MEETING #3
Design Advisory Committee
May 1, 2012
5:30-7:30pm
Saint Paul Parks and Recreation
AGENDA

- Welcome & Update
- Meeting Goal
- Review Survey Results
- Project Approach:
  Phased Buildout and Goals for each Phase
- Discussion
MEETING 1 & 2: RE - CAP

Meeting 1: Background and Site boundary discussion
Meeting 2: Review of existing conditions related to population and context, and discussion of placemaking goals.
MEETING 3 GOAL

Review on-line survey results, establish design goals, determine preferred activities, and outline a phased approach to the park construction.

Project Goal:
This project will develop a master plan and cost estimate for the phased development of critical parcels for a new downtown park within the block bounded by 10th, Robert, 9th and Minnesota Streets.
SURVEY RESULTS: who took the survey?

• How was survey distributed?
  - Email to task force members
  - Email to Building Managers to send to building residents
  - Email sent by St. Paul Chamber of Commerce to downtown St. Paul area
  - Email sent by BOMA
  - Facebook update and Twitter feed from Parks & Recreation
  - Hardcopy surveys mailed and dropped off (29 completed)
  - Postcards – mailed to residents
  - Postcards at neighborhood businesses to distribute

• 883 individuals took the survey
Question 1: Do you work or live in downtown St. Paul?

The majority of survey participants (479) were non-residents who work in downtown St. Paul.

Residents (358) were also well-represented in the survey, nearly half of whom also work in downtown St. Paul.
Question 2: Approximately how far do you LIVE from the Pedro Park site?

- 59% (503) Outside of downtown Saint Paul
- 19% (168) Adjacent to the park
- 7% (61) Within one block
- 8% (71) Within four blocks

Question 3: Approximately how far do you WORK from the Pedro Park site?

- 28.7% (229) Within four blocks
- 23.3% (200) Outside of downtown Saint Paul
- 13.4% (115) In downtown Saint Paul, but further than four blocks
- 7.9% (68) Adjacent to the park

The majority of survey participants work or live within four blocks of the park site.
Question 11: Which category best represents your age group?

The age categories of 30-39, 40-49, and 50-59 were best represented in the survey.

93% response rate
Question 4: In your opinion, what is the style of the park that you would like to see based on the images and the descriptions?

1. Traditional –
   Like Rice Park (symmetrical, historic elements, planting design is linear and formal)

2. Contemporary –
   Like Landmark Plaza (geometric, simple unadorned materials, vegetation is controlled and contained)

3. Natural –
   Like the stream in Mears Park (organic, circular, natural materials informally placed, vegetation replicates a natural setting)

4. Recreational –
   (an emphasis on fields and courts to accommodate active recreation)
Question 4: In your opinion, what is the style of the park that you would like to see based on the images and the descriptions?

Overall, most people thought a “Natural” style is most appropriate.
Question 4: What is the style of park that you would like to see?

- Traditional
  - Like Rice Park (symmetrical, geometric elements, planting design is linear and formal)
  - Rating: 2.24

- Contemporary
  - Like Landmark Plaza (geometric, simple unadorned materials, vegetation is controlled and contained)
  - Rating: 1.27

- Natural
  - Like Mears Park (organic, circular, natural materials informally placed, vegetation replicates a natural setting)
  - Rating: 2.53

- Recreational
  - An emphasis on fields and courts to accommodate active recreation
  - Rating: 0.63

**Rating Responses**
(Appropriate = 3, Moderately appropriate = 2, Not appropriate = -1)

**Survey Results:**
Preferred style - responses

- Traditonal: 2.24
- Contemporary: 1.27
- Natural: 2.53
- Recreational: 0.63

+ 64 comments
Question 5: What are the activities that you would like to see?

Passive recreation and gathering spaces for socializing or community events are most desired.
Question 5: What are the activities the park should accommodate (all responses)?

Survey participants recognized that the community would benefit from play areas, dog walking, and active recreation.
Question 5: What are the activities the park should accommodate?

Overall, preferences for the top three activities followed the same trend between residents and non-residents by preferring passive recreation, socializing, and gathering space. There is a slight difference in the rating of dog walking, recreation, and play areas.
Question 6: What are the elements that the park should accommodate?

