
- Confirmation that the wet pond will always have water in it.
- Confirmation that the pond is required.
- There was a desire for a dog park on site. The consensus was a .5 acre or less, fenced dog park in the most appropriate location that can be found.
- Document in the plan that the bridge detailed design will come back to the community.
- What is the timeline for these improvements?

The contents of the worksheet were developed into an on-line poll for people who could not attend the meeting. Full results are included after this summary.

Next Steps: Robert and Charles informed stakeholders about the schedule and next steps.

The Grove at Shoal Creek Park Master Plan

May 30, 2017
Project 1: Gateway Park
The corner pocket park serves as the front porch of the project. It should invite people in while providing a great vantage for relaxing and watching the world pass by.

Survey Responses
The survey was conducted both in person at Public Meeting #3 and online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Person</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 2: Shoal Creek Trail Enhancements
The 12-foot concrete trail is a key part of the site and city’s pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and should be designed as a complete park facility.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 3: Casual Play and Fitness
The northern area of the Signature Park is characterized by low-impact play for all ages, including playgrounds, trails, and fitness equipment, woven into a majestic grove of trees.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 4: The Great Lawns
The upper lawn is a flat, multi-purpose field for a wide range of activities. This is an ideal place for relaxing in the grass, small informal gatherings, and playing catch with friends.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 5: The Active Hub
This area is expected to be the most intensively used part of the park, with a destination adventure playground, a large community deck full of activity, and a shade position overlooking an event lawn.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 6: Pond Enhancements
The wet pond will serve as the centerpiece of the park, a cooling and beautiful water feature that provides wildlife habitat and opportunities to explore and learn.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 7: Natural Zone Enhancements
The natural zone can escape from the surrounding city, an urban refuge. It also provides an important buffer for Shoal Creek and the site’s vernal wetland.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 8: Passive Park South
The southern area of the Signature Park is not as actively programmed, but provides ample unprogrammed lawns, paths, and gardens while also addressing some challenging grade transitions.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 9: Pocket Park Play Zone
The Pocket Park will provide a family play area convenient to the southern portion of the site and surrounding neighborhoods. Shaded by live oaks and a large pavilion, this will be a daily destination for families in and around The Grove.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project 10: Pocket Park Gardens
This portion of the Pocket Park is characterized by shade gardens under existing oaks surrounded by open lawns and populated with paths, small gathering spaces, and a historic marker or monument.

Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The weighted average scores each project by the percentage of respondents giving “High” priority to a project plus half the percentage of respondents giving “Medium” priority to that project.*

*Note: The following responses were included in the online survey only as a response to feedback received from attendees at the public meeting.*

Dog Park Feasibility Study

In the May 30th meeting it was suggested that a fenced approximately 1/2-acre dog park would be appropriate in the Parks.

Due to environmental and other constraints, a fenced dog park is most feasible in the two areas shown on the Dog Park Feasibility Study below.

Do you believe location 1 is appropriate for this use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe location 2 is appropriate for this use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your priority for a fenced dog park in relation to the other enhancements proposed in this survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Comparison w/ Weighted Average

The weighted average scores each project by the percentage of respondents giving “High” priority to a project plus half the percentage of respondents giving “Medium” priority to that project.*

*Percentage of respondents is as all rather than total responses to ensure fair comparison between projects surveyed both in person and online. Projects surveyed and priority scores:

- Project 1: 74%
- Project 2: 63%
- Project 3: 56%
- Project 4: 55%
- Project 5: 54%
- Project 6: 44%
- Project 7: 49%
- Project 8: 46%
- Project 9: 45%
- Project 10: 62%

*Note: The following responses were included in the online survey only as a response to feedback received from attendees at the public meeting.*
Bull Creek Visioning Aggregate Survey Results

Prior Stakeholder Input

2015 and 2016

Bull Creek Visioning Aggregate Survey Results

This survey was conducted as part of the Bull Creek Visioning Study in 2015 and 2016. It was designed to collect input from residents on the characteristics they would like to see for the community on either side of the Creek, as well as their general feelings toward the area.

