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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
PURPOSE OF PLAN

The City of Plano has long been a leader in parks and recreation. Thirty years ago, a visionary City Council and Park Board had the foresight to preserve land for parks adjacent to schools and along creeks. This resulted in a strong parks and recreation system that is accessible to residents and that is often used as a model for other communities. Since most of the parks were developed over thirty years ago, much of the park infrastructure is aging and in need of replacement. Additionally, as Plano’s population has grown, there is a need for additional parkland to meet the needs of existing residents.

Parks and Recreation in Plano must respond to these new realities to ensure that Plano maintains its quality of excellence through a park system that serves the needs of the community today and in the future. Thus, the purpose of this Master Plan is to take an objective look at parks, recreation, trails, and open space in Plano and position the city in such a way that future generations will want to continue to live, work, and play in Plano even as competition in the DFW Metroplex continues to increase.

While the Parks and Recreation Master Plan makes general suggestions for future improvements to Parks and Recreation facilities, the development and renovation of specific parks is made through a cooperative process with residents. Park Planning staff conduct community outreach meetings, surveys, and design charrettes for each improvement project to ensure the completed park responds to community needs. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan functions as the Department’s long-term action plan, providing guidance to the department, establishing goals and recommendations, and identifying needs related to both existing and future facilities. While Section 7 discusses past sources of funding, and provides suggestions for other opportunities, the Master Plan is not a funding document. All park land acquisitions and improvements are funded through voter-approved bond authority initiatives and the City’s annual budget process, with City Council approval.
KEY COMPONENTS ADDRESSED BY PLAN:

COMPLETING THE PARKS SYSTEM

There are approximately 500 acres of undeveloped parkland within the City. This master plan document includes priorities for developing these parks as well as identifies areas of need for strategic land acquisition to help meet the needs of Plano’s growing population.

ADDRESSING AGING INFRASTRUCTURE

Just like roadways and utilities, parks and recreation facilities include infrastructure that needs to be replaced over time. Playgrounds, pavilions, and athletic fields are just some of the infrastructure that are aging in parks that need to be replaced. This master plan document identifies updated amenities that reflect parks and recreation trends that can be incorporated into parks when they are renovated.

MEETING PARKLAND NEEDS

Plano has experienced tremendous growth with the continued concentration of corporate headquarters and establishment of successful commercial centers. This has brought additional residents to the city, which translates into need for additional parkland. This master plan document assesses the parkland level of service and identifies strategies for incorporating parks and open space with limited land available.

MAINTAINING QUALITY OF EXCELLENCE

As evidenced by the City’s tagline – City of Excellence – Plano takes pride in providing quality services and programs. This master plan document is based on the vision to provide excellent parks, recreation facilities, trails, and open space and the recommendations reflect strategies to enhance the system.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTEXT

Plano is nearing build-out, meaning that there is a lack of available, affordable land for the City to acquire and develop into parkland. Therefore, the focus of this plan is on improving existing parks rather than significant land acquisition. Additionally, the continued concentration of corporate headquarters taking shape within the northwest quadrant, development of successful mixed-use centers, extension of DART rail service, redevelopment of areas throughout the City, and shifting demographics are all major contributors to growth and change within the city. This growth was addressed in the Plano Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2015, which serves as a long-range guide for future growth, priorities, services, development, and redevelopment in the city. This Master Plan is aligned with the overall vision, policies, and actions of the Comprehensive Plan.

Furthermore, parks and recreation facilities bring extensive economic value to Plano. In 2017, the Trust for Public Land studied the economic benefits that the park and recreation system generates in Plano. The study found that parks in Plano raise the market value of nearby homes by nearly $337 million annually. Sports and tournament-related tourism generates $39.2 million annually in direct visitor spending. Finally, exercise at these facilities yields an annual medical cost savings of $21.2 million. Therefore, investing in parks and recreation in Plano yields tangible economic and health benefits to individuals and the overall community.
PLAN VISION AND GOALS

A robust citizen and stakeholder engagement process was initiated to seek input on what the future of parks, recreation, trails, and open space should look like in Plano. 3,210 residents responded to an online survey and over TBD people attended public open house meetings during the plan development process. The resulting plan vision and goals are representative of the input heard throughout the engagement process.

VISION

Complete the Parks and Recreation system by anticipating future needs and providing excellent parks, recreation facilities, trails and open space.

GOAL: Encourage healthy lifestyles by providing an appropriate mix of facilities and range of activities throughout the city.

GOAL: Renovate and modernize park infrastructure so that they offer similar elements across the city but are unique to the surrounding area.

GOAL: Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the growing diversity of the city and allow for social interaction.

GOAL: Maintain high standards for planning, implementing, maintaining, and operating quality parks and recreation facilities.

GOAL: Expand upon trail and bikeway linkages between parks, schools, commercial areas, and other cities.

GOAL: Expand communications and outreach to encourage residents to use facilities and participate in activities.

GOAL: Create exciting and inviting park spaces in special area parks.

GOAL: Utilize environmentally and fiscally sustainable practices for developing and maintaining parks, trails, and facilities.

GOAL: Ensure long-term financial stability of the city’s park and recreation facilities.

GOAL: Maintain and promote high standards for athletic facilities.

GOAL: Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the growing diversity of the city and allow for social interaction.
EXISTING SYSTEM SNAPSHOT

The total size of the Plano park system is 4,370 acres, which includes undeveloped park sites. This accounts for approximately 9.4% of Plano’s total city limits. The system is made up of a variety of park and facility types:

**Neighborhood Parks:**
Plano currently has 31 neighborhood parks, which are generally 7 to 10 acres in size and serve surrounding residents within a ½ mile radius. Typical amenities include playgrounds, picnic tables, pavilions, walking paths, and open areas for free play.

**Community Parks:**
Plano currently has 19 developed community parks, which are generally at least 25 acres in size and serve surrounding residents within a 1 mile radius. Both passive and active recreation elements are found in community parks. Of the existing community parks, 15 are designated as athletic complexes featuring baseball, softball, soccer, and other sports.

**Linear Parks:**
Plano currently has 16 linear parks, which are narrow stretches of green spaces that link residential areas, schools, public facilities, and other parks. Amenities typically include trails and related amenities.

**Special Use Facilities:**
Plano has 9 special use facilities, which are parks that serve a specific, unique purpose such as memorials and cemeteries.

**Open Space Preserves:**
Plano has 3 existing open space preserves which provide passive recreation opportunities and also preserve environmentally-sensitive areas. Amenities include trails and nature viewing areas.

**Golf Courses:**
Plano has two municipal golf courses each with 18 holes. Pecan Hollow is located in the southeastern corner of Plano and Ridgeview Ranch is in the northernmost part of the City.

**Recreation and Aquatic Facilities:**
There are twelve recreation and aquatic facilities within the city. This includes recreation centers, aquatic centers, and golf courses, as well as the tennis center, nature center, and senior center.

**Trails and Bikeways:**
There are 81 miles of paved trails, 15 miles of soft-surface trails, and 150 miles of signed bike routes within the City.

Plano currently has 14.08 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. With the expected population growth, by 2040 the parkland level of service will be 14.57 acres per 1,000 residents. According to the needs assessment, by the year 2040, the City will need to acquire 27 acres of neighborhood parkland to meet established parkland level of service targets. Given that the City is primarily built-out, acquiring this amount of acreage is likely not possible. Therefore, the recommendations focus on enhancing amenities at existing parks and developing strategies to incorporate green space in alternative ways.
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

RENOVATE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

In order to maintain the quality of excellence that Plano residents expect, neighborhood parks should be renovated with new infrastructure and updated amenities that are unique to the setting. Recommended strategies for neighborhood parks include:

• Incorporate bright colors
• Install unique playgrounds that can be customized to individual parks in Plano
• Replace aging pavilions with ones that are updated and architecturally interesting
• Incorporate updated park signage
• Utilize native landscaping
• Include space for practice fields that serve nearby teams for drop-in practices
• Incorporate flexible space for a growing variety of play
• Fix any ADA accessibility issues
DEVELOP AND ENHANCE COMMUNITY PARKS

In order for Plano’s park system to lead on a regional and even state-wide level, community parks should continue to be developed and also enhanced to make them stand out as recreation destinations. The three opportunity typologies identified for community parks in this Master Plan are social, environmental, and active nodes.

Recommended strategies for social nodes in community parks include:
- Make more parks Wi-Fi enabled
- Create a safe, legal space for remote control drone users
- Incorporate consistently themed wayfinding signag
- Add a splash pad in community parks in each major sector of the City
- Replace and update restrooms and gathering spaces

Recommended strategies for environmental nodes in community parks include:
- Encourage outdoor learning with outdoor classrooms
- Add interpretative signage that explains unique features of parks
- Incorporate nature viewing areas
- Connect neighborhoods to the nature preserves via trails
- Add unique trail markers along trails within the nature preserves

Recommended strategies for active nodes in community parks include:
- Continue philosophy of providing multi-purpose field at athletic complexes
- Maintain flexibility in programming field space as trends evolve
- Develop practice only spaces that are reservable
- Be strategic in placing goal posts in practice field areas so multiple games can occur at once
- Consider placement of artificial turf field in each quadrant of the City
- Create a stronger partnership with Plano ISD for shared-use of fields
- Continue to coordinate with surrounding cities to project field needs in the future
- Seek partnerships with corporations for shared-use of private field

CREATE SPECIAL AREA PARKS

Two areas in Plano have experienced extensive development but do not have enough parkland to serve the growing population. These two areas are Downtown Plano and the Northwest Legacy area. For these study areas defined in this Master Plan, parks and open space should be strategically located and programmed to serve a diverse range of citizens, while recognizing that land is limited for park development. Recommended strategies for creating special area parks include:
- Work with other departments and developers to implement streetscape features to ‘green’ the street where land acquisition is not feasible
- Acquire small pockets of vacant or underutilized land to increase parkland access
- Work with developers to implement publicly accessible parks, open space, and trails within areas of the city that are undergoing redevelopment or significant new development
- Partner with corporations to carve out publicly accessible green space on corporate campuses
- Acquire land to serve as unique special area parks in areas of high park needs
RENEW RECREATION FACILITIES

To further enhance recreation facilities and programming in Plano, the focus should be on looking for opportunities to renew facilities and programs to serve evolving needs. Recommended strategies for renewing recreation facilities include:

- Address near-term demand for adult court space by providing a minimum of six additional indoor courts
- Address near-term demand for additional pool lap lanes
- Incorporate a permanent space for adaptive recreation
- Further define and address senior programming needs
- Explore additional opportunities for senior programming at the existing Senior Center as well as the existing recreation centers
- Incorporate programs and facility spaces that respond to emerging recreation trends
- Evaluate the recreational needs of existing and future residents in the downtown area and determine what the City’s role should be in meeting those recreation needs
- Conduct a study to determine if recreation needs of residents in the northwest sector of the City are currently being met

CONNECT TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS

As more people want to utilize trail and bikeway facilities for both commuting and recreation, additional opportunities for connectivity should be assessed to accommodate growing demand. Recommended strategies for connecting trails and bikeways include:

- Complete the design and construction of trails in accordance with the Bicycle Transportation Plan Map
- Determine feasibility of proposed expansions to the trail and bikeway network
- Implement safety treatments at major thoroughfare crossings
- Review on-street signed bike routes
- Implement aesthetic improvements to trails in utility easements
- Capitalize on robust trail network tourism opportunities
- Continue to review local trail standards
- Address ADA accessibility of existing trails
- Conduct trails and bikeways master plan
- Revise trail design standards
TOP PRIORITY ITEMS

The following list represents action items to be pursued in the first 1-5 years of the plan.

LAND ACQUISITION

- Acquire land in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map to provide additional park and open space, particularly in the Downtown Area and the Northwest Legacy Area.

POLICY ACTIONS

- Park Fee Ordinance Revision
- Interdepartmental Collaboration
- Review Standards for Sidewalks and Trail Widths
- Review Open Space Requirements

MASTER PLANS/STUDIES

- Senior Recreation Need Study
- Trail and Bikeway Master Plan
- Individual Park Master Plans

PARK DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

- Existing Neighborhood Park Infrastructure Improvements
- Existing Community Park Infrastructure Improvements
- Rowlett Creek Greenbelt Park Development
- K Avenue Streetscape Improvements
- Headquarters Drive Streetscape Improvements
- Maintenance Facility Construction
- Windhaven Meadows Park Development

RECREATION FACILITIES

- Existing Recreation Facility Improvements
- Harry Rowlinson Natatorium Improvements

TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS

- Trail Construction – design and construct 3 miles of trail per year
- Thoroughfare crossing safety improvements
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

The City of Plano has long been recognized as a thought leader and trend setter in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex and beyond. Measuring 71.6 square miles, the City offers diverse housing, schools, employment, and entertainment options, as well as a rich, quality park system. From Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve in the east to Arbor Hills on the western border, the City offers a robust and unique mix of parks, recreation, and open space for residents of all ages to enjoy.

Many of the parks within Plano that are enjoyed today are the result of a visionary Council and Park Board more than 30 years ago which foresaw the importance of setting aside land next to schools for parks. Primarily located within neighborhoods, these parks are now easily accessible and provide much needed open space and play areas for surrounding residents. These “neighborhood parks” are prevalent throughout the city, but represent only one category of Plano’s overall park system. Larger community parks, linear parks, trail corridors, sports complexes, open space preserves, and recreation centers all contribute to the complete system and are the result of anticipating future needs.
MASTER PLAN PURPOSE

The first Parks Master Plan for Plano was completed in 1972, with periodic updates in the years that followed. The last major update was completed in 1986 and the last minor update was in 2014. The creators of the 1970’s plan embarked on a journey to propel their park system to the future. Forward-thinking advocates for the preservation and protection of creeks, streams, and greenbelts elevated Plano to one of the greatest parks system in Texas and the parks have long been used as a model for other communities.

In the last 15 years, Plano has seen tremendous growth and changes that will significantly alter the City for the foreseeable future. The continued concentration of corporate headquarters taking shape within the northwest quadrant, development of successful mixed-use centers, extension of DART rail service, redevelopment of areas throughout the City, and shifting demographics are all major contributors to this change.

As more residents move to the city, there is a need to provide additional parkland in areas that are now residential. However, as the City approaches build-out, there is limited land available for additional park development. Additionally, many parks have aging infrastructure and amenities that need to be updated to maintain the quality of excellence that Plano leaders and citizens expect.
Parks and recreation must respond to these new realities to ensure that Plano continues to have a high-quality parks system that serves the needs of the community today and in the future. Thus, the purpose of this Master Plan is to take an objective look at parks, recreation, trails, and open space in Plano and position the City in such a way that future generations will want to continue to live, work, and play in Plano even as competition in the DFW Metroplex continues to increase.
MASTER PLAN CONCEPT

The overall vision for this Master Plan is to complete the Parks and Recreation system by anticipating future needs and providing excellent parks, recreation facilities, trails and open space. The major components to realize this vision are to:

- **Renovate** NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
- **Develop & Enhance** COMMUNITY PARKS
- **Create** SPECIAL AREA PARKS
- **Renew** RECREATION FACILITIES
- **Connect** TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS

### NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

**Renovate**

Plano’s neighborhood parks are fantastic amenities for its citizens with good access and often close proximity to schools. However, many parks have aging infrastructure and are indistinguishable from one another. In order to maintain the quality of excellence that Plano residents expect, neighborhood parks should be renovated with new infrastructure and updated amenities. **When planning for neighborhood parks the City should consider updated amenities and unique elements to distinguish parks from one another.**

### COMMUNITY PARKS

**Develop & Enhance**

Community parks in Plano are extremely popular and there is additional demand for sports complexes and open space preserves. In order for Plano’s park system to lead on a regional and even state-wide level, community parks should continue to be developed and also enhanced to make them stand out as recreation destinations. The three opportunity typologies identified for community parks in this Master Plan are social, environmental, and active nodes. **When planning for community parks the City should consider embracing social, environmental, and active elements.**
CREATE SPECIAL AREA PARKS

Two areas in Plano have experienced extensive development but do not have enough parkland to serve the growing population. For the special area park study areas defined in this Master Plan, parks and open space should be strategically located and programmed to serve a diverse range of citizens. When planning for special area parks, the City should consider new strategies to integrate parks and open space that are not traditional neighborhood and community parks.

RENEW RECREATION FACILITIES

Plano has a comprehensive system of recreation and aquatics facilities, many of which have been recently updated in the past decade. In addition to top-notch facilities, the city has diverse recreation programming at many of their facilities. To further enhance recreation in Plano, the focus should be on looking for opportunities to renew facilities and programs to serve evolving needs. When planning for these facilities the city should consider the growing senior population and diverse needs.

CONNECT TRAILS & BIKEWAYS

The city has an extensive network of shared use paths and on-street bike routes which enhances overall quality of life in Plano. However, as more people want to utilize trail and bikeway facilities, additional opportunities for connectivity should be assessed to accommodate growing demand. This Master Plan identifies additional connections that could be made throughout the city and sets standards for trail design. When planning for additional trails and bikeways, connectivity to the existing system should be the priority.
PLANNING PROCESS

Plano is a large, complex city with countless variables that shape what we see today. Thus, the development of the Master Plan was a collaborative effort guided by many different entities including interdepartmental city input, focus groups, business owners, city staff, city leaders, and the citizens of Plano.

The following steps were used to develop the Master Plan:
Additionally, this Master Plan is composed of seven chapters that describe each step of the planning process.

**CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**  
Defines purpose of Master Plan and describes the planning process.

**CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY CONTEXT**  
Analyzes factors that influence the parks and recreation system such as natural resources, demographics, lifestyle trends, and other planning efforts.

**CHAPTER 3: VISION**  
Reviews public and stakeholder input received throughout the plan process and establishes goals for the Master Plan.

**CHAPTER 4: PARKS, ATHLETICS, AND OPEN SPACE**  
Assesses the existing park system, determines needs for future parks and open space, and identifies strategies to renovate neighbor od parks, develop and enhance community parks, and create special area parks.

**CHAPTER 5: RECREATION FACILITIES**  
Analyzes recreation needs in Plano and makes recommendations for improvements to existing facilities and potential new facilities.

**CHAPTER 6: TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS**  
Reviews the existing trail and bikeway system and identifies corridors for further evaluation for additional trail and bikeway connectivity.

**CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION**  
Includes an implementation action plan that outlines specific actions, priorities, and responsible entities to achieve the plan vision and recommendations.

**APPENDICES**  
Includes an assessment and recommendations for ten parks and the recreation facilities as well as survey results.
TPWD COMPLIANCE AND CAPRA ACCREDITATION COMPONENTS

This Master Plan was developed to be consistent with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department’s (TPWD) eligibility requirements for Outdoor Recreation grants as well as the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) requirements for accreditation for excellence in operation and service. This section describes where the required elements for both TPWD and CAPRA are found in this Master Plan document.

TPWD Compliance: In order to be eligible for TPWD funding, the agency requires that a municipality submit an updated park master plan every five years and a completely new plan every ten years. Minimum requirements for the plan include:

- Summary of accomplishments since previous plan (see Previous Master Plan section in Chapter 2)
- New, pertinent public input (see Public Input section in Chapter 3)
- Inventory data (see Parks Inventory section in Chapter 4)
- Updated needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4, 5, and 6)
- Priorities (see High Priority Needs List section in Chapter 7)
- Implementation plan (see Chapter 7)
- Demographics (see Demographics section in Chapter 2)
- Goals and objectives (see Goals and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Standards (see Recommendations section in Chapters 4-6)
- Maps (see Figures 4.20 and 6.2 for recommendation maps)
CAPRA Accreditation: This recognition sets parks and recreation agencies apart for excellence in operation and service. Plano has been accredited through CAPRA since 1994 and is up for reaccreditation in 2019. The Parks Master Plan is one required element of the accreditation process and plans must include the following items:

- Agency mission and objectives (see Department Mission and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Recreation and leisure trends analysis (see Trends and Lifestyle Benchmarking section in Chapter 2)
- Needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4, 5, and 6)
- Community inventory (see Natural & Cultural Resources, Physical Development, and Demographics sections in Chapter 2)
- Level of service standards (see Needs Assessment section in Chapter 4)
PLANNING AREA

At 71.6 square miles, Plano is a large city located about 20 miles north of downtown Dallas. The City is located primarily in Collin County but also reaches into Denton County and is landlocked by other communities on all sides. Major highways include US 75 running through the eastern part of the City, President George Bush Turnpike on the southern boundary, Dallas North Tollway on the western side, and the Sam Rayburn Tollway forming most of the northern city border.

Plano is the fourth largest city in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, a region that has experienced tremendous growth in recent decades. That population growth is expected to continue; from 2017 to 2040, the region is expected to grow by 48%. Plano has also seen a large increase in the number of people working in the City in recent years. As part of this master plan, two areas in the City that have experienced increased development and concentration of corporate headquarters were analyzed in more depth to develop recommendations to integrate parks and open space. These two areas are Downtown Plano and the Northwest Legacy area and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.
CITY HISTORY

Plano is a city rich in history; the downtown was recently designated as a Downtown Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places. The first known settler in Plano was McBain Jameson who settled in the area in 1840. John Haggard, whose family still owns large tracts of land in the City today, followed close behind, settling in the area in 1856. In 1873 Plano was officially incorporated and businesses, schools, and churches began to be established. The Haggard family in 1925 made a sizable donation to the Plano Lions Club to construct a park in the downtown area, which was named after the donor when the park was dedicated in 1928. 30 years later, in 1958, the construction of North Central Expressway through Plano was completed which is considered to be a major factor contributing to the City’s growth, and as early as 1960 Plano was the fastest-growing city in Collin County.

Since the 1960s, growth in Plano skyrocketed – more and more residential subdivisions were built, major employers constructed headquarters in Plano, and the population boomed. This growth required massive investment from the community through bonds and other sources to construct schools, infrastructure, and quality of life elements such as parks to keep up with the demand. In 1980, Electronic Data Systems (EDS) announced that the company was moving their headquarters to Plano; this ushered in many corporate campuses in the succeeding decades as Plano was, and still is today, viewed as a business-friendly community.
Major public transportation came to Plano in 1985 through DART, and represented the first suburban service in the regional system. Today, the DART light rail serves downtown Plano and goes as far north as Parker Road; there are also bus routes and several bus transfer stations throughout the City. When new residential and commercial development was approved around the downtown station in the late 1990’s a new resurgence of downtown began, leading to the distinct area we see today.

Accolades that the City has received relevant to parks and recreation include:

- **CAPRA National Charter Accreditation:**

- **NRPA National Gold Medal Award:**

- **TRAPS Arts and Humanities Award:**
  - 2015

- **TRAPS Gold Medal Award Winner:**

- **NRPA National Gold Medal Finalist:**
  - 2012, 2013

- **NRPA Excellence in Aquatics Award:**
  - 1996, 2004

- **Tree City USA Designation:**
  - 1989 to Present

- **TRAPS Administration-Management Award:**
  - 1990

- **TRAPS Maintenance Award:**
  - 1988
NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Plano bears its name from the flat plains that exist in the City, however, more undulating topography can be found at Arbor Hills Nature Preserve in the western part of the City. Additionally, almost the entire eastern border of Plano is parkland or open space, creating a scenic greenbelt for natural relief. The centerpiece of this eastern greenbelt is Rowlett Creek which eventually ends at Lake Ray Hubbard. Additional natural and channelized streams exist in Plano, including: Brown Branch; Bowman Branch; Russell Creek; Watters Creek; Spring Creek; Pittman Creek; White Rock Creek; and, Indian Creek. The City had the foresight to develop trails along many of these creeks and preserved them as open space.

In addition to natural resources, there are also significant cultural resources within the City. There are four sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, including: Plano Downtown Historic District; the Plano Station/Texas Electric Railway; the Ammie Wilson House; and, the Saigling House. Additionally, there are seven sites that are designated as Historic Landmarks and an additional seven cemeteries designated as Historic Cemeteries by the Texas Historic Commission.¹

Plano is home to many festivals and events hosted on parkland throughout the year that add to the unique and diverse culture, including the Plano International Festival, Plano Balloon Festival, Asia Fest, and All-American Fourth. These events typically draw thousands of attendees from around the region, creating a boon for the local economy. The Arts, Culture and Heritage Division is housed under the Parks and Recreation Department. The arts and theater community is also very active; Downtown Plano houses the ArtCentre of Plano, Plano Repertory Theatre, Plano Courtyard Theater, and Cox Playhouse. The McCall Plaza Stage also recently opened down the street from Haggard Park as a public performance space.

**PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT**

As previously discussed, the City transformed into a bedroom community in the 1960s and 1970s so the development pattern that emerged was relatively typical for the period: commercial development at major roadway intersections with low-density, single family residential development and associated uses filling in the rest of the square mile block. Parks, however, were typically established adjacent to schools, which created a neighborhood unit design that served as a model for many other communities. As Plano matured and grew, the demand for different types of housing increased; a variety of residential types are now found in Downtown Plano and the Legacy area in Northwest Plano. Today, Plano is about 94% built out, so opportunity for substantial growth is limited, but opportunities for redevelopment exist.
DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic make-up of a community is important to understand at the outset of any planning process. For parks system planning specifically, growth trends are used to determine need for new facilities and race and ethnicity make-up can affect which sports will be in high demand. This section describes the past, current, and, where applicable, projected population trends in Plano. The source of the data is from the U.S. Decennial Census, the 2011-2015 American Community Survey (ACS) Five-Year Estimates, the City of Plano, and the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

GROWTH TRENDS

Plano started booming in the late 1970s as the DFW area as a whole began to grow. Plano was known as a bedroom community and growth skyrocketed as families looking for a quality place to raise their families moved to the City. In 1980, the population was about 72,331; in 2010, the population was 259,841. This is a 260% increase in just thirty years. The most recent Census population estimates for Plano is 275,645. Figure 2.2 shows the growth in Plano over time.

Looking to the future, NCTCOG projects that the 2040 population will be 302,794 and that there will be 327,269 employees working in Plano in 2040. The Plano Planning Department estimates the following future growth:

- 2020: 285,600
- 2030: 293,000
- 2040: 300,000

While Plano is primarily built out, development projects over the last decade have shown that redevelopment and additional population growth is possible in the City.

POPULATION PROFILE

Age and Gender Characteristics

Evaluating population by age and gender helps to ensure that a community has an appropriate mix of parks and recreation facilities. Figure 2.3 shows the current age and gender composition of Plano. As of 2015, the largest population cohort is made up of 50-54 year olds, followed by 40-44 year olds. These age groups will be seeking active adult facilities in the next few decades, which is important to note for future recreation programming. There is also a substantial number of children from 5 to 19 years while the number of 0-5 year olds is less, indicating that the population of Plano is plateauing.
Figure 2.2: Historical Growth in Plano, 1950-2015

Source: NHGIS

Figure 2.3: Age and Gender, 2015

Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey Five Year Estimates
**Race and Ethnicity Characteristics**

Plano has become a diverse, even international city, yet most of the parks and recreation system reflects older park and recreation trends. Different cultures like to play sports such as cricket and table tennis, and as Plano continues to evolve, the parks and recreation system should reflect the growing diversity. According to 2015 American Community Survey data, 44% of Plano is a minority; this figure has increased since 27% in 2000. Additionally, 24% of residents in Plano were born in other countries, which is much higher than many other DFW area cities. **Table 2.0** shows changes in race and ethnicity over time.

![Image of people at an event](Image)

**Table 2.0: Race and Ethnicity, 2000-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>222,030</td>
<td>259,841</td>
<td>275,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pacific Islande</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other Races</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Multiple Races</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity*</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hispanic and Latino Ethnicity is not considered a race. Percentages may not add up to 100%.
Household Characteristics

Another important component of a population profile is household characteristics which can indicate what type of facilities or amenities residents may demand. The percentage of renter occupied homes has increased as has the average household size. These trends are consistent with nationwide trends of millennials who tend to put off buying a home and having children. The median household income in 2015 was $83,793, which is much higher than the regional and statewide median. Table 2.1 shows additional household characteristics over time.

Table 2.1: Household Characteristics, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>86,078</td>
<td>103,672</td>
<td>108,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Occupied</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner Occupied</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renter Occupied</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vacant</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Person Home</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>$162,300</td>
<td>$210,500</td>
<td>$231,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$765</td>
<td>$815</td>
<td>$976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$77,935</td>
<td>$81,822</td>
<td>$83,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Population Characteristics: Additional population characteristics can help create a more comprehensive picture of a community. As communities become more diverse, limited English speaking ability, poverty, and households without cars are characteristics that may become more prevalent.

Poverty: The percentage of individuals that are living below the federally-established poverty level has increased in the past fifteen years. In 2000, 4.3% of residents were considered impoverished and in 2015, that percentage increased to 7.5%.

• Educational Attainment: In 2015, nearly 94% of residents 25 and older had at least a high school degree. This percentage has increased slightly since 2000. Additionally, in 2015 55% of residents 25 and older had at least a bachelor’s degree, which has increased from 53% in 2000.

• Limited English Proficiency: The percentage of individuals that have difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English in 2015 is 12.1%, which is an increase from 8.2% in 2000. The largest LEP groups are those that speak Spanish (4.7%) and Asian languages (4.4%).

• Zero-Car: The percentage of households without a car has dropped from 2.4% in 2000 to 1.4% in 2015. This figure represents individuals that cannot afford a working car as well as those that choose to not own a car for lifestyle reasons.
ESRI Tapestry Segmentation: ESRI, a mapping technology company, has developed a product called Tapestry Segmentation to help identify consumer markets at the zip code level. Using Tapestry Segmentation, residential areas in the U.S. are divided into segments based on the socioeconomic and demographic composition. The following represents the most common tapestry segments found in the City of Plano.

Professional Pride: This segment is composed of residents who are well-educated and have upscale suburban lifestyles. Most residents are homeowners and homes are valued at more than twice the US median home value. The median household income is also high – just under $130,000.

Savvy Suburbanites: This segment is composed of residents who are well-established empty nesters or that have adult children living at home. Almost 50% are college graduates and the median age is 44 years old. The average household size is 2.83.

Metro Renters: This segment is composed of residents in their late twenties and thirties in mainly single-person households. Renters make up close to 80% of all households and many live close to their jobs and may walk or take transit.

Home Improvement: This segment is composed of primarily married couple families in single-family homes. The median household income is $67,000 and the median age is 37. Many households have 2 or more workers.

Boomburbs: This segment is composed of young professionals with families that live in newer housing in the suburbs. Over 50% are college educated and most households have more than two workers. The median household income is $105,000.
RELEVANT PLANS AND STUDIES

PREVIOUS PARKS MASTER PLAN

The 2015 Comprehensive Plan included the Park Master Plan shown in Figure 2.4 as well as the Bicycle Transportation Plan found in Chapter 6. Prior to that, the most recent park master plan update was conducted in 2014.

Three major themes guided the 2014 plan: ‘Livable City,’ which focused on continuing the excellent services and quality of life; ‘City of Organized Development,’ which established a framework for development of facilities; and, ‘City in Transition,’ which discussed how park and recreation development trends will be impacted by Plano’s changing population. Objectives and strategies for each of these three themes were also developed. Major improvements identified in this plan included two new community parks, an indoor pool, expansion of the Senior Recreation Center, skate park, additional dog parks, athletic facilities, trails, and facilities at Oak Point.

Since the plan update, the City has constructed the indoor pool at Carpenter Recreation Center, renovated Oak Point Center, designed the improvements at the Senior Recreation Center, constructed new athletic fields at Carpenter Park, and acquired land along Legacy Drive for a future park.
Livable City

Objective: Encourage healthy lifestyles through the provision of recreation facilities and activities.

Objective: Provide places for social interaction and community gatherings.

Objective: Provide for relief from the built environment through the acquisition and maintenance of open areas and natural settings.

City of Organized Development

Objective: Provide for a wide range of passive, active, formal and informal recreation activities in appropriate locations across the City.

Objective: Use neighborhood parks as a focal point and activity centers for Plano’s residential areas.

Objective: Use linear parks to link key public and private activity centers with residential areas.

City in Transition

Objective: Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the diverse needs of the community.

Objective: Ensure that a balance exists between the maintenance of existing facilities and system expansion.

Objective: Ensure long term financial stability of the City’s parks and recreation facilities.
PLANO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Adopted in 2015, the Plano Comprehensive plan is entirely online as opposed to the traditional document format. The plan is a long-range guide for future growth, priorities, services, development, and redevelopment of the City. The overall vision for the plan is a 'vibrant city with attractive and walkable neighborhoods, distinct mixed-use urban centers with active nightlife, strong commercial corridors, and a multi-modal transportation system that includes a variety of transit options.

The Parks and Recreation Policy documented in the Plano Comprehensive Plan is:

Plano will develop and maintain a comprehensive system of park, trail, recreational, fitness, and sports facilities and programs that keeps pace with the City’s changing demographics, creates multiuse destinations, and improves the health, wellness, and morale of the citizens.
OTHER RELEVANT STUDIES

Heritage Preservation Plan (2011): The plan serves as a guiding document for Plano’s Heritage Preservation Program. Key issues presented in the plan include heritage resource identification, preservation and interpretation, designation, promotion, reinvestment in historic assets, education, and implementation of programs. The plan also discusses the potential for establishing conservation districts in Downtown and Haggard Addition areas to preserve the historical character.

Collin County Regional Trails Master Plan (2012): This plan focused on identifying opportunities to better connect cities in Collin County via trails and bikeways. Key components of the plan were the identification of high-priority corridors for regional linkages and identification of critical gaps that should be filled in the network. Eleven key inter-city connections involved Plano. The resulting plan serves as guidance for which trails and bikeways each city can pursue in the future.

Trail/Bike Master Plan (2015): This plan was included as an element in the 2015 Plano Comprehensive Plan. The plan identified major issues facing cyclists in the city, such as crossing major roadways via bike, as well as major initiatives to pursue, such as connecting the Chisholm Trail south to Richardson, the Preston Ridge Trail south to Dallas, and trails in the Rowlett Creek area to Allen and Frisco.
Regional Study of Sports (2016): The cities of Allen, Frisco, McKinney, Plano, and Richardson worked together for this planning effort to identify current athletic needs, use, and allocation of fields, and recommended improvements. In Plano, the primary need was identified as more practice fields as well as fields for newer sports, such as cricket, lacrosse, and ultimate Frisbee. Additionally, the study recognized that Plano has taken on the role as a regional provider of fields for leagues and tournaments of which other area cities take advantage. Major recommendations included reclassifying fields in Plano based on their size and primary uses, establishing a Youth Sports Council, and establishing a Five-Cities Athletic Fields Council.

Parks and Recreation Marketing Plan (2016): The Marketing and Community Engagement department at the city oversees communication functions for all Plano departments. The plan documented trends in Plano, including increasing diversity, plateauing population, and increasing median age. The goals that the team seeks to emphasize in coming years include being a community of choice, offering something for everyone, and educating citizens.