- Seating Areas: Really want to add (2)
- Shade structure: Nice to have but not needed (1)
- Ornamental Plantings: Do not need at all (-1)
- Water Element to look at (Fountain): Really want to add (2)
- Bike Parking: Nice to have but not needed (1)
- Gazebo/Shade Structure/Conservatory: Do not need at all (-1)
- Outdoor Performance Space: Really want to add (2)
- Community garden (vegetables/flowers): Nice to have but not needed (1)
- Play Features: Do not need at all (-1)
- Water element to interact with: Really want to add (2)
- Dog Run: Nice to have but not needed (1)
- Basketball Court: Do not need at all (-1)
- Tennis Court: Really want to add (2)
Question 6: What are the elements that the park should accommodate?

Seating areas, a shade structure, ornamental plantings & water features are preferred elements for the park.

+ 40 comments
Question 6: What are the \textbf{elements} that the park should accommodate?

The trend in preferences were similar, though residents rated performance space, gardening and inclusion of a dog run higher than non-residents.
Question 7: What are the types of plantings do you prefer?

Shade Trees, Gardens with Flowers and Lawn Area are most preferred.

Percentage of responses from 826 survey participants.
Question 8: Does the proximity of the future development of the LRT station at 10th and Cedar and the Penfield/Lunds development influence the design of the park?

Both developments will bring potential park users to the neighborhood and will be considered in the park design.

+ 54 comments
Most comments related to the style of landscaping, the desire for seating, performance space, and to create a kid – friendly park.

+ 556 comments from all questions
Survey Summary:

-The survey response reached a significant number of residential and working community members who represent potential users of the Pedro Park site.

-The preferred style of the park is a ‘natural’ style defined as organic/circular form, natural materials, and vegetation replicating a natural setting. A ‘traditional’ style is also valued.

-The preferred activities and elements lend itself to a “Passive Park” to accommodate gathering spaces, seating for individuals or small groups in a family friendly setting.

-Attractions to the park might also include ornamental plantings, a performance area, a shade structure or gazebo, a dog area, and a water fountain.
Where do we go from here?
Current Site Conditions: Land Ownership

- The block is divided into seven parcels owned by three different entities in addition to the city.

- The Pedro family donated the parcel in the northern corner of the site.

- The donated parcel will be used for construction staging for the Penfield/Lunds development site until fall 2014 (approx.).

- The city is considering where the police operations building might be relocated.

- Funding for future land acquisition has not been secured.
Size and Scale of Pedro Park (per review at 1st Task Force meeting):

Option A: City Parcels
Option B: Half Block
Option C: L-Shaped
Option D: Full Block
Proposed buildout of Pedro Park:

Temporary: Pocket Park  
Short Term: City Parcels  
Mid Term: Extension  
Long Term: U-shaped
Buildout: Phase 1

Temporary: Pocket Park
Details: .45 acres

GOALS FOR PHASE 1:
- Create a useable area for the neighborhood.
  > Remove Fence
  > Fill site to sidewalk grade
  > Incorporate seating and tables
  > Add greenery: lawn, trees, planters
  > Include space for temporary art installation
  > Designate a small dog area
- Construct a community space that is a relatively low-cost investment yet will set the stage for creating a community gathering area.
- Complete in coordination with Penfield/Lunds opening.
Short Term: City Parcels
Details: .85 acres

GOALS FOR PHASE 2:

- Expand “pocket park” on City owned land to create a community gathering area with permanent tables and seating for small gatherings.

- Include a multiuse element such as a gazebo or shade structure for gatherings and performance.

- Add plantings and streetscape on 10th street that relates to the Penfield site.
Mid-Term: City Parcels with Extension
Details: 1 acre

GOALS FOR PHASE 3:
- Accommodate pedestrian movement through the park to connect from the Park walk (9th and Robert) to 10th and Cedar (LRT station)
  > Bridge over parking area to address grade change
  > Extend park so it has a continuous front along Robert St
- Eliminate major grade change at 10th and Minnesota corner to allow better flow through the site.
- Consider alley vacation to create a transition towards the Union Gospel Childcare Center
- Add streetscape plantings along Robert St
Buildout: Phase 4

**Long-term: U-Shape**
Details: 2.0 acres

**GOALS FOR PHASE 4:**

- Add fill at 10th and Minnesota so that site is level with sidewalk elevation
- Design a family-friendly greenspace with artful elements that encourage play, community interaction, and accommodates small performances
- Add seating, a water element, native plant gardens, with a ‘natural aesthetic’, and designated dog area
- Create important pedestrian connections
- Find alternative parking options for Childcare Center and Naomi.
- Improve streetscape plantings along Minnesota and 9th street
Discussion

1. Survey results: Comments, questions, reactions, clarifications

2. Moving forward: Response to phasing approach goals and objectives
Moving Forward….

Next Meeting: Mid or Late Summer 2012
Review of conceptual plans for park design