Survey Methodology

The survey was conducted at two community workshops (January 21st and 28th, 2015) as well as being available online. 216 surveys were collected at the workshops and 488 were taken online, for a total of 704 surveys. The surveys received break down by neighborhood as follows:

- Allandale: 75
- Brykerwoods: 29
- Highland Park West / Balcones: 53
- Oakmont Heights: 94
- Ridgelea: 104
- Westminster: 90
- Rosedale: 172
- Other: 70

Station 1: Residential Character

To what extent are the characteristics of residential development appropriate for this site? This only refers to the developed areas and does not include future open space. Disregard architectural style and materials for this exercise.

Please rate each image on a 1 to 4 scale, based on the following criteria. The type of development shown is:

1. Not appropriate on the site in any situation.
2. Appropriate in Low Density areas of the site.
3. Appropriate in High Density areas of the site.
4. Appropriate in all areas of the site.

**Image 1.1**

Average Score = 2.6

Not Appropriate

Appropriate in Low Density

Appropriate in High Density

Appropriate in all areas of the site.
Image 1.2: Average Score = 2.5

Image 1.3: Average Score = 2.3

Image 1.4: Average Score = 2.1

Image 1.5: Average Score = 1.8
Image 1.6: Average Score = 2.5
Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere

Image 1.7: Average Score = 2.7
Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere

Image 1.8: Average Score = 2.4
Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere

Image 1.9: Average Score = 2.8
Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere
Image 1.10: Average Score = 1.5

Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere

Image 1.11: Average Score = 2.2

Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere

Image 1.12: Average Score = 1.8

Not Appropriate
Appropriate in Low Density
Appropriate in High Density
Appropriate Anywhere
Station 2: Commercial Character

To what extent are the following types of commercial development appropriate for this site? This only refers to the developed areas and does not include future open space. Disregard architectural style and materials for this exercise.

Please rate each image on a 1 to 4 scale, based on the following criteria. The type of development shown is:

1. Not appropriate on the site in any situation.
2. Appropriate in Low Density areas of the site.
3. Appropriate in High Density areas of the site.
4. Appropriate in all areas of the site.

**Image 2.1: Average Score = 2.3**

**Image 2.2: Average Score = 1.4**

**Image 2.3: Average Score = 1.7**
**Image 2.4:** Average Score = 1.2

- Not Appropriate: 5
- Appropriate in Low Density: 9
- Appropriate in High Density: 5
- Appropriate Anywhere: 5

**Image 2.5:** Average Score = 2.3

- Not Appropriate: 48
- Appropriate in Low Density: 25
- Appropriate in High Density: 2
- Appropriate Anywhere: 22

**Image 2.6:** Average Score = 1.4

- Not Appropriate: 14
- Appropriate in Low Density: 37
- Appropriate in High Density: 4
- Appropriate Anywhere: 91

**Image 2.7:** Average Score = 2.9

- Not Appropriate: 192
- Appropriate in Low Density: 178
- Appropriate in High Density: 9
- Appropriate Anywhere: 254
Image 2.8: Average Score = 2.4

Image 2.9: Average Score = 1.5

Image 2.10: Average Score = 1.9

Image 2.11: Average Score = 2.7

Image 2.12: Average Score = 2.9
Section 3: Open Space Character

The following images reflect various characters and types of open space that may be developed or preserved on the site. To what extent should each type of open space be represented on the site? Please rate each image on a 1 to 4 scale, based on the following criteria. The type of open space shown:

1. Should not be present on the site.
2. Should be minimally present on the site.
3. Should be well represented on the site.
4. Should be the majority of open space on the site.