Trust for Public Land Report (2017): The report analyzed and quantified the economic benefits of parks, recreation, and trails in Plano. Overall, parks in Plano raise values of nearby homes by $337 million. Additionally, sports-related tourism generates $39.2 million annually in direct visitor spending. The benefits to human health amount to $21.2 million annually, since healthier residents spend less on medical costs.

Urban Forestry Master Plan (2017): This plan provides goals and actions to improve and grow the urban forest in Plano. The plan found that the replacement value of the urban forest in Plano is more than $1.6 billion. Additionally, the urban forest represents approximately $11.4 million in environmental, economic, and infrastructure benefits each year. The three areas of focus for plan actions were growing a healthy and resilient urban forest, branding and outreach, and program organization and funding.

Performing Arts Facility Needs Assessment (2017): This assessment analyzed what additional cultural facilities are needed in the city and was initiated due to increased demand for existing performance spaces. Based on the assessment, the report recommended a new community arts center and a partnership with PISD for access to the school district facility.
TRENDS AND LIFESTYLE BENCHMARKING

TRENDS IN PARK AND RECREATION

Like many other community aspects, parks and recreation trends change over time, so individual parks and recreation agencies should be flexible and proactive.

Greater emphasis on health outcomes. As obesity rates rise nationwide, people have become more cognizant of and concerned about opportunities to improve their health. Parks and recreation provide a vital role in access to open space and trails for recreation and exercise. As a result, trails and biking paths are in high demand in many communities. There is also more funding available from the state and federal government to improve health outcomes in communities, which can be used to improve parks and recreation facilities. In Plano, the Trust for Public Land found that approximately 16,500 adult residents get exercise by using Plano’s park and recreation system and associated annual medical cost savings amount to $21.2 million.2

Demand for open space protection. In general, people are more aware of their impact on the environment now more than ever. This has led to an increased emphasis on protecting open space and natural areas in communities to balance the ever-expansive impervious cover. In Plano, Arbor Hills and Oak Point are two natural areas that offer scenic relief and are subsequently two of the most visited parks in the City.

Changing participation rates. Sports participation trends are constantly changing. The Sports & Fitness Industry Association stated in their 2016 annual report that the biggest shift in the past 10 years has been a move from core to casual participation, meaning that fewer people are participating in organized leagues. The study also found that growth in ‘niche’ sports such as lacrosse, rugby, and field hockey continue to grow in popularity while growth in traditional team sports remained fairly steady.3 These trends are evident in Plano’s participation rates in recent years.

Emerging sports. As Plano becomes more diverse in terms of culture and age, the number of sports will continue to increase. Sports popular in other countries such as cricket and table tennis have experienced massive growth in Plano. Pickleball has also boomed in popularity in recent years as the median age has increased. To accommodate these newer sports, flexibility in field space and within recreation centers is important. Plano currently rotates different activities through sports turf fields and multi-use courts in recreation centers throughout the year.


BENCHMARK COMMUNITIES

To compare Plano with similar communities, five benchmark communities across the country were identified. These five communities are similar to Plano in terms of size, demographics, and income profile. Table 2.2 shows the most recent population figures, acres of developed parkland, and associated acreage level of service for the five benchmark communities and Plano.

One element that is used to compare parks systems in communities is the Trust for Public Land’s ParkScore tool which ranks the park systems in the 100 largest cities based on a variety of factors. These factors include overall park acreage, access to parks, per capita spending, and availability of various facilities. In 2017, Plano was ranked 17th out of the 100 largest cities and was the highest ranked community in Texas.

### Table 2.2: Benchmark Community Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Populations (2015)</th>
<th>Total Acreage (Developed and Undeveloped)</th>
<th>Acres/1000 People</th>
<th>ParkScore 2017 Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>275,645</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA*</td>
<td>227,499</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ*</td>
<td>251,786</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco, TX</td>
<td>137,797</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV*</td>
<td>277,102</td>
<td>9,173</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville, IL</td>
<td>145,058</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Naperville, IL

The Naperville Park District oversees 140 parks that serve the community’s approximately 145,000 residents. Within the Parks District there are five operational departments: Golf, Parks, Planning, Recreation, and Marketing and Communications. Special amenities found in the system include a Riverwalk, beach, disc golf course, skate parks, nature center, community garden plots, two golf courses, and paddleboats and kayaks available for rent. The District’s website also discusses the current green initiatives going on in the City, including maintaining natural areas, propane fueling stations for fleets, and solar panels at one of the community centers. The level of service for parks in Naperville exceeds the LOS in Plano just slightly.

*Data provided by ParkScore 2017 Rankings.
Henderson, NV

The Las Vegas suburb’s population is approximately 277,000 and the parks system includes 64 parks. Special amenities that are found in the parks system include sixteen dog parks, two BMX parks, seven skate parks, and sixteen splash pads. Henderson also features a bird preserve and an adopt-a-park program. The documented park acreage level of service is very high, but this is likely due to a large National Conservation Area being included in the acreage. According to ParkScore 2017, Henderson is ranked 32nd out of the top 100 largest cities in the country. The City scored high on spending and dog parks per capita.

Chandler, AZ

This Phoenix suburb has a population of approximately 251,000 and includes over 60 parks. Special amenities in the system include a BMX park, skate park, four dog parks, and three splash pads. The City also has an ‘adopt-a-park’ program. The level of service is much lower than Plano. According to the 2017 ParkScore Rankings, Chandler is ranked 59th out of the largest 100 cities in the country. Chandler scored high in median park size and dog parks per capita.

Frisco, TX

This North Texas suburb boasts a population of approximately 137,000 and has 40 parks. What is unique about Frisco is that it has nearly 750 acres of undeveloped parkland that will be developed in the future. The City has an impressive sports complex and is building a skate park. The parkland level of service is on par with Plano, but as Frisco continues to develop and become more built-out, the LOS is likely to decrease.

Arlington County, VA

With a population of approximately 227,000, the County oversees 151 parks and facilities. Special amenities include an amphitheater, community garden, bocce ball, climbing wall, skate park, nature center, splash pad, dog park, and an ornamental rose garden. The County is currently updating their public spaces master plan and they have a quarterly publication dedicated to nature and history. The level of service is much lower in Arlington County than in Plano, however the County ranks 6th in ParkScore’s 2017 rankings out of the top 100 most populated cities. Arlington scored high on spending, dog parks per capita, playgrounds per capita, and access to parks.
Additionally, the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) collects data from park agencies across the country and annually produces a report containing park and recreation agency performance benchmarks. The 2018 report stated that the typical park and recreation agency has 10.1 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and 1 park for every 2,114 residents. Plano exceeds the parkland acreage level of service with 15.6 acres per 1,000 residents but more residents are served by each park (1 park per 3,281 residents). Another statistic included in the report is annual per capita spending per resident; nationwide the average is $77.32; in Plano, the annual operating expenditures per capita is $147.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITIES

Since Plano has evolved into a diverse, culturally-rich community, lessons can be learned from the parks systems of international communities. In Europe, grand plazas and gardens make up the majority of space in many city parks. The Garden of Mont Des Arts in Brussels, Belgium is composed of grand gardens that are lit up in dramatic colors at nighttime. There are also open-air theaters to attract formal and informal events like in the Vondelpark in Amsterdam. Finally, landscape architects in Germany created a unique park that was integrated into a former industrial site at Landschaftspark in Duisburg-Nord. Perhaps most striking about these and other parks found in great cities is that, when visited during particularly pleasant times of year, there is a real sense that these parks are destinations frequented by many residents and travelers from around the world.

INTRODUCTION

This plan was developed for the citizens of Plano, both today and in the future. Therefore, community engagement was a very important component throughout the entire plan development process. This chapter defines the stakeholders, summarizes the results of the various outreach techniques and surveys, and presents the established vision, goals, and objectives of the plan.
STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders were engaged throughout the planning process via visioning sessions as well as one-on-one meetings. A visioning week was also held in June 2017 that engaged over 100 people total via focus group meetings and a public open house.

**City Staff:** In addition to Parks and Recreation Staff, several other departments were engaged to get their take on how their department interacts with parks and recreation and what they would like to see in the future. During the visioning week, department heads from Parks and Recreation, Planning, Engineering, Visit Plano, Neighborhood Services, Community Outreach, and the Assistant City Manager met as a focus group to discuss their vision for the plan. Major elements staff seek for this plan include increasing awareness of the parks systems, developing standards for new types of parks, completing the parks and trails system, raising the status quo for parks, and strengthening collaborative standards amongst departments.

**Parks and Recreation Planning Board:** The project team met with the Parks Board four times throughout the plan development. This included an opening visioning session, presentation of preliminary recommendations, draft final recommendations, and the approval meeting. During the visioning session, Parks Board members noted that they want the plan to incorporate creative solutions, be based on analytics, compare benchmarks to other cities, and support efficient use of funds.
Sports Associations: During the visioning week in June, all sports associations active in Plano were invited to a focus group meeting. Meeting attendees noted that they think Plano needs to stay ahead of growth, make updates, and modernize fields in order to maintain great athletic services. Attendees included leaders from the following organizations:

- Plano Sports Tourism Department
- Plano Walking Club
- Plano Pacers Running
- USA Softball
- North Texas Co-Ed Soccer Association
- North Texas Premier Soccer Association
- North Texas Soccer
- North Texas Women’s Soccer Association
- USA Softball
- Plano ISD
- Plano Sports Association

Special Interest Groups: Special interest groups were also invited to a focus group meeting during the visioning week in June. When asked what was the one thing they wanted to see the plan accomplish, attendees noted that it should get people to use the parks, call for updates to parks, and create a foundation for exciting spaces. Attendees included members of the following organizations:

- Senior Advisory Board
- Plano Moms
- Arts Centre of Plano
- Plano Symphony
- North Texas Performing Arts
- Chamberlain Performing Arts
- Plano Chamber of Commerce
- Plano Economic Development Corporation
- Plano Heritage Commission
- Plano Neighborhood Services Department
- City of Richardson Parks and Recreation
- Plano Parks and Recreation
PUBLIC INPUT

A critical stakeholder in any planning process is the public; for this Master Plan the public was engaged in a variety of ways in order to gain the most public input possible.

TELEPHONE SURVEY RESULTS

In June 2017, a telephone survey was conducted over the course of two weeks. While many people no longer have land lines, a telephone survey is still important to capture demographics that may not be able to use or have access to a computer for online surveys. 400 total respondents evenly distributed across the City were surveyed as part of the telephone survey. Over half of attendees were over the age of 55 and have lived in Plano for over 20 years; this means that the results are skewed toward an older demographic. However, this input is still important to consider along with all of the other input methods. Key results include:

- **90% of respondents think it is important to PRESERVE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS.**

- **TOP NOTED AMENITIES that respondents want in the future are SENIOR CENTER, MULTI-USE TRAILS, NATURAL HABITAT, and RECREATION CENTER.**

- **90% of respondents think it is important for Plano to IMPROVE and ENHANCE maintenance of PARK FACILITIES.**

- The **TOP THREE areas that respondents think the City should prioritize** is additional BICYCLING OPPORTUNITIES are connecting to EXISTING TRAILS, assisting TRAIL CROSSINGS of major roads, and CONNECTING TO SCHOOLS.

A summary of the full telephone survey results is included in the Appendix.
In addition to the telephone survey, a 19-question online survey was developed and administrated over the course of several months. The City advertised the survey at the visioning meetings, at the outreach events, and in local newsletters. As a result of this targeted outreach, 3,210 people took the survey - a very high number for this type of survey relative to other cities’ parks plans. 97% of respondents were residents of Plano and 40% of respondents have lived in Plano for more than 20 years. Key results include:

- Top noted amenities and facilities that respondents want in the future are natural habitat, multi-use trails, a senior center, a splash pad, and a dog park.
- 89% of respondents think it is important or very important to improve and enhance maintenance of park facilities.
- 89% of respondents think it is important or very important to preserve environmentally sensitive areas.
- The top three areas that respondents think the City should prioritize additional bicycling opportunities are assisting trail crossings of major roads, connecting to existing trails, and connecting to schools.

A summary of the full online survey results is included in the Appendix.
OUTREACH EVENTS

Visioning Public Meeting
June 29, 2017

At the end of the visioning week, a public meeting was held and over 50 citizens attended. An introductory presentation was made and then seven break-out stations were set up for attendees to interact with and provide input. Key input heard from these stations include:

Park Amenities: Top amenities that attendees wanted to be added were more shade, soft-surface trails, and fitness station.

Open Space & Natural Areas: The most frequently mentioned ways that attendees interact with open space in Plano included walking on trails, viewing wildlife/animals, and visiting creeks and streams.

Sports & Athletic Fields: The top three noted athletic field facilities that attendees noted were pickleball, volleyball, and lacrosse.

Indoor Recreation & Aquatics: The top three preferred indoor recreation and aquatic facilities noted were cardio rooms, indoor courts, and senior activities.

Trails & Bikeways: Attendees noted that more shade trees, bike lanes, and pet waste stations were ways to improve the cycling experience in Plano.

Special Area Parks – Downtown Area: Most frequently mentioned amenities that attendees wanted to see in a park downtown included seating, water features, and greenery.

Special Area Parks – Legacy Area: Most frequently mentioned amenities that attendees wanted to see in a park in the Legacy area included natural areas, places to park, activities for kids, and bike trails.

Plano Balloon Festival
September 23, 2017

The Plano Balloon Festival is a highly-attended event held each year at Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve. A booth was set up to solicit input from festival attendees about their preferences for parks, recreation, open space, and trails in Plano. Attendees were also given the opportunity to fill out a brief questionnaire; 62 people responded to it during the festival.

Plano International Festival
October 14, 2017

The Plano International Festival is held each year in Haggard Park and is meant to celebrate the cultural diversity of the City. Again, a booth was set up to solicit input from festival attendees and a total of 133 people filled out the questionnaire. A summary of the outreach questionnaire results are included in the Appendix.
Preliminary Recommendations Meeting
January 30, 2018

To seek feedback on the preliminary recommendations for the park system, a public open house was held in January 2018. The project team gave a brief presentation and then participants were invited to visit the six open house stations to view the preliminary recommendations and interact with staff and the project team. Key input heard from these stations include:

Master Plan Vision and Goals: Attendees were generally in favor of the overall plan vision and had comments about specific parks or facilities.

Renovate Neighborhood Parks: The most frequently mentioned comments were related to creating better access to parks and providing more shade.

Develop & Enhance Community Parks: Comments related to community parks included considering artificial turf and recreating the success of Arbor Hills elsewhere.

Create Special Area Parks: The most frequently mentioned comments related to special area parks were to add safe bicycle parking and consider flexible open space in park areas for gathering.

Renew Recreation Facilities: Comments related to recreation facilities included the need for more court space and senior recreation space.

Connect Trails & Bikeways: The most frequently mentioned comments regarding trails and bikeways were to better identify the on-street bike routes and include prioritization of planned trails.
VISION

This section discusses the master plan vision in more detail and defines the specific goals of the plan as determined through the stakeholder and public input process.

AGENCY MISSION AND OBJECTIVES

Prior to establishing the vision, goals, and objectives for a particular effort, it is important to understand what the mission statement of the overarching agency is. Below are the current mission statements for the City, Department, and Parks Board.

City of Plano Mission Statement: The City of Plano is a regional and national leader, providing outstanding services and facilities through cooperative efforts that engage our citizens and that contribute to the quality of life in our community.

City of Plano Strategic Vision for Excellence: Plano is a vibrant, safe and sustainable city with attractive neighborhoods and urban centers, a vital economy, a high degree of mobility and an abundance of educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities.

Parks and Recreation Department Mission: Through a fun and innovative team, we enrich Plano by providing inviting spaces, caring service, outstanding value, and memorable experiences.

Parks and Recreation Planning Board Mission: Provide visionary planning resulting in an outstanding parks and recreation system that positively impacts the quality of life in the Plano community.
MASTER PLAN VISION

As discussed in Chapter 1, the overall vision for this Master Plan is to...

Complete the Parks and Recreation system by anticipating future needs and providing excellent parks, recreation facilities, trails and open space.

In order to realize this vision, the following components are discussed in this plan:

Renovate Neighborhood Parks: Represents the notion that all neighborhood parks should be updated with new, state-of-the-art features and technology to continue to attract residents to Plano. Recommendations related to this concept are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Develop and Enhance Community Parks: Represents categories for community parks to focus improvements. The three categories, or nodes, are: environmental, which includes open space preserves and natural areas; active, which includes large athletic complexes; and social, which includes non-athletic focused community parks. Recommendations related to this concept are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Create Special Area Parks: Represents parks and open space in the designated special area park study areas (downtown and the Legacy area) that should be pursued. Recommendations related to this concept are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Renew Recreation Facilities: Represents the notion that the city should continue to look at opportunities to renew facilities and programming based on evolving recreation trends. Recommendations related to this concept are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

Connect Trails and Bikeways: Represents the need for additional trail and bikeway connections in the city. The identified connections could be a variety of bicycle accommodations from shared-use-paths to sidepaths. Recommendations related to this concept are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.
MASTER PLAN GOALS
AND OBJECTIVES

In order to achieve the overall Master Plan vision, ten goals that represent the desired aims of the plan were developed. Each goal is accompanied by more specific, achievable objectives. These goals support the overall vision of the Plano Comprehensive Plan.

GOAL: Encourage healthy lifestyles by providing an appropriate mix of facilities and range of activities throughout the city.

OBJECTIVE 1A: Develop and maintain a comprehensive program of facilities in accordance with the Master Plan.

OBJECTIVE 1B: Approximate future locations for future facilities and acquire land in accordance with the Master Plan.

GOAL: Renovate and modernize park infrastructure so that they offer similar elements across the city but are unique to the surrounding area.

OBJECTIVE 2A: Identify and prioritize the needs of existing and proposed facilities through the annual Community Investment Program (CIP) budget process.

OBJECTIVE 2B: Update park components to be unique and reflect the surrounding community.

GOAL: Maintain high standards for planning, implementing, maintaining, and operating quality parks and recreation facilities.

OBJECTIVE 4A: Periodically evaluate maintenance standards and schedules as the park system evolves.

OBJECTIVE 4B: Place equal importance on maintenance of existing facilities and system expansion.

GOAL: Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the growing diversity of the city and allow for social interaction.

OBJECTIVE 3A: Maintain flexibility of spaces so as to not limit the type of activities that can occur.

OBJECTIVE 3B: Design and locate park facilities that support formal and informal gatherings.

GOAL: Expand upon trail and bikeway linkages between parks, schools, commercial areas, and other cities.

OBJECTIVE 5A: Acquire remaining properties to complete the trail system within Plano and link with systems in other cities incorporate with the master plan.

OBJECTIVE 5B: Address any safety or ADA accessibility issues in the trail and bikeway system.

GOAL: Expand communications and outreach to encourage residents to use facilities and participate in activities.

OBJECTIVE 6A: Expand the department’s media presence to reach more followers.

OBJECTIVE 6B: Translate resources into common languages other than English such as Spanish.
GOAL: Create exciting and inviting park spaces in special area parks.

OBJECTIVE 7A: Incorporate public art, gathering areas, and event spaces to create social spaces in downtown Plano and the Legacy area.

OBJECTIVE 7B: Increase parkland level of service in special area park areas.

GOAL: Utilize environmentally and fiscally sustainable practices for developing and maintaining parks, trails, and facilities.

OBJECTIVE 8A: Explore alternative water sources and more efficient use of existing water resources.

OBJECTIVE 8B: Incorporate native plants in parks, along trails, and in open space areas.

GOAL: Maintain and promote high standards for athletic facilities.

OBJECTIVE 10A: Maintain efficient guidelines and procedures to enable park staff to manage usage of athletic facilities.

OBJECTIVE 10B: Provide additional practice space throughout the city.

GOAL: Ensure long-term financial stability of the city’s park and recreation facilities.

OBJECTIVE 9A: Improve efficiency and cost effectiveness through privatization, public/private partnerships, and joint operations with other public entities.

OBJECTIVE 9B: Seek grant funding to complement other funding sources.

These goals are referenced in the beginning of Chapters 4-6 as they relate to those topics.
PARKS, ATHLETICS, & OPEN SPACE
INTRODUCTION

One of the first parks established in Plano was Haggard Park, dedicated in 1928. The quaint park served around 1,500 total residents at the time, but has long since been enveloped by the changes brought on by modernity – surrounded now by mixed-use developments, homes, trendy restaurants, and a light rail station. In 2018, however, one can still look over at the park on a pleasant afternoon and see people enjoying their lunch breaks, kids playing, and people out for a quiet stroll. This is a testament to the longevity and importance of quality parks in cities.
GOALS AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this chapter can best be imagined by the passing of a baton between two runners. Now is the time to take an already well-established system of parks, athletics, and open space and carry it forward into the next 100 years. As we have previously stated, the face of Plano is changing. Populations are shifting, new developments are happening, and the next generation of citizens have different wants and needs than their parents and grandparents. This chapter establishes a classification system of parks in Plano, inventories existing parks, assesses needs based on established standards, and outlines system-wide recommendations for neighborhood parks, community parks, open space preserves, athletic complexes, and special area parks in Plano.

First presented in Chapter 3, the overall master plan goals that are relevant to this chapter are to:

**GOAL:** Encourage healthy lifestyles by providing an appropriate mix of facilities and range of activities throughout the city.

**GOAL:** Renovate and modernize existing parks so that they offer similar elements across the city but are unique to the surrounding area.

**GOAL:** Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the growing diversity of the city and allow for social interaction.

**GOAL:** Maintain high standards for planning, implementing, maintaining, and operating quality parks and recreation facilities.

**GOAL:** Utilize sustainable practices for developing and maintaining parks, trails, and facilities.

**GOAL:** Maintain and promote high standards for athletic facilities.
PERTINENT CITIZEN INPUT

Feedback heard throughout the plan development process related to parks, athletics, and open space included:

- Increase open space
- Need for more amenities at parks (e.g. shade, walking trails, fitness stations, etc.)
- The majority of visioning public meeting attendees placed a high priority on preserving open space in Plano
- Like quality of athletic fields in the city
- Need more practice fields
PARK CLASSIFICATION

The established park classification system in Plano includes neighborhood parks, community parks, linear parks, special use facilities, open space preserves, and golf courses. However, many parks can be classified as multiple kinds of parks. For example, some community parks and linear parks also have a neighborhood park component. This multi-purpose nature is reflected in the subsequent inventory. As part of this master plan process, an additional classification was identified to be officially codified in the park classification system: special area parks. The park type is discussed briefly in this section and in more detail at the end of the chapter.

**Neighborhood Parks** in Plano typically serve neighborhoods within a one square mile area and are generally 7 to 10 acres in size. The service area that these parks reach is approximately ½ mile radius, or a five to ten minute walk. Many neighborhood parks in Plano were developed adjacent to an elementary school to share amenities and parking. Amenities typically include playgrounds, picnic tables, pavilions, walking paths, and open areas for free play. They function as activity centers and focal points for the neighborhood. In Plano there are 31 developed neighborhood parks.

**Community Parks** typically serve a group of neighborhoods or portion of a city and are generally at least 25 acres in size. The service area that these parks reach is approximately 1 mile radius. Both passive and active recreation elements are found in community parks. Overall, more amenities are included in community parks, including competitive athletic fields, recreation centers, concession stands, and permanent restroom facilities. Plano currently has 19 developed community parks and 4 undeveloped park sites slated to be community parks.

Of the existing and planned community parks, 16 are designated as athletic complexes featuring baseball, softball, soccer, and other sports. Athletic complexes in Plano are unique because the majority of fields are multi-purpose; their use changes based on the season. This reduces maintenance needs and allows more efficient use of space year-round.

**Linear Parks** are long, narrow stretches of green spaces that link residential areas, schools, public facilities, and other parks. These parks are often located along creek corridors, utility easements, and rail corridors. They provide breaks in the urban development pattern, conserve ecologically unique areas, and are often contiguous with Community Parks and Open Space Preserves. There is no typical size nor service area since these parks vary in size. Amenities in linear parks typically include passive recreation elements like trails and associated amenities. In Plano there are 16 linear parks.

**Special Use Facilities** are differentiated from other park classifications because they draw more attendance from across the city and
special, unique purpose. Examples include memorials and cemeteries, as well as facilities or sites managed by the Parks and Recreation Department that do not easily fit into other categories. In Plano there are currently 9 facilities or sites managed by the Parks and Recreation Department that are considered Special Use Facilities.

**Open Space Preserves** have a dual purpose to both preserve environmentally-sensitive sites and provide passive recreation. In Plano there are currently 3 open space preserves. Amenities in open space preserves are focused on passive recreation, including trails and nature viewing areas.

**Golf Courses** provide spaces to socialize and be active. In Plano there are two municipal golf courses: Pecan Hollow and Ridgeway Ranch. For a nominal fee, anyone can play golf at these facilities.

**Special Area Parks** are a new park classification for the master plan; there are two areas designated as special area park areas - Downtown and the Northwest Legacy area. Within these two areas, available land is scarce and expensive, so strategies for park space in these areas does not follow traditional park development. Types of parks could include small pocket parks, greening street edges, and carving out linear park spaces on the edges of corporate campuses. Currently there is one undeveloped special area park in Plano.

The Park System Map shown in Figure 4.0 shows the location of all existing parks and undeveloped park sites in the Plano Parks System.
PARKS INVENTORY

Inventorying the existing park facilities is an important step in the master planning process. This section lists the address and size at each of the developed and undeveloped parks in Plano.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

There are 31 developed neighborhood parks totaling 267.77 acres.

ARROWHEAD PARK
2500 Millington Road
6.04 acres

BLUE RIDGE PARK
6409 Blue Ridge Trail
5.02 acres

BUCKHORN PARK
3601 Mission Ridge Road
8.00 acres

CADDIO PARK
2701 Round Rock Trail
7.72 acres

CAPSTONE PARK
2325 Harrisburg Lane
8.85 acres

CLEARVIEW PARK
4000 Eagle Pass
6.88 acres

COPPER CREEK PARK
3100 Copper Creek Drive
4.00 acres

COYOTE CREEK PARK
5801 Communications Parkway
16.74 acres

ELDORADO PARK
1704 Iowa Drive
6.87 acres
EXISTING INVENTORY | NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

EVANS PARK  
1601 Mollimar Drive  
11.00 acres

FRANK BEVERLY PARK  
7112 Quarry Chase Trail  
10.13 acres

GLEN MEADOWS PARK  
6300 Park Meadow Lane  
2.91 acres

HACKBERRY PARK  
1600 Rio Grande Drive  
5.63 acres

HIDDEN MEADOW PARK  
3500 Kimble Drive  
6.76 acres

INDIAN CREEK PARK  
2701 La Costa Drive  
5.31 acres

LONE STAR PARK  
6450 Mission Ridge Road  
8.27 acres

LONGHORN PARK  
1100 Colgate Place  
7.00 acres

LT RUSSEL A STEINDAM PARK  
4501 Quincy Lane  
8.29 acres

PARKWOOD GREEN PARK  
2500 Parkwood Boulevard  
4.13 acres

PRAIRIE MEADOW PARK  
3225 Caravan Drive  
8.14 acres

RIDGEVIEW PARK  
2903 Elsinore Drive  
7.56 acres
EXISTING INVENTORY | NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

SHOSHONI PARK
1501 Del Sol Drive
2.80 acres

STEEPLECHASE PARK
1500 Balcones Drive
18.65 acres

STIMPSON AND DRAKE PARK
1212 H Avenue
0.41 acres

STONEY HOLLOW PARK
4030 Coldwater Creek Lane
41.00 acres

SUNSET PARK
Shady Brook Trail
14.92 acres

TEJAS PARK
920 Bass Drive
10.96 acres

TIMBER BROOK PARK
6622 Norwood Lane
8.57 acres

W.H. BUZZ RASOR PARK
8942 Rockledge Lane
6.28 acres

WAGON WHEEL PARK
Rainier Rd
4.94 acres

WESTWOOD PARK
1001 Westwood Drive
4.00 acres
COMMUNITY PARKS

There are 19 developed community parks totaling 970.03 acres and 4 additional undeveloped park sites totaling 484.02 acres.

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park is indicated in parentheses.
EXISTING INVENTORY | COMMUNITY PARKS

OAK POINT CENTER
6000 Jupiter Road
24.70 acres

OLD SHEPARD PLACE PARK
1301 Winding Hollow Lane
17.95 acres

PRESTON MEADOW PARK*
4243 Lorimar Drive
25.53 acres (7)

ROWLETT CREEK GREENBELT PARK
(undeveloped)
1700 Country Club Drive
196.50 acres

RUSSELL CREEK PARK*
3500 McDermott Rd
184.51 acres (10)

SCHELL PARK*
2305 Laurel Lane
31.26 acres (5)

SGT. MIKE MCCREARY SPORTS FIELDS
1601 19th Street
4.12 acres

SHAWNEE PARK*
3380 Sherwood Drive
44.09 acres (8)

SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK SITE
(undeveloped)
51.10 acres

WILLOWCREEK PARK*
2101 Jupiter Road
23.94 acres (8)

WINDHAVEN PARK*
3300 Clark Parkway
25.14 acres (10)

WINDHAVEN MEADOWS PARK SITE
Passive Park Site - Under Construction
123.31 acres
SPECIAL USE FACILITIES

There are 9 special use facilities totaling 44.55 acres.

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park is indicated in parentheses.

- **BOWMAN CEMETERY**
  - Oak Grove Drive
  - 3.61 acres

- **HERITAGE FARMSTEAD SITE**
  - 1900 W. 15th Street
  - 3.91 acres

- **DOUGLASS COMMUNITY CENTER (LEASED SITE)**
  - 1111 H Avenue
  - 2.42 acres

- **HAGGARD PARK***
  - 901 E. 15th Street
  - 6.88 acres (2)

- **MEMORIAL PARK**
  - 2101 Bay Hill Drive
  - 8.59 acres

- **PLANO AQUATIC CENTER (LEASED SITE)**
  - 2301 Westside Drive
  - 2.00 acres

- **HORSESHOE PARK***
  - 4012 Roundrock Trail
  - 9.40 acres (7)

- **HIGH POINT TENNIS CENTER**
  - 421 W. Spring Creek Parkway
  - 6.75 acres

- **HARRY ROWLINSON COMMUNITY NATATORIUM (SCHOOL-BASED)**
  - 1712 P. Avenue
  - 1.00 acre
SPECIAL AREA PARKS

There is one special area park totaling 7.12 acres.

LEGACY DRIVE PARK*
(undeveloped)
Legacy at Communications Pkwy
7.12 acres (2)

GOLF COURSES

There are two municipal golf courses in Plano totaling 463.14 acres.

PECAN HOLLOW GOLF COURSE
4901 14th Street
257.80 acres

RIDGEVIEW RANCH GOLF CLUB
2701 Ridgeview Drive
205.34 acres

OPEN SPACE PRESERVES

There are three existing open space preserves totaling 1327.34 acres.

ARBOR HILLS NATURE PRESERVE*
6701 W Parker Road
210.98 acres (8)

BOB WOODRUFF PARK*
2601 San Gabriel Drive
324.16 acres (16)

OAK POINT PARK AND NATURE PRESERVE*
5901 Los Rios Boulevard
792.19 acres (8)

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park(s) is indicated in parentheses.
LINEAR PARKS

There are 15 linear parks totaling 786.83 acres. There is one undeveloped linear park that is 20 acres.

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park(s) is indicated in parentheses.

BIG LAKE PARK*
3800 Rainier Road
13.71 acres (3)
1 mile of walking path

BLUEBONNET TRAIL
Midway Road to K Avenue
102.63 acres
8.3 mile trail

BRECKINRIDGE TRAIL
Murphy Road to Bradshaw Dr.
34.82 acres
2.7 mile trail

CHISHOLM TRAIL*
Legacy Drive to 15th Street
94.89 acres (4)
5.4 mile trail

COTTONWOOD CREEK GREENBELT*
Parker Road to City Limits
123.13 acres (4)

LEGACY TRAIL*
Rockledge Lane to W. Spring Creek Parkway
153.52 acres (6)
1.6 mile trail

OVERLAND TRAIL
1600 Janwood Drive
6.87 acres
0.1 mile trail

PRESTON RIDGE TRAIL
Ridgeview Drive to Eldorado Drive
106.88 acres
6.2 mile trail
**EXISTING INVENTORY | LINEAR PARKS**