Image 3.1: Average Score = 3.2

Image 2.12: Image with percentage distribution chart.
Image 3.2: Average Score = 2.9

Image 3.3: Average Score = 2.6

Image 3.4: Average Score = 2.6

Image 3.5: Average Score = 2.4
Image 3.6: Average Score = 1.7

Image 3.7: Average Score = 2.1

Image 3.8: Average Score = 3.0

Image 3.9: Average Score = 2.8
Station 4: Park Amenities

What amenities would you like to have available within the public parks and open spaces on this site?

Please list the 5 amenities you would most like to see and list up to 5 amenities that you think would not fit into the site's public parks and open spaces.
### Station 5: Development Density

**Most Appropriate for Higher Density**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Avg. Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Appropriate for Open Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Avg. Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Density Development on this Site

- Accept higher density w/ no traffic issues: 60% (6 out of 10 areas)
- Against higher density: 40% (4 out of 10 areas)

### Disregarding Traffic Issues, Density Development on this Site

- Accept higher density development, if it meant there would be more public open space: 80% (8 out of 10 areas)
- Lower density development, even if it means there would be less public space: 20% (2 out of 10 areas)
Station 6: Additional Questions

Greatest Overall Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Avg. Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Tree Preservation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Traffic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of Land Uses</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance During Construction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wet Pond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image #</th>
<th>Least Desired vs Most Desired</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image #</th>
<th>Least Desired vs Most Desired</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grove at Shoal Creek
Park Design Meeting Survey Results
Meeting Held: 12/12/15

STATION #1 – Park and Amenity Character
**Small Performance Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Map</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Map</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Map</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Map</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other/Write-in Suggestions:**

- Adult Swings (1)
- Bocce Ball (1)
- Basketball (1)
- Bike path connection to Shoal Creek Trail (2)
- Bridge across Shoal Creek (2)
- Overlook @ pond/creek (1)
- Outdoor Art (2)
- Rock Climbing (2)
- Waterfall (1)
- Trail loops (3)
- Greenbelt along Tract E (1)
- More Park/Access (5)
- Bike Parking (1)
- Benches throughout (1)
- Farmer’s Market (2)
- Community Garden (9)
- Wild Food Forest (3)
- WR (2)
- Community Pool (2)
- Art/Culture Center (1)
- Public Restrooms (1)
- Ball Fields, Soccer and Softball (4)
- Splash Pad (1)
- Local Shopping (3)
- Restaurant w/ outdoor seating near playground (1)
- Rain Gardens (1)
- Mini “Rittenhouse Square” (1)
- Wildlife (1)
- Fitness Stations (2)
- Biergarten (1)
- Basketball Court (1)
- Small Water Feature (1)
STATION #3 - Bubble Diagrams

Bubble Diagram Preference

- Diagram 1: 42%
- Diagram 2: 16%
- Neither: 4.2%

Kid's Station

Number of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image #</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Common Notes from Surveys and Maps

- Many people mentioned more park land so that they don’t have to choose between natural and improved – they want both.
- Pretty divided on wanting a natural or improved park, but even those who want more amenities desire elements that are smaller and more natural in character.
- Parking doesn’t seem like a huge priority, bike parking is important though. Instead of providing actual parking just provide a loading/unloading zone.
- Sustainability: drought tolerant, especially in the case of the large lawn area.
- How do we incorporate more green into the development without using more acreage – green roofs, green walls, rain gardens, lots of street trees, etc.
- Trails that are accessible and provide large loops are desired.
- People want shade in their great lawn.
- A desire for choices – large gathering vs intimate conversation, walk in nature vs play ball on the lawn, sun vs shade.
- The idea of interactive/adventure learning for kid’s amenities, playground and splash pad. Do something different and innovative.
- Can we make the creek area more usable? Many people mentioned that they often just go down in there and poke around with their kids, would love to continue doing that but maybe get it cleaned up a little bit and provide stairs for easier access down the embankment.
- Public art comes up a lot, specifically interactive.
- Safety is a concern – lighting and separation of peds/bikes/cars.