**RUSSELL CREEK GREENBELT SITE**
3500 McDermott Road
28.59 acres
2 miles of walking path

**RUSTIC PARK**
1900 Rustic Drive
1.84 acres

**SANTA FE TRAIL***
Adjacent to Oak Grove Drive:
28.05 acres (6)
1.6 mile trail

**SHADY BROOK TRAIL**
Kings Manor Lane to Midway Road
34.67 acres
1.9 mile trail

**SUNCREEK PARK**
Near Alma Road and Rollins Drive
13.87 acres

**WHITE ROCK TRAIL PARK**
5500 Channel Isle Drive
39.79 acres
2 miles of walking path
### NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARROWHEAD PARK</td>
<td>2500 Millington Road</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE RIDGE PARK</td>
<td>6409 Blue Ridge Trail</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKHORN PARK</td>
<td>3601 Mission Ridge Road</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADDO PARK</td>
<td>2701 Round Rock Trail</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPSTONE PARK</td>
<td>2325 Harrisburg Lane</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEARVIEW PARK</td>
<td>4000 Eagle Pass</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPPER CREEK PLAYGROUND</td>
<td>3100 Copper Creek Drive</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COYOTE CREEK PARK</td>
<td>5801 Communications Parkway</td>
<td>16.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDRADO PARK</td>
<td>1704 Iowa Drive</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS PARK</td>
<td>1601 Mollimar Drive</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK BEVERLY PARK</td>
<td>7112 Quarry Chase Trail</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEN MEADOWS PARK</td>
<td>6300 Park Meadow Lane</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACKBERRY PARK</td>
<td>1600 Rio Grande Drive</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN MEADOW PARK</td>
<td>3500 Kimble Drive</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN CREEK PARK</td>
<td>2701 La Costa Drive</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONE STAR PARK</td>
<td>6450 Mission Ridge Road</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGHORN PARK</td>
<td>1100 Colgate Place</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT RUSSEL A STEINDAM PARK</td>
<td>4501 Quincy Lane</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKWOOD GREEN PARK</td>
<td>2500 Parkwood Boulevard</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAIRIE MEADOW PARK</td>
<td>3225 Caravan Drive</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDGEVIEW PARK</td>
<td>2903 Elsinore Drive</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOSHONI PARK</td>
<td>1501 Del Sol Drive</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEPLECHASE PARK</td>
<td>1500 Balcones Drive</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIMPSON AND DRAKE PARK</td>
<td>1212 H Ave</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONEY HOLLOW PARK</td>
<td>4030 Coldwater Creek Lane</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSET PARK</td>
<td>Shady Brook Trail</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEJAS PARK</td>
<td>920 Bass Drive</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBER BROOK PARK</td>
<td>6622 Norwood Lane</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.H. BUZZ RASOR PARK</td>
<td>8942 Rockledge Lane</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGON WHEEL PARK</td>
<td>Rainier Rd</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTWOOD PARK</td>
<td>1001 Westwood Drive</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMMUNITY PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHGATE PARK*</td>
<td>6600 Archgate Dr</td>
<td>49.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTER PARK*</td>
<td>6701 Coit Rd</td>
<td>1043.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEYENNE PARK*</td>
<td>2501 Mission Ridge Rd</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFIELD PARK*</td>
<td>700 Legacy Dr</td>
<td>47.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRINGTON PARK</td>
<td>401 West 16th St</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE YARDS AT PLANO*</td>
<td>4525 Hedgcoxe Rd</td>
<td>61.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH POINT ATHLETIC FIELDS</td>
<td>6500 Alma Dr</td>
<td>55.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOBLITZELLE PARK*</td>
<td>7500 Red River Dr</td>
<td>139.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK CARTER PARK*</td>
<td>2800 Maumelle Dr</td>
<td>70.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTY PARK*</td>
<td>1200 Mill Valley Dr</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE PARK SITE</td>
<td>Future Athletic Site</td>
<td>113.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK POINT CENTER</td>
<td>6000 Jupiter Rd</td>
<td>24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD SHEPARD PLACE PARK</td>
<td>1301 Winding Hollow Lane</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON MEADOW PARK*</td>
<td>4243 Lorimar Dr</td>
<td>25.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWLETT CREEK GREENBELT PARK</td>
<td>1700 Country Club Dr</td>
<td>196.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL CREEK PARK*</td>
<td>3500 McDermott Rd</td>
<td>184.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHELL PARK*</td>
<td>2305 Laurel Lane</td>
<td>31.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGT. MIKE MCCREARY SPORTS FIELDS</td>
<td>1601 19th St</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAWNEE PARK*</td>
<td>3380 Sherwood Dr</td>
<td>44.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY SITE</td>
<td>(undeveloped)</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLOWCREEK PARK*</td>
<td>2101 Jupiter Rd</td>
<td>23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDHAVEN PARK*</td>
<td>3300 Clark Parkway</td>
<td>25.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDHAVEN MEADOWS PARK SITE</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>123.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park(s) is indicated in parentheses.
### SPECIAL USE FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowman Cemetery</td>
<td>Oak Grove Drive</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass Community Center (Leased Site)</td>
<td>1111 H Avenue</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggard Park*</td>
<td>901 E. 15th Street</td>
<td>6.88 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Rowlinson Community Natatorium (School-Based)</td>
<td>1712 P. Avenue</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Farmstead Site</td>
<td>1900 W. 15th Street</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point Tennis Center</td>
<td>421 W. Spring Creek Parkway</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe Park*</td>
<td>4012 Roundrock Trail</td>
<td>9.40 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Park</td>
<td>2101 Bay Hill Drive</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano Aquatic Center (Leased Site)</td>
<td>2301 Westside Drive</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL AREA PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Drive Park* (UNDEVELOPED)</td>
<td>Legacy at Communications</td>
<td>7.12 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOLF COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pecan Hollow Golf Course</td>
<td>4901 14th Street</td>
<td>257.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeview Ranch Golf Club</td>
<td>2701 Ridgeview Dr</td>
<td>205.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park(s) is indicated in parentheses.
### OPEN SPACE PRESERVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserve</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARBOR HILLS NATURE PRESERVE*</td>
<td>6701 W Parker Road</td>
<td>210.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB WOODRUFF PARK*</td>
<td>2601 San Gabriel Drive</td>
<td>324.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAK POINT PARK AND NATURE*</td>
<td>5901 Los Rios Boulevard</td>
<td>792.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LINEAR PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIG LAKE PARK*</td>
<td>3800 Rainier Road</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUEBONNET TRAIL</td>
<td>Midway Road to K Avenue</td>
<td>102.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECKINRIDGE TRAIL</td>
<td>Murphy Road to Bradshaw Dr.</td>
<td>34.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHISHOLM TRAIL*</td>
<td>Legacy Drive to 15th Street</td>
<td>94.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTONWOOD CREEK GREENBELT*</td>
<td>Parker Road to City Limits</td>
<td>123.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM 544/ROWLETT CREEK SITE*</td>
<td>(undeveloped)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGACY TRAIL</td>
<td>Rockledge Ln to W. Spring Creek</td>
<td>153.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERLAND TRAIL</td>
<td>1600 Janwood Drive</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON RIDGE TRAIL</td>
<td>Ridgeview Drive to Eldorado Drive</td>
<td>106.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWLETT TRAIL</td>
<td>Custer Road to SH 121</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL CREEK GREENBELT SITE*</td>
<td>3500 McDermott Road</td>
<td>28.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSTIC PARK</td>
<td>1900 Rustic Drive</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA FE TRAIL*</td>
<td>Adjacent to Oak Grove Drive</td>
<td>28.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHADY BROOK TRAIL</td>
<td>Kings Manor Lane to Midway Road</td>
<td>34.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNCREEK PARK</td>
<td>Near Alma Road and Rollins Drive</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE ROCK TRAIL PARK</td>
<td>5500 Channel Isle Drive</td>
<td>39.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates that a neighborhood park is contained within the facility. The number of acres devoted to the neighborhood park(s) is indicated in parentheses.

Additionally, the Parks Department manages approximately 6.6 acres associated with recreation facilities, which are discussed in Chapter 5.

### NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Needs for additional parkland and facilities in a parks system is partially determined by analyzing level of service (LOS) for park acreage and service area. For this plan, three approaches are used to determine current and future needs: the acreage and service area level of service approach, demands-based approach, and resource-based approach.
ACREAGE AND SERVICE AREA LEVEL OF SERVICE

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Acreage LOS is generally shown as a per-capita figure, such as “X acres per 1,000 population.” The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) has developed standards for neighborhood park acreage LOS and based on these national standards, a target LOS (TLOS) was developed for Plano and vetted by the Parks Board.

- NRPA Acreage Standard for Neighborhood Parks: 1-2 acres/1,000 population
- Plano Acreage TLOS for Neighborhood Parks: 1 acre per 1,000 population

As shown in Table 4.0, Plano has a slight deficit (8 acres) of neighborhood park acreage from the Target LOS of 1 acre per 1,000 residents. With the expected population growth by 2040, the LOS for neighborhood parks decreases and the city would have a 27 acre deficit of the Target LOS of 1 acre per 1,000 residents.
Table 4.0: Current and Target LOS for Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>275,645</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>267.77 acres</td>
<td>276.75 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>0.97 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
<td>0.92 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target LOS</td>
<td>1.0 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
<td>1.0 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Needed to Meet Target</td>
<td>8.3 acres</td>
<td>27 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Acreage LOS, an important figure to consider is Park Service Area LOS, which spatially represents how much of a community is served by parks. The regional benchmark for park service area TLOS for neighborhood parks is:

- **Neighborhood Park Service Area**: ¼ to ½ mile radius, or approximately a five to ten minute walk

As shown in Figure 4.1, much of the city is within a five to ten minute walk of a neighborhood park, with the exception of the Legacy Area and downtown Plano area. As Plano continues to grow and more areas of the city includes housing, it is important that additional neighborhood parks are constructed. It is also important to note that this service area is general; physical barriers such as roads or bodies of water limit connections between parks and the service areas they are meant to serve. The service area map also includes community parks that serve as ‘de-facto’ neighborhood parks for areas of the city that are served by community parks instead of neighborhood parks.
COMMUNITY PARKS

The same analysis was conducted for community parks in Plano. A TLOS was developed for Plano based on the NRPA standards and vetted by Parks Board.

- NPRA Acreage Standard for Community Parks: 5-8 acres/1,000 population
- Plano Acreage TLOS for Community Parks: 5 acres per 1,000 population

The current LOS for community parks in Plano is 3.85 acres per 1,000 residents, which is a 317 acre or 23% deficit to reach the Target LOS of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. With the addition of Moore Park, Windhaven Meadows, Rowlett Creek Greenbelt, and the South Central Community park sites, the community park acreage would increase. This translates to a LOS of 5.15 acres per 1,000 residents in 2040 which exceeds the established target. For this assessment, the portion of Bob Woodruff Park that includes the playground, pavilion, fishing pier, sand volleyball courts, practice space, and walking trail is included in the community park level of service calculations. This is because portions of the park do serve as a community park for the surrounding neighborhoods.
Furthermore, Park Service Area LOS spatially represents how much of a community is served by parks. The regional benchmark for park service area TLOS is:

- **Community Park Service Area**: one mile radius, or approximately a five minute drive

The majority of residential areas in Plano are served by community parks as shown in Figure 4.2. Most of the areas that are not included are served by open space preserves. It is important to note that this service area is general; physical barriers such as roads or bodies of water limit connections between parks and the service areas they are meant to serve.

**Table 4.1**: Current and Target LOS for Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>275,645</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>1060.73</td>
<td>1544.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>3.85 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
<td>5.15 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target LOS</td>
<td>5 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
<td>5 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Needed to Meet Target</td>
<td>317.0 acres</td>
<td>0 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARK SYSTEM

Today, the acreage of the total park system is approximately 3,880 acres and when undeveloped park sites are included, the acreage increases to 4,370 acres. This translates to a LOS of 14.08 acres per 1,000 residents today and 14.57 acres per 1,000 residents in 2040. This far exceeds the NRPA average LOS of communities nationwide, but is just short of the target the City of Plano established for themselves in previous plans of 15 acres per 1,000.

Figure 4.3 shows the service area for all developed parks and currently undeveloped parks within the city. This shows a service area of ½ mile for neighborhood parks, 1 mile for community parks, 1 mile for open space preserve, and ½ mile for special use facilities. Most of the city is served by parks, with the exception of the northwest Legacy area and parts of downtown.

It is important to note that private parks, such as HOA-maintained parks and golf courses, are not included in this assessment since they are not accessible to the general public. Additionally, the service area is general; physical barriers such as roads or bodies of water limit connections between parks and the service areas they are meant to serve.
Additionally, the Trust for Public Land (TPL) assesses access to parks by determining the percentage of residents that are able to reach a park within a half-mile walk, which roughly equates to ten minutes. This assessment of park access takes into account potential obstructions and barriers such as freeways, rivers, and fences that a general service area does not. In the 2017 analysis, TPL determined that 74% of residents in Plano were able to access a park within a ten minute walk. This is the highest percentage for any city in Texas and ranks 37th nationally. Figure 4.4 shows the TPL’s accessibility analysis that indicates areas of moderate to high park need. This map differs from the previous figure because TPL used a ½ mile barrier for all parks, regardless of size or type.

Figure 4.4: Trust for Public Land Accessibility Analysis
AMENITIES

Level of Service is also used to assess the need for additional amenities within parks. A current and future LOS for each major amenity is calculated based on the current population and projected population. While the NRPA has established target LOS for certain amenities, these vary so greatly amongst communities so the NRPA suggestions are just provided as a reference. Table 4.2 inventories the existing amenities and the current and future level of service. This amenities inventory only includes city-owned facilities; it does not include amenities at schools or private fields or court space.

As presented in Chapter 2, Plano currently ranks 17th out of the top 100 cities in the Trust for Public Land’s Park Score rankings. Amenities that are incorporated into the rankings include the number of basketball goals, playgrounds, dog parks, and recreation centers per capita. In 2017, Plano scored below 10 points for each of these amenity scores with the highest possible score of 20. Adding additional basketball goals and playgrounds is a relatively inexpensive way to increase the overall Park Score ranking and as shown in Table 4.2, the LOS for both are below the NRPA suggested target today and in 2040.

Table 4.2: Amenities Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>Future LOS</th>
<th>NRPA Suggested Target LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball Fields*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1 per 4,753</td>
<td>1 per 5,172</td>
<td>1 per 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1 per 3,097</td>
<td>1 per 3,371</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Fields*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 per 68,911</td>
<td>1 per 75,000</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse Fields*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 per 91,882</td>
<td>1 per 100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Grounds*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 per 34,456</td>
<td>1 per 37,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backstops</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1 per 4,446</td>
<td>1 per 4,839</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Goals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 per 5,513</td>
<td>1 per 6,000</td>
<td>1 per 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 per 30,627</td>
<td>1 per 33,333</td>
<td>1 per 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 per 12,529</td>
<td>1 per 13,636</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Units</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 per 3,938</td>
<td>1 per 4,286</td>
<td>1 per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1 per 3,995</td>
<td>1 per 4,348</td>
<td>1 per 2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number of fields available for a sport varies depending on the season. The numbers in this table represent the maximum number of fields during the season that has the most activity for that particular sport.
DEMAND-BASED APPROACH

In addition to the acreage and service area level of service approach, considering current usage and demand for facilities is also a key part of an overall needs assessment. This section summarizes demand for parks, open space, and athletics based on past assessments, public workshops, and public input surveys. As discussed in Chapter 3, over 3,805 people were reached via the surveys and about 100 people attended public meetings for this Master Plan; key input related to demand for facilities is discussed below.

Park Amenities: Feedback that was heard consistently throughout the plan development process was the desire for more shade within parks. Specific amenities that online and telephone survey respondents desired include splash pads, dog parks, and outdoor performance areas. Additionally, 86% of telephone survey respondents thought it was important to construct facilities in accordance with demand as new residents move to the city.

Open Space: Among both online and telephone survey respondents, natural habitat or nature areas were rated as the highest priority for desired amenities. Additionally, nearly 90% of both online and telephone survey respondents prioritized preserving environmentally sensitive area as important or very important. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan is supported by the Urban Forest Master Plan, a document that examines the existing tree canopy throughout the City and provides strategies for tree species diversity, maintenance, and provides guidance for future Park plans.

Athletics: The Regional Study of Sports conducted in 2016 included an assessment of participation in sports leagues. As of 2014, there were seven youth sports organizations and eleven adult sports organizations operating leagues in Plano. Within these organizations, there were 66,216 participants in Plano sports leagues. The study also estimated which sports leagues would experience the greatest increase in participation in the five cities; soccer was first, followed by baseball and then softball. The study listed the greatest need as practice field space and predicted continued growth in emerging sports such as cricket, ultimate frisbee, and lacrosse.

According to the online survey conducted for this Parks Master Plan, the most highly rated sport field that respondents wanted more of was multi-purpose fields (65% ranked very important or important), followed by youth soccer (50%), and then tennis (47%).
RESOURCES CONSIDERED IN A PARKS MASTER PLAN ARE AREAS IN A CITY THAT COULD POTENTIALLY BE PARKS, TRAILS, OR OPEN SPACE IN THE FUTURE; THESE POTENTIAL RESOURCES INCLUDE GREENBELTS, BODIES OF WATER, CITY-OWNED PROPERTY, AND VACANT LAND. IN PLANO ONLY A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE CITY IS NOT DEVELOPED – PRIMARILY FALLING WITHIN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN ZONES OF THE CITY. LARGER PARCELS THAT ARE VACANT ARE EITHER ALREADY PLANNED FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT OR ARE VALUED AT A COST THAT IS PROHIBITIVE TO THE CITY FOR ACQUISITION.

The city proactively preserved much of the area in the floodplain around Rowlett Creek in the eastern part of the city. Today, Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve and Bob Woodruff Park cover a substantial part of the eastern greenbelt and the city has embarked on a master planning effort to convert the Los Rios Golf Course into another to complete the greenbelt park space.

Another good example of the city proactively preserving areas around creeks for open space or trails is Chisholm Trail that follows Spring Creek. The trail follows the naturalized creek for about 5.4 miles in the center of the city. Additionally, Legacy Trail is adjacent to White Rock Creek in the western part of the city. Plano also made use of undevelopable areas around a major utility easement by constructing the Preston Ridge Trail.
The city has already identified many of the remaining resources as future parks or trails. Trails are proposed along the Cotton Belt rail line and the DART Red Line. Additionally, the utility easement in the southeastern corner of the city is an opportunity to extend the existing Breckinridge Trail. Finally, if any private golf course were to be repurposed as another use in the future, trails could be extended where they currently do not connect.

**INDIVIDUAL PARK REVIEW**

Since there are over eighty parks in the city’s system, the project team worked with staff to identify ten parks that would be reviewed more closely. The recommendations for these parks could be applied to other parks in the system as well. The discussion of these ten park sites are included in the Appendix.

**Neighborhood parks:**
- Clearview Park
- Hackberry Park

**Community parks:**
- Bob Woodruff Park
- South Central Community Park Site
- Hoblitzele Park
- Rowlett Creek Greenbelt Park
- Moore Park
- Old Shepard Place Park

**Linear parks, trails and bikeways:**
- Preston Ridge Trail
- FM 544/Rowlett Creek Site
SYSTEM-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

This section describes strategies to renovate neighborhood parks, to develop and enhance community parks, including active, environmental, and social focused community parks, and to create special area parks.

RENOVATE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

As first discussed in Chapter 1, part of the overall vision for the future of parks and recreation in Plano is to renovate neighborhood parks. Neighborhood parks in Plano long served as a model for other communities. Located near the center of a roughly square mile neighborhood bounded by major roadways, the city was proactive by locating parks adjacent to elementary schools and did not include parking. The amenities that are typically found in each park include a playground, walking path, pavilion, and open area, but while this model offers convenient access to parks close to home, most of the parks are now indistinguishable from one another.

Additionally, Plano’s parks were developed quickly to meet the basic needs of rapidly developing residential areas. As a result, the improvements are of a similar age, in need of replacement, and should the improvements needed are to provide services that go beyond basic. Some of the issues that are evident in neighborhood parks in Plano are lack of accessibility, lack of identity, and need for citizens to be involved in the planning process.
EXISTING PARK IMPROVEMENTS

To stay ahead of the curve and once again be the leading community in the region and state, the city should focus on renovating neighborhood parks to replace aging infrastructure and reestablish the excellent quality. As new amenities are needed in parks, they should be updated with new, state-of-the-art features and technology that continues to attract residents to Plano. The following strategies should guide future updates.

Color
A relatively inexpensive way to give parks new life is incorporating bright colors. Updating park elements such as playground equipment, benches, picnic units, and signage with new, vibrant colors can make neighborhood parks unique.

Unique Play and Structures
Manufacturers today offer unique playgrounds that can be customized to individual parks in Plano. When playgrounds in neighborhood parks are scheduled to be replaced, elements that should be considered include all-abilities play equipment like that found at Jack Carter Park and themed playgrounds like W.H. “Buzz” Rasor Park and Liberty Park.

Pavilions and Shade Structures
The City of Plano should implement a program with the goal of providing custom, rather than off-the-shelf, shade structures and pavilions to its parks. Visitors are naturally drawn to these structures in parks because of the shade, so making pavilions that are interesting architecturally is well worth the investment and will distinguish Plano from other cities in the region.
Signage
The standard sign for neighborhood parks in Plano is a simple wooden sign with white lettering. While it is important that these signs are consistent throughout the system, they could be updated to make each park feel more unique. Materials to consider include architecturally-finished concrete, stone, metal and wood.

Native Landscaping
In order to keep maintenance needs to a minimum, native landscaping should be prioritized for all planting programs at neighborhood parks. Additionally, tree replacement was a comment that was heard often during the public input process; the Urban Forestry Master Plan should be referenced whenever new trees are needed in neighborhood parks.

Practice Fields
A citywide need identified in this master plan is for more practice fields. Such fields at neighborhood parks should serve nearby teams for drop-in practices and not serve as a site for scrimmages or games. These practice areas should be fertilized and treated for weeds and watered regularly to produce acceptable turf.

Flexible Space
Access to unprogrammed, flexible space is also important for Plano residents as identified in the outreach methods. Neighborhood parks can help meet this need by including space that can be used for a variety of drop-in uses, such as a permitted fitness class, game of tag, or picnic.

Walking Paths
Finally, many park users visit their neighborhood park to walk their dog or go for a jog. The majority of neighborhood parks in Plano have a perimeter walking path that either connects to the exterior sidewalk network or to a larger trail. A critical component to address is to fix any ADA accessibility issues with existing walking paths and to add crosswalks to connect to the exterior sidewalk or trail networks.
CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

As discussed in the Needs Assessment section, with the expected population growth by 2040, about 27 acres of additional neighborhood parkland would be warranted. This roughly equates to three additional neighborhood parks. The location of these parks should be prioritized in areas identified as areas of high park need as identified in Figure 4.4.

If more infill development occurs in Plano, some areas will increase in population and warrant additional parkland. Not all neighborhood parks need to include the amenities typical of a traditional neighborhood park, however. For example, young professionals living in a home with little to no yard and without children would likely seek green space to take their dog outside rather than to use a playground structure. Pocket parks are an alternative to the traditional neighborhood park that could provide green space areas for areas with increasing residential density.

A pocket park serves as small natural open space in developed areas. Amenities might include benches, shade trees, and sidewalks. They are meant to be less programmed than traditional neighborhood parks and are therefore less maintenance as well.
DEVELOP & ENHANCE COMMUNITY PARKS

In addition to renovating neighborhood parks, another focus of this master plan is to develop & enhance community parks. In order for Plano’s park system to remain a leader on a regional and statewide level, these parks should stand out as destinations for sports, open space, or events. The three opportunity typologies identified for community parks are active, environmental, and social nodes. This section describes strategies to develop and enhance athletic complexes, open space preserves, and community parks.

ACTIVE NODES – ATHLETICS

Youth and adult sports are a key component of the overall Plano parks system. In 2014, there were over 66,000 participants in leagues and over 70 tournaments held in the city. Additionally, the Trust for Public Land found that sports and tournament related tourism resulted in $39.2 million annually in direct-visitor spending.

Within the 16 parks that include an athletic complex, many of the sports fields are multi-purpose; depending on the season, they are used for soccer or baseball/softball. This results in a more efficient use of space and less maintenance with fewer fields lying vacant during off-seasons. This philosophy of multi-purpose fields has worked well in the past and should continue in the future.
The strategies discussed below can further enhance athletics in Plano and reinforce the city’s prominence in youth and adult sports in the Metroplex.

**Variety of Sports:** It is evident in Plano that new sports are gaining in popularity. While traditional sports like baseball, softball, and soccer are still prevalent, sports such as cricket and lacrosse are gaining in popularity. Within Plano, there are 8 cricket and 3 lacrosse fields, but the Regional Sports Study only identified a deficit in the number of cricket fields. As more fields are being replaced and the new athletic complex at Moore Park is designed, consideration for a variety of sports should be given. The master plan process for Moore Park is anticipated to begin in 2019, so the new fields wouldn’t be built until at least 2021. **It is also recommended that the City remain flexible in programming field space since sports trends continue to evolve.**
Practice Space: Another need identified in the Regional Sports Study was practice fields. Currently, drop-in practice spaces are only available at neighborhood parks and at elementary and middle school open spaces on a first-come, first-serve basis. Additionally, when not scheduled for games, athletic fields can be reserved for practices for a fee.

A needed addition to the system would be to develop practice only spaces that are reservable. This would fill an immediate need for leagues that are wanting to practice during times when games are occurring so they can’t reserve a field at an athletic complex and are also spread out across the city so it doesn’t make sense to practice at a neighborhood park that doesn’t have parking. These reservable practice-only fields should incorporate defined areas for different sports with quality turf, but should not be the same quality as game fields. These sites should also include restrooms, parking, and regularly closed days for maintenance.

Additionally, in order to make the most efficient use of space at neighborhood park drop-in fields, the backstops and soccer goals should be strategically placed so sports that take up more room don’t commandeer multiple practice spaces.

Figure 4.6 shows the location of current and future athletic complexes and drop-in fields, as well as potential reservable practice-only sites.
Turf: With the exception of six fields that are under construction at Carpenter Park, all sports fields in Plano are grass. There has, however, been a push from league participants in recent years to install artificial turf. This is beneficial to both the city and sports participants. From the city standpoint, it results in water conservation and has lower operating costs over time. Sports participants benefit because the amount of down time following a heavy rain event is reduced, thus leading to more playing time. There are relatively high costs to install and replace artificial turf, however. Should the City decide that artificial turf is worth the upfront cost and that sports participants prefer it, the following items should be considered when installing artificial turf elsewhere in the city:

- Consider placement of artificial turf fields in each quadrant of the City. Provide when possible for sports with high wear-and-tear such as lacrosse.
- Artificial turf fields should be lighted to get the most use.
- The turf requires replacement about every eight years; a revolving fund could be set up to fund replacement of the fields.
- Consider allowing time during the week for reservable practice use of the fields.

Partnerships: In addition to municipal leagues, Plano ISD and Plano Sports Authority (PSA) also play a large role in youth sports in Plano. PSA provides year-round recreational and competitive leagues for over 100,000 youth in the Metroplex with facilities in Plano, Murphy, and McKinney. An opportunity exists for a stronger partnership with Plano ISD for shared-use of fields. For example, the fields at the schools near Carpenter Park are in poor condition, but a potential partnership could consist of public access to the fields for practice in exchange for the City helping to maintain the fields.

Additionally, the increasingly regional nature of sports means that youth that live in Plano may play games in Frisco, Allen, or McKinney, and vice versa. Therefore, continued coordination with surrounding cities is important to project field needs in the future. The priority of athletic fields in Plano has always been to focus on local residents needs first, then youth recreational sports, adult sports, elite sports, and finally tournaments. That is why there is no true tournament space within the city. If this philosophy changes in the future, coordination with the other cities in the Regional Sports Study is crucial.

Finally, with the increasing number of corporations headquartered in Plano, there are opportunities for partnerships to manage fields on corporate campuses in exchange for public access at certain times. This would increase access to athletic fields particularly in the park-deficient northwest Legacy area. Sponsorship opportunities like the Frito Lay Ballpark near Oak Point Park is another great way to partner with corporations.
Another key component to the overall park system is the network of open space preserves. As previously mentioned, previous generations of Plano leaders proactively preserved the areas around Rowlett Creek in the eastern part of the city and Arbor Hills in the west. Arbor Hills, Oak Point, and Bob Woodruff, comprise roughly 1,300 acres and provide much needed open space within the highly urbanized DFW Metroplex. Most other communities in the area did not have the foresight to preserve large swaths of land for passive recreation and habitat preservation. The strategies discussed in this section can enhance the existing preserve areas and help make them more accessible for all users.

**Outdoor Learning:** Outdoor learning is a positive opportunity for students to interact with nature near their school. An opportunity to encourage outdoor learning would be to add an outdoor classroom where teachers can instruct outdoors surrounded by nature. Characteristics that are important to consider include making the outdoor classroom fit in with the surrounding setting, like the examples shown here. Additionally, open space preserves often protect wildlife habitat. For example, Arbor Hills includes reconstructed remnants of the Blackland Prairie habitat, which has almost completely disappeared. **Interpretative signage that provides additional information about what makes the preserve unique can provide learning opportunities for visitors.**
Nature Viewing Areas: A major draw of open space preserves are the scenic views that can often be capitalized upon. The observation tower located with Arbor Hills is an iconic example that is well-used by both casual visitors and even as a backdrop for wedding proposals – indicating the value people place on quality design and nature. Those types of viewing areas should be incorporated in preserves in other parts of the cities where applicable. Additionally, the Dallas Fort Worth Metroplex is located within the migratory path of monarch butterflies. Communities across the country within the migration path are creating monarch waystations by planting milkweed and nectar plants that attract the butterflies. This provides the butterflies temporary shelter and gives residents the opportunity to view the butterflies.

Trails: Within the existing preserves, there is a strong network of soft-surface and concrete trails. However, trail connections from surrounding neighborhoods to the preserves could be improved. This is particularly important at Arbor Hills where parking is hard to find on a nice day. Improved bicycle and pedestrian connections would allow for more people to walk or bike instead of drive and reduce the need for more parking. Additionally, unique trail markers could be added along the trail within the preserves like the ones that exist at Arbor Hills. This gives a unique brand or theme to the area.
SOCIAL NODES

The final community park branding concept is social nodes; these represent all remaining community parks that are not athletic complexes and are meant to be spaces for gathering, events, exercise, and more passive activities as well. The strategies discussed in this section are focused on park elements that make it even easier to interact with other park users.

Technology: Parks are usually viewed as a respite from the everyday grind and our growing dependence on technology. However, when used strategically, technology can make parks smarter and even easier to maintain. Most parks in Plano are Wi-Fi enabled in part due to sponsor donations; this should be enacted in all community parks. Additionally, a popular trend of late is remote control drones, but many communities have rules against using them for purposes of safety and security. The City should consider a safe, legal space for remote control drone users to use their devices.

Wayfinding: In large community parks there are often many amenities spread out across a large area. Signage that directs to various amenities, also known as wayfinding signage, is important to include in community parks to make park users aware of different parts of the park. The Wayfinding Signage Design Study conducted for Plano in early 2018 came up with options for distinctive wayfinding signage to direct to city amenities and districts. The final concepts developed in that study should be used as a framework for wayfinding signage within community parks in Plano.
**Splash Pads:** Many communities in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex are installing splash pads in parks and they are quickly becoming a popular and sought-after amenity. The only splash pads located in the City currently are at outdoor pool areas that are part of recreation or aquatic centers. Since these centers require residents to pay a membership fee, there are no splash pads that are open to general park visitors. The City should look at the feasibility to add a splash pad at a community park in each major sector of the city so residents can access them closer to home. Potential locations the City is currently considering include Windhaven Meadows, Russell Creek Park, Bob Woodruff North, and the South Central Community Park site; these proposed locations are shown on the overall Park Master Plan map presented later in this chapter.

**Other Amenities:** Amenities that should be replaced and updated as needed in community parks include restrooms and gathering spaces. An outdated restroom or pavilion structure detracts from the overall appeal of a park and can dissuade people from using the park. Like neighborhood parks, pavilions in community parks should be architecturally interesting and also highly functional since they require reservations at community parks. There was also quite a bit of feedback related to the need for more disc golf holes at parks; there is only one disc golf course in the city currently located at Shawnee Park east of US 75. The City should prioritize adding a disc golf course in the western part of the city so more residents can easily access a course.
CREATE SPECIAL AREA PARKS

Plano has experienced commercial, office, and residential growth over the past few decades, particularly in two areas of the city. Downtown Plano has grown exponentially in the past decade and continued concentration of corporate headquarters in the Legacy Business Park has spurred major investment and development. Minimal parkland exists in these areas today, aside from historic downtown parks and private green space in the Legacy Area. However, there is a need for additional parkland in these areas to serve new residents. This section seeks to develop typical park typologies and standards for incorporating parks, open space, and trails into these areas for all to enjoy. These areas of the community may develop area plans or participate in master planning processes beyond the special areas identified here, and these planning efforts should influence the ultimate disposition of parks, open space, trails, and facilities in these areas. The study area shown in Figure 4.7 were identified based on the Plano Comprehensive Plan future land use areas.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Plano has a unique opportunity to set standards for special area parks within two developed sections of the City. Because the focus areas are largely built-out, this can be seen as a challenge that begs the question: How do we provide quality parks and recreation space within these areas?

The answer will require a creative approach that seeks out and targets available land known as “found space” and also recognizes that traditional suburban park typologies will not be feasible in these areas. Instead, one must look for those few strategic parcels where park development necessitates a much higher investment that, in turn, results in a much higher quality park that is suitable for its setting.

The typology for a special area park will be different than the types of parks found in Plano’s current park system. While neighborhood and community parks are spread out across the City and sometimes linked together by trails, special area parks will be developed in areas with more of a gridded street system. These create opportunities for found spaces and pocket parks, plazas, event spaces, and dynamic space.
CASE STUDIES

There are other jurisdictions that have sought to integrate special area parks into their park systems.

Fairfax County, Virginia recognized that additional growth and planned development and activity centers meant that there would be additional demand for park and recreation facilities in many areas. In order to supplement the existing suburban park system, the County created an ‘Urban Parks Framework’ that defined characteristics of various elements or aspects of proposed urban parks. These elements included context/location, function/purpose, access, ownership, management & operation, amenities, form/visuals, general length of stay, and size & service area. The four types of parks that the framework defined are pocket parks, common greens, civic plazas, and recreation-focused urban parks.

Austin, Texas created an Urban Parks Workgroup in 2011 to best determine where additional parks are needed within the City, with a particular focus on urban pocket parks. The City Council set a goal that all residents living in the urban core of the City should be able to access a “publicly accessible and child friendly park or green space” within ¼ mile. The workshop findings discuss strategies to address immediate areas of concern that do not meet the established access standards.
STUDY AREA 1: DOWNTOWN

The downtown special area park study area defined for this master plan encompasses the downtown business district, the industrial area east of downtown, and the area around Collin Creek Mall west of Central Expressway. It is roughly bordered by President George Bush Turnpike to the south, Shiloh Road to the east, 14th Street and Park Boulevard to the north, and Alma Road to the west.

Within this approximately 2,900 acre study area, there are two existing parks totaling just over 27 acres. The existing parks are Haggard Park, a 7.4 acre park categorized as a special use facility, and Harrington Park, a 19.8 acre park categorized as a community park, and Stimpson and Drake Park, a 0.41 acre neighborhood park. There are also over 60 acres of proposed parkland within the study area west of US 75 that may be acquired if redevelopment occurs in the future. Other facilities in the study area associated with the Plano Parks and Recreation Department include the Plano Senior Recreation Center, Douglass Community Center, McCall Plaza, Chisholm Trail, and several miles of on-street bike routes. Figure 4.8 shows the existing and current proposed parkland as identified in the 2015 Park Master Plan Map.
DEMOGRAPHICS

According to the 2010 Census, the population of the downtown study area is approximately 8,700. The Plano Planning Department projects that the population will increase 69% to 14,700 by the year 2040 and that the population density will be about 3,400 people per square mile. Additionally, according to NCTCOG, the number of employees working in the downtown area in 2040 is expected to be 39,800 and the employment density will be about 7,000 people per square mile. This increase in both population and employment in the area indicates that there will be increased demand for parks and open space in the area.

PARKLAND LOS

Using the 2010 population, the existing parkland Level of Service (LOS) for the downtown study area is 3.8 acres per 1,000 residents. This is drastically lower than the city-wide average of 14.52 acres per 1,000 residents. Additionally, by the year 2040, if no additional parkland is acquired, with the expected population growth the future parkland LOS decreases to 2.4 acres per 1,000 residents. However, if the parkland that is currently proposed in the study area is realized, the future LOS would be 6.6 acres per 1,000 residents. It is important to note that it is not feasible to attain the same citywide LOS standard in the downtown area due to lack of available land and prohibitive acquisition costs.

Additional existing conditions for the downtown study area are included in the appendix.
STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Staff from Parks, Planning, Engineering, Neighborhood Engagement, and Special Projects departments were interviewed about how they envision parkland in the downtown area. Input received included making the case for more parkland to raise the level of service to match other parts of the City. Elements that staff would like to see in a downtown park include streetscape features, passive areas as well as play areas, bike access, parallel parking, and picnic areas. Additionally, it is not anticipated that the industrial area to the southeast of downtown will change anytime soon so pocket parks could be a consideration for these areas. If redevelopment of Collin Creek Mall occurs in the future, there is an opportunity to incorporate greenspace into whatever development occurs. Pedestrian connectivity is also critical for all teams interviewed.

During the public visioning meeting held in June 2017, meeting attendees were asked to envision what they thought a park in the downtown area should look like. Amenities that attendees wanted to see in such a park included activities such as events, people watching, dog walking, extending evening activities, and as a place to bring visitors. The most commonly noted elements attendees did not want to see in a park in downtown included parking, fitness stations, large pavilion, sports fields, lack of maintenance, and off-leash dog area.

TABLES/SEATING  WATER FEATURES  TREES, GREEN SPACE  FOOD TRUCKS  PUBLIC ART  GAMES  PLAYGROUNDS  RESTROOMS  SAFE  EVENT SPACE
OPPORTUNITIES

Since the study area included in this analysis is larger than just the downtown core, the project team first assessed what the various development patterns were to determine what type of park space is needed.

West of US 75, there is mostly new development and redevelopment occurring. Therefore, the focus in this part of the study area should be to work with developers to plan park space in the new development and redevelopment areas and also to provide access to the downtown core. The Heritage Creekside development that is currently being constructed will include some private open space and a trail connection. Additionally, the existing Collin Creek Mall makes up a large portion of this part of the study area. If the mall is redeveloped in the future, the city should work with the developer to require useable, public open space within the new development.

In the downtown core just east of US 75, the land uses range from historic residential neighborhoods to the downtown business core and civic buildings. There are existing parks in this area, but as residential density continues to increase, additional park space will be warranted. Therefore, strategic acquisition of land is the primary strategy for this core area. Vacant parcels or underutilized buildings could be purchased to develop small park spaces for residents to enjoy. Additionally, the proposed trail along the DART Red Line would provide a critical connection through the center of Plano and down to the Cityline development in Richardson.

Finally, the area to the east of K Avenue is primarily light industrial business park development with very few residences. Therefore, the park needs in this area are different from the other sections of the study area. Park space in this area could be small pocket parks for employees to eat lunch or take a break. Bicycle and pedestrian connections should also link to the downtown core to give employees the opportunity to use alternative modes for their commute.

Based on this analysis, several opportunities were identified that the City could pursue to incorporate parks and open space into the downtown study area. Figure 4.9 depicts these opportunities and the subsequent section includes detailed special area park development scenarios.

Figure 4.9: Downtown Study Area: Special Area Park Opportunities
Opportunity Areas
The Downtown Core Linkage opportunity area links the two existing DART Red Line stations, the future Cotton Belt Line station, the downtown core, municipal center, and City Line development to the south. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements as well as street treatments are recommended for this core area. Another opportunity area is the utility easement in the southeastern part of the study area. This is already a planned trail corridor, but it could be enhanced by creating small pocket parks along the trail to provide more usable park space. The Collin Creek Mall area is also identified as an opportunity area to work with future developers if the use changes in the future to provide meaningful park space and also create a pedestrian connection over US 75 to connect the core downtown area to the area to the west.

Pedestrian Improvements
Roadways designated for enhanced sidewalks or sidepaths to encourage walkability primarily in the eastern part of the study area but also to connect to the downtown core and redevelopment occurring west of US 75.

Roadway Gateways
Monumental features adjacent to roadways that represent entry into key parts of the study area.

Trail Gateways
Represents potential locations for trailheads or major trail wayfinding signage along the existing and proposed trails.

Intersection Gateway Treatments
Opportunities for monumentation that are visible from the major highways.
SPECIAL AREA PARK DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

CONNECTIVITY OVER US 75

A major barrier in the study area is US 75. Currently there are sidepath connections under the highway at 14th Street and at Park Boulevard to connect the Chisholm Trail to the Downtown and Park Boulevard DART stations. When the Collin Creek Mall area is redeveloped, there will be an increased need to connect the redeveloped area with the core business district on the other side of the highway. Figure 4.10 depicts a pedestrian bridge concept that would connect the two areas near the 13th/14th Street connector. The grand pedestrian bridge would also serve as a gateway into Plano for motorists on US 75. An example of a successful, grand pedestrian bridge is the Continental Avenue Bridge in Dallas.
REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY

If Collin Creek Mall is redeveloped in the future, it would present a valuable opportunity for the City to work with the developer to incorporate meaningful public park space early in the design process. The City has identified the area as future parkland on the current parks master plan map and seeks to extend the Chisholm Trail through the site and preserve about 10 acres of additional parkland adjacent to the trail. Figure 4.11 shows a concept of how park space could be incorporated into the site if the mall is ever redeveloped in the future.
STREET ENHANCEMENTS

Since available land is minimal and costly, an alternative to purchasing property would be to green areas that are in the city’s existing right-of-way. One such area is publicly-owned streets. As shown in Figure 4.12, K Avenue could be transformed by adding a landscaped median, trees and green areas on the outer edges of the roadway, and pavement treatment to intersections. While this isn’t a traditional park, it does allow for more green space in a densely developed area. This strategy would involve collaboration with the Planning Department to work with developers to form Overlay Districts or Maintenance Districts to provide such amenities.
As shown in the Opportunity Map earlier in the chapter, there are several corridors identified for additional trail and bikeway connectivity in the downtown area. The utility easement in the southeastern part of the study area could be transformed into a linear park with a trail.

Typically, when trails are installed in utility easements minimal vegetation is allowed so as to not obstruct the utility lines. However, strategic landscaping can be added to make these types of trails more inviting. Figure 4.13 is an example of greening trails in utility easements; this concept could be applicable in other areas of the city as well.
STUDY AREA 2: LEGACY

The Legacy special area park study area is located in the northwest sector of the City and is roughly bordered by the Sam Rayburn Tollway to the north, Preston Road to the east, and Spring Creek Parkway to the south and west. Much of the study area is corporate business parks, the Shops at Legacy, and the Legacy West mixed-use development.

Currently there is one public park site; the City recently acquired 7.1 acres on Legacy Drive to develop into a park. Besides this site, there are two trail corridors. Private open space exists at the Shops at Legacy and within some of the corporate campuses. Proposed parkland in the study area include approximately 23 acres of linear greenspace in the southern part of the study area.

The study area is marked by a stark contrast in land uses. Compact and walkable environments can be found at the Shops at Legacy, Legacy West and at Granite Park where a mix of restaurants, retail, residential, and office are prevalent. The next predominant land use consists of corporate campuses and large office buildings. Many of these campuses were built in the 1980’s and have restricted access, but feature very wide landscape setbacks from the surrounding roadways. They are strictly auto-oriented, but often have lengthy, narrow walking paths around the campus for employee use.

It is clear that the recent additions of the new Toyota Headquarters, Legacy West, and the Nebraska Furniture Mart (located in The Colony) have spurred rapid development along the northern edge of the site, and as of 2015, only 3% of the study area was
undevolved land. Additionally, as with JC Penney’s campus, the excess open space around properties has started to be sold off and developed for various uses in recent years. How these lands develop in the future will play a large part in the creation of parks and green space.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In 2010, the US Census population for the Legacy study area was approximately 5,100. City of Plano planning staff projects that the population will increase 75% to 9,000 by the year 2040. The significant increase in residents by the year 2040 indicate that additional parks and open space are needed. Additionally, NCTCOG projects that the number of employees working in the Legacy study area in 2040 is expected to be 69,000.

PARKLAND LOS

With the parkland on Legacy Drive, the existing parks LOS is 1.3 acres per 1,000 residents in the Legacy study area. By 2040, if the currently proposed parkland is developed, the LOS will be 3.3 acres per 1,000 residents. These figures are much lower than the city average of 14.52 acres per 1,000 residents.

STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Staff from Parks, Planning, Engineering, Neighborhood Engagement, and Special Projects departments were interviewed about how they envision parkland in the Legacy area. Some of the input heard was that bicycle and pedestrian connections are critical in the area since traffic is only projected to get worse with the increasing number of employees in the area. One of the policies from the city’s comprehensive plan is to fill in gaps in the sidewalk network, which is needed in this area since some of the office parks were built before sidewalk development was required. Another comment was that there are opportunities for demonstration projects in the area for innovative planning solutions.

During the public visioning meeting held in June 2017, meeting attendees were asked to envision what they thought a park in the Legacy area should look like. Amenities that attendees wanted to see in such a park included:

- Natural Areas, Greenspace
- Parking
- Public Art
- Ways to Engage Corporations
- Bike/Walking Trails
- Kids Activities
- Trolley
- Lighting
The most commonly noted elements attendees did not want to see in a park in the Legacy area included cars, bars, smoking, trash, playgrounds, sports fields, and more concrete.

Additionally, there were questions related to Legacy area parks in the 2017 Parks Master Plan Visioning Survey. Key input included:

**How important is it to create an urbanized park area in the Legacy West/Legacy East area?**

- Very Important: 21%
- Important: 34%
- Unimportant: 17%
- Very Unimportant: 12%
- No Opinion: 16%

**How important is it to expand pedestrian trail connections in the Legacy West/Legacy East area?**

- Very Important: 25%
- Important: 32%
- Unimportant: 15%
- Very Unimportant: 11%
- No Opinion: 16%
The final area is land that is currently undeveloped, or open. While some of these areas are already slated for new development, most are not far enough in the development process to preclude the incorporation of parks and open space. Therefore, the strategy is to be proactive in collaborating with the Planning Department to require more parks and open space before development occurs.

Based on this analysis, several opportunities were identified that the City could pursue to incorporate parks and open space into the Legacy study area. Figure 4.15 depicts these opportunities and the subsequent section includes detailed special area park development scenarios.
Opportunity Areas

The existing Legacy Trail that follows White Rock Creek is a great setting for a new linear park. Much of the land around the trail is floodplain that shouldn’t be developed otherwise. Additionally, a deck park over DNT at Legacy is a long-term opportunity to provide connectivity and increase access to open space.

Roadway Gateways

Monumental features adjacent to roadways that represent entry into key parts of the study area.

Trail Gateways

Represents potential locations for trailheads or major trail wayfinding signage along the existing and proposed trails.

Intersection Gateway Treatments

Opportunities for monumentation that are visible from the major highways.
SPECIAL AREA PARKS DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

CONNECTIVITY OVER DALLAS NORTH TOLLWAY

Like the downtown study area, the Dallas North Tollway is a major barrier that splits the Legacy study area. As more new development occurs on either side of the tollway, better connectivity across the barrier is needed. The City of Plano received funds in 2017 to convert the existing U-Turn lane into a pedestrian crossing over the tollway on the north side of Legacy Drive. Figure 4.16 depicts a long-term concept to create a deck park on either side of the Legacy Drive bridge. This would create usable park space and create safer pedestrian connections in a highly developed area, similar to the Klyde Warren deck park in downtown Dallas.
STREET ENHANCEMENTS

Many of the corporate headquarters are set back several hundred feet so there are large areas of unused space in front of many of the buildings. This presents an opportunity to create wider walkways and safer crossings at intersections. An example is shown in Figure 4.17, which shows how the streets near the intersection of Legacy Drive and Headquarters Drive could be enhanced with wide pedestrian paths and safer pedestrian access by removing the right-turn only lanes. Additionally, the concept shows an opportunity for green space at the four corners of the intersection. The City is currently retrofitting a pedestrian crossing at this intersection due to interest from Toyota employees, but this concept shows how that improvement could be taken a step further. This strategy would involve collaboration with the Planning Department to work with developers to form Overlay Districts or Maintenance Districts to provide such amenities.
CORPORATE CAMPUS SPACE

The Legacy Business Park used to be almost exclusively large corporate office parks. However, corporations that have recently moved in such as Liberty Mutual, Toyota, and State Farm take up a smaller footprint and headquarters that have been in the area for decades like JC Penney, are beginning to sell off some of their land. If other corporations decide to sell off portions of their campuses, the City should consider purchasing a piece as was done to acquire the Legacy Drive parkland on former JC Penney land. Figure 4.18 shows how park space could be carved out of the HP campus site and connected to other public and private green areas.
SPECIAL AREA PARK STRATEGIES AND STANDARDS

The special area park development scenarios presented in the previous section are concepts that could be applied elsewhere in the two areas of Plano. This master plan recommends five main strategies for incorporating parks into the special area park study areas:

1. Street Enhancements
2. Found Space
3. Greening Redevelopment and New Development Areas
4. Corporate Partnerships
5. Land Acquisition

This section dives deeper into appropriate standards and guidelines for the different special area park strategies.

Street Enhancements: Implement streetscape features to ‘green’ the street where land acquisition is not feasible but right-of-way is available.

- **Amenities**: Streetscape features could include wide sidewalks (10’ – 12’), shade trees, benches, pedestrian-scale lighting, intersection treatments, gateways, mid-block crosswalks, and wayfinding signage.
- **Size**: 1-2 blocks, both sides of street.
- **Ownership**: Since these improvements are within the right-of-way of streets, ownership would remain with the City of Plano. Where applicable, overlays may be utilized to coordinate with developers.
- **Maintenance**: Partnership between streets and parks departments.
- **Applicable Future Land Use Plan Areas**: Compact Complete Center; Transit Corridor; Employment Center; and, Regional Center.

‘Found’ Space: Acquire small pockets of land to increase parkland access within areas of the city that have minimal park access.

- **Amenities**: Primarily passive amenities such as walking paths with connections to the citywide network where applicable, benches, shade trees, and picnic units.
- **Size**: <1 acre to 5 acres.
- **Ownership**: City to acquire land or enter into long-term lease with landowner or partner.
- **Maintenance**: Parks department to maintain sites. Recommended to limit need for irrigation and use low-maintenance plant materials.
- **Applicable Future Land Use Plan Areas**: Compact Complete Center; Transit Corridor; Employment Center; and, Regional Center.

Candidates for incorporating the streets as parks concept include K Avenue in the downtown area and Legacy Drive and Headquarters Drive in the Legacy study area.
Greening Redevelopment and New Development Areas: Work with the Planning Department and developers to implement public parks, open space, and trails within areas undergoing redevelopment or significant new development.

- **Amenities**: Elements that are unique to the setting to include gathering spaces, signature features, natural relief, and trail connections.
- **Size**: 5-10 acres.
- **Ownership**: City to acquire land or enter into long-term lease with landowner.
- **Maintenance**: Partnership with development for shared maintenance responsibilities or private operator (e.g. Woodall Rogers Park Foundation).
- **Applicable Future Land Use Plan Areas**: Compact Complete Center; Transit Corridor.

Candidates for incorporating meaningful public park space in redeveloped or newly developed areas include Collin Creek Mall if it is developed in the future and all of the remaining large open parcels in the Legacy study area.

Corporate Partnerships: Partner with corporations to make part of campuses publicly accessible or to carve out public parks as land turns over with time.

- **Amenities**: Open space, walking trails, areas for exercising, gathering, socializing, and eating.
- **Size**: Varies, up to 5 acres.
- **Ownership**: Shared-use agreement with corporations.
- **Maintenance**: Shared maintenance agreement with corporations.
- **Applicable Future Land Use Plan Areas**: Employment Center.

Candidates for carving out public park space through partnerships include older corporate campuses in the Legacy study area.

Land Acquisition: Acquire land to serve as unique special area parks in areas of high park need.

- **Amenities**: Natural relief and walking trails with connections to city-wide trail network. Other amenities depend on setting, but could include event spaces, dog parks, food trucks, community gardens, playgrounds, and remote-control gaming areas.
- **Size**: 5-10 acres.
- **Ownership**: City to acquire land.
- **Maintenance**: City (Parks Department) to operate and maintain site.
- **Applicable Future Land Use Plan Areas**: Compact Complete Center; Transit Corridor.

Candidates for acquiring land to serve as unique special area parks are any areas within the two study areas that are underserved in terms of park access. The park site on Legacy Drive is an example of strategic land acquisition in an underserved area.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEPARTMENT COLLABORATION

This section lists actions that the City can undertake to implement the previously discussed special area park strategies. Additional details are included in the implementation action table in Chapter 7.

- Major streets in the two special area study areas (six lanes in Legacy Area and four lanes in downtown area) should have walks that are at least 10' wide with a 5' buffer from the roadway. Developers should be required to fund construction of these walks when new development occurs. In areas where walks were not required when the original development occurred, the city should seek out partnerships with business owners or corporations to construct walks.

- Revise requirements for dedication of open space in the existing zoning district to ensure that meaningful public open space is included. Sometimes, developers count landscaped edges and fountains as open space, which is not worthwhile open space. There could also be stricter maintenance standards, but the city wants to maintain flexibility to continue to attract employers.

- Seek partnerships with corporations for shared use of land. Many of the corporations have significant acreage of open space or natural areas that the City could help maintain in exchange for public access of the site.
• Use **unique pavement treatment** to distinguish between different areas. For example, brick pavers should only be in the historic downtown core. Other types of pavement treatment such as colored and stamped concrete, or decorative concrete pavers could be used in other districts.

• In the Legacy area, consider incorporating an **outdoor performance area**. There is currently no such facility on the west side of the city. The performance area should be designed to be easily maintained so as to not be an additional burden on staff.

• Include space for **public art**. This is a relatively inexpensive strategy to integrate culture into existing parks or public spaces. As new special area parks are developed in the two study areas, public art should be considered.
PROPOSED PARK AREAS

As discussed in the Needs Assessment section, there are areas within the city that are not currently served by parks. In addition to the proposed park areas included in the current Park Master Plan Map and carried forward into the 2018 Park Master Plan Map, there are areas that should be a priority moving forward to acquire parkland and provide increased access to parks.

Land within the two special area park study areas in Downtown and the Northwest Legacy areas should be acquired when opportunities arise to increase open space. To provide parkland in these areas shaded purple in the map, the City should utilize the strategies discussed earlier in the chapter including streetscape enhancements, found space, greening redevelopment and new development areas, corporate partnerships, and strategic land acquisition.
Outside of these two special area park zones, there are small pockets of the City that are not served by existing parks. The two proposed park areas shown as the purple circles represent need for additional parkland in the future to increase access to parks. Figure 4.19 shows the proposed park areas as a result of the needs assessment analysis. These areas, in addition to the proposed park areas on the current Park Master Plan Map, should be a priority moving forward to acquire parkland and provide increased access to parks.
2018 PARK MASTER PLAN

Figure 4.20 represents the updated Park Master Plan map that is to be adopted by City Council. This incorporates the special area park opportunity areas, additional proposed park areas, maintenance facility changes, and additional proposed trails not on parkland. The map serves as a guide for future acquisition and park development.

Specific areas to be acquired in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map include the following areas:

- Greenbelt that follows overhead transmission line (north of Windhaven Parkway between Spring Creek Parkway and Parkwood Boulevard).
- Greenbelt along White Rock Creek west tributary (between Windhaven Meadows Park and Spring Creek Parkway).
- Neighborhood park space in the area north of Spring Creek Parkway, south of Windhaven Drive, west of Preston Road and east of the Dallas North Tollway (could be adjacent to proposed greenbelts).
- Completion of Chisholm Trail south from Park Boulevard to the President George Bush Tollway through the existing Collin Creek Mall site.
- Acquisition of open space in the Collin Creek Mall area in accordance with needs depending on the type of redevelopment that takes place in this area. Open space dedication requirements should be considered to ensure these needs are met.
• Proposed park opportunity west of Preston Road, south of Parker Road, east of Parkwood Boulevard, and north of Park Boulevard.
• Proposed park opportunity west of Coit Road, south of Park Boulevard, east of Ohio Drive, and north of Plano Parkway.
• Continue acquisition of floodways, utility easements, and easements adjacent to street rights-of-way to complete the trail system in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map and the Bicycle Transportation Plan Map (see Chapter 6).
• Complete acquisition of land fragments adjacent to existing parks and greenbelts needed to complete or enhance existing parks.

Acquisition that should be pursued as opportunities present themselves include:

• Acquire additional land within and in the vicinity of downtown Plano as opportunities present themselves to alleviate overcrowding and overuse of Haggard Park.
• Acquire land as opportunities are available east of the current downtown and south of 14th Street as redevelopment occurs to ensure open space needs of potential residents in this area are met. Consider areas adjacent to future DART stations to meet this need.
• Acquire additional open space in the Legacy Area when opportunities arise to meet open space needs in the Legacy Area and to reduce overcrowding of existing parks west of Preston Road.
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

During the visioning sessions, stakeholders continuously mentioned that they want to maintain the high-level of commitment to maintenance of park and recreation facilities. Additionally, since Plano is nearing build-out, the focus will eventually shift from development to completing and enhancing existing facilities. However, as growth in the parks system occurs in accordance with population growth over time, additional operations and maintenance staff may be needed. One way to assess if the current staffing levels are adequate is to look at the ratio of parkland acreage to the number of staff. Using the total parkland acreage vs. number of staff, the city can evaluate its current performance and determine what an ideal ratio should be.

Furthermore, there are existing satellite maintenance facilities throughout the city to decrease the amount of driving required of maintenance crews. As the amount of parkland on the western side of the city grows over time, there will be a need for an additional satellite maintenance facility to be built. Maintenance facilities should be strategically located to reduce the number of cross-city trips, move locations outside of neighborhoods where possible, and provide additional equipment storage locations to reduce costs and increase staff efficiency.

As shown in Figure 4.20, existing maintenance facilities that are located adjacent to single-family neighborhoods should be phased
out over time and replaced with facilities that are further from residential areas. New maintenance facilities are proposed at Carpenter Park, High Point Athletic Fields (funded), and Oak Point Park. New satellite maintenance facilities are proposed at Arbor Hills (funded) and Windhaven Meadows.

Finally, funding for park maintenance may vary over time, especially if sales tax revenues decrease. Alternative maintenance sources such as a revolving fund for field maintenance or donations from organizations like the Plano Parks Foundation may play a larger role than they do today. The city should remain flexible in both creating and accepting alternative sources of funds for park development and maintenance.
RECREATION AND AQUATIC FACILITIES
INTRODUCTION

Another key component of the Plano parks system are the recreation and aquatic facilities. City leaders and voters have shown support for recreation and aquatics through continuous investments in improving the facilities. The majority of the facilities have either been built or undergone a major renovation in the past decade. However, as Plano continues to become more diverse and trends in the wellness and recreation industry continue to evolve, there is a need to continuously evaluate recreation space and programming to ensure that the greatest number of residents are being reached and served. This chapter focuses on strategies to ‘Re-New’ Recreation Facilities within Plano. In addition to recreation and aquatic facilities, Recreation Division also oversees the High Point Tennis Center, the two municipal golf courses, the Nature Center, and Adult Sports.
GOALS AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the condition of the existing facilities, to understand how these facilities respond to current demands and future trends, and to develop a vision for how the facilities can keep pace with dynamic changes within the community.

The overall master plan goals that are relevant to this chapter are to:

• Encourage healthy lifestyles by providing an appropriate mix of facilities and range of activities throughout the city.

• Refresh and modernize park infrastructure so that they offer similar elements across the city but are unique to the surrounding area.

• Provide for park and recreation opportunities that reflect the growing diversity of the city and allow for social interaction.

• Maintain high standards for planning, implementing, maintaining, and operating quality parks and recreation facilities.

• Expand communications and outreach to encourage residents to use facilities and participate in activities.

• Utilize sustainable practices for developing and maintaining parks, trails, and facilities.

Figure 5.0: What New Facilities Do You Think Are Needed?
Feedback on recreation and aquatics was gathered during the visioning public workshop and through the telephone and online survey. At the open house, open-ended questions that facilitators asked meeting attendees included:

- What centers do you attend?
- What new facilities do you think are needed?
- What improvements are needed?
- What new programs do you think are needed?

In addition, individuals attending were asked to review a list of amenities and to place a vote on the top three amenities they judged to be most important. Figure 5.0 – 5.2 show the results of the facilities, improvements, and programs that meeting attendees thought were most needed.

Additionally, in the telephone survey, 86% of respondents thought that a senior center was important to construct and 77% thought a recreation center was important to construct. From the online survey respondents, 65% thought a recreation center was important in addition to 63% for the senior center. It is important to note that while senior recreational opportunities were highly ranked by survey respondents as an important recreational amenity, the survey did not ask respondents to expand upon exactly what type of senior recreation opportunities they seek.
FACILITY INVENTORY

Within Plano there are twelve total recreation and aquatics facilities, as shown in Figure 5.3. The Appendix includes a description of the existing recreation and aquatic facilities within Plano and provides an assessment of their condition.
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This goal of this section is to assess the facility needs of Plano in comparison to other cities. This allows city staff to determine if they provide facilities to the level provided by their peers. It also helps the city to make informed decisions on the optimal set of service and facility offerings based upon this comparative analysis.
DEMAND-BASED APPROACH

In addition to the public input and survey results discussed in the pertinent citizen input section, staff input is very critical to determine demand for facilities since they are the ones interacting with facility users on a daily basis. According to parks and recreation staff, the most critical recreation and aquatics needs include:

- **Additional adult court space**: Within the existing recreation centers, gymnasiums are multi-purpose to be used for a variety of sports. In recent years, the City has attempted to accommodate an increase in demand for organized play. However, this has impacted members’ ability to use the courts for open play. The City should fully evaluate the demand for court space and respond accordingly.

- **Defining and addressing senior programming needs**: This master plan update identified a demand for additional senior programming. Subsequent surveys or studies should dive deeper into what specifically is needed.

- **Additional pool lap lanes**: Demand from schools, swimming clubs, and drop-in users for pool space is increasing.
STANDARDS-BASED APPROACH

The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) had previously set standards for recommended recreation improvements. These standards became outdated over time with more emphasis on quality of life by municipalities. The NRPA recently published The 2017 NRPA Agency Performance Review which provides benchmarks expressed around operations without speaking to recommended standards.

Because of this, the planning team has benchmarked against cities with similar demographics, growth characteristics, and population. This will then allow the City of Plano to establish its own standards in consideration of expressed needs of residents and the city’s economic, administrative, operational, and maintenance capabilities.

**Indoor Facility LOS**

Indoor facility level of service (LOS) defines the number of recreation facilities that serve the population. They are expressed as the square footage of indoor facility per capita. In 2017, Plano’s indoor facility LOS was 1.09 SF per resident, which exceeds the regional average of 0.86 SF per resident. This includes the recent square footage expansions. In 2040, with the expected population growth, the LOS is reduced to 1.00 SF per resident.

Additionally, Plano’s senior center LOS in 2017 was 0.10 SF per resident, which is less than the regional average of 0.18 SF per resident. In 2040, with the expected population growth, the LOS is reduced to 0.09 SF per resident.
Aquatics

Developing benchmarking data from other cities is more difficult because of the various ways aquatics is quantified. Through research the planning team has found the unofficial general standard of 1 pool per 50,000 residents; Plano currently exceeds this standard.

Additionally, USA Swimming has established a standard that recommends 22 lap lanes per 100,000 population. Plano currently has 55 lanes combining both indoor and outdoor lanes. With the projected population at 300,000 this would indicate Plano should consider an addition of approximately 11 lanes in future aquatic planning to be close to the USA Swimming recommendations. This accounts for the leisure pool areas that is not included in the USA Swimming standards. This would also be consistent with some comments made by citizens about need for more lap lane time.

This discussion about needs in aquatics does not address leisure pool areas. There are no standards for leisure pools due to the broad variations of use. Leisure pools are often used by families and play an important role in both socializing as well as a first introduction to swimming for many young children.

Plano provides a range of leisure pools which includes both indoor and outdoor facilities. A larger outdoor leisure aquatic facility is being planned at Oak Point Center. There is not a pressing need for additional leisure pools in the foreseeable future.
COMPARISON TO BENCHMARK COMMUNITIES

This section includes a summary of comparative benchmarking that was performed for this plan. The communities included in the benchmark analysis are comparable in growth, size, demographics and location to Plano. Benchmarks were established by developing ratios of square footage per capita for each of these cities and were based upon existing facilities as well as facilities planned for the near future. In instances where indoor aquatic areas were part of a recreation center, that square footage was included in the study.

It is important to understand that data is a valuable tool, but not the final answer in terms of decision-making for the unique characteristics of Plano. It provides a good sense for others when evaluating what is needed in Plano. However, no two parks and recreation agencies are the same. A successful agency is one that combines this information along with consideration of the unique elements of their city in formulating a forward looking master plan.

Recreation Centers: As shown in Figures 5.4 and 5.5, Plano exceeds other communities in the region for recreation center square footage per resident. The average of the regional benchmark communities is 0.86 square feet per resident, and in Plano the ratio was 1.09 square feet per resident in 2017. When comparing to the national benchmarks, again the average was 0.86 square feet per resident and Plano comes in second after Arlington, VA.
**Senior Centers**: As shown in Figures 5.6 and 5.7, Plano does not fare as well in terms of senior center square footage per resident. In 2017, the ratio in Plano was 0.10 square feet per resident, while the average for the regional benchmark communities was 0.18. When compared to the national benchmark communities, the average is 0.14 square feet per resident, of which Plano falls short.

### Figure 5.6: Senior Centers – Regional Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano (50+)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen (50+)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco (50+)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton (50+)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie (50+)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney (50+)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5.7: Senior Centers – National Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano (50+)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville, IL (55+)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA (55+)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco, TX (50+)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ (55+)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV (60+)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATION TRENDS

As a community seeking to remain a leader in recreation, the City should understand the many elements of change, often referred to as trends, that are currently impacting the municipal recreation marketplace. That being said, Plano is unique and must judge which trends are valuable to consider in the future. This section describes these trends and what impacts these trends may have on the way recreation facilities are designed and the types of programs that are offered.

Technology Growth

- Leverage latest technology advancements to improve customer experience and efficient and effective operations.
- Use technology to teach on-demand classes.
- Consider technology upgrades when replacing fitness equipment.

Responding to Social, Demographic, and Ethnic Changes

- Natatorium operations and locker room design is impacted by some religions. For example, for those religions that stress the importance of modesty, this requires rethinking how locker rooms can still be efficient but also address this important need. This manifests itself in the form of more changing rooms, more family toilets, and accessible locker room locations.
- Being sensitive to preferences of different nationalities for activities such as table tennis, futsol, or badminton.
Growing need for recreational activities to break down barriers of socializing across ethnically and financially diverse citizens.

Creating health education and prevention for certain diseases that are high among certain ethnic groups.

Recruiting bilingual recreation center staff and class instructors.

Offering more diverse programs

Developing inclusionary programs

Flexibility of Spaces

Growing demand for more flexible spaces that translates to more openness with closed-off support areas that can be used to change the use of the space.

Competitive socializing - the combination of sports and socializing has resulted in a growing demand for structured (non-league) play that addresses competition in a fun and engaging manner.

Use of fiber optics and LEDs for quick change of field of plays for more flexibility

Making facilities more financially sustainable through memberships and program fees.

Life-Long Learning

Utilizing leisure time to attend courses on language, cooking, learning new sports, and university courses at centers.

Special Activities for Senior Adults

Increasing demand for special fitness facilities and larger recreational offerings for the growing senior demographic.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of existing facilities and overall needs assessment, a series of recommendations were developed to enhance recreation and aquatic facilities in Plano.

Address near-term demand for adult court space.

City staff has identified the need for a minimum of six additional indoor courts for pickleball, badminton, table tennis, volleyball, etc. Since expanding court space at existing facilities is likely not feasible, the City should construct a facility for use as a stand-alone sports court facility.

Address near-term demand for pool lap lanes.

There are several different pool users in Plano; these include public and private schools, City of Plano Swimmers (COPS), and drop-in users. While there is increased demand for lap lanes, there needs to be a more formal analysis done to seek input from pool users and determine if the City could sustain another pool or if reallocation of lane usage would address the issue. Another opportunity would be if the COPS program were to build a pool, which would free up space in the existing municipal aquatic facilities.

Address near-term demand for adaptive recreation.

The City should include permanent space for adaptive recreation that is accessible to all ages and also increase the number of inclusionary programs. Additionally, the City should explore the use of activity modifications and assistive technologies.

Further define and address senior programming needs.

Traditional senior centers, like the existing Plano Senior Recreation Center, do not reflect the desires of seniors today, who are more active and some of whom prefer going to a non-age specific center for exercise. Plano provides both a senior-specific center, which is currently being renovated, as well as senior programs dispersed at other centers throughout the city. Through the public input for this master plan update, it was determined that residents want additional senior programming, but there needs to be more definition of what exactly that entails (additional senior center, multi-generational center, different types of programming, etc.).

Therefore, a specific survey should be conducted to determine what exactly residents aged 50-75 and also those 75 and older want. Additionally, it is important to note that at the time of the master plan survey, seniors were waiting for updates to the existing senior center, so the results may be slightly skewed.

Additionally, the City should explore additional opportunities for senior programming at the existing Senior Recreation Center and at the Tom Muehlenbeck Recreation Center, Carpenter Park Recreation Center, Liberty Recreation Center, and Oak Point
Recreation Center. Consideration should also include evaluation of the need for additional programming space at any or all of these facilities as well as possible future facilities.

Incorporate programs and facility spaces that respond to emerging recreation trends.

This includes:

- Adding outdoor programming such as crossfit, extreme sports, and yoga
- Developing a new or repurposing an existing center into a multi-generational facility that has flexible spaces designated to seniors, teens, children, etc.
- Incorporating technology to better understand how users interact with the facility
- Adding life-long learning courses
- Consider outdoor programming when renovating community parks

Maintain appropriate staffing levels and set targets for cost recovery.

As the number and variety of programs increase at a facility, staffing should be assessed to ensure consistent service. Additionally, there is a desire to make recreation and aquatic facilities achieve a higher cost recovery, which will require making the facilities more financially sustainable.

Consider options to provide facilities in the defined special area parks.

As more development occurs in the downtown and northwest Legacy areas, there will be a need for recreation facilities in these areas in addition to the parks and open space discussed in Chapter 4. The downtown area is currently served by the Senior Recreation Center and the Douglass Community Center, both of which have restricted attendance. Therefore, the City should evaluate the recreational needs of new and future residents in the downtown area and determine what the City’s role should be in meeting those recreation needs. One option could be a new center constructed in the downtown area that would serve both downtown residents and the Douglass Community. Such a facility could include multi-purpose courts, meeting spaces, and group fitness spaces that can accommodate a variety of classes. Additionally, the existing facilities at the Douglass Community Center run by the Boys and Girls Club should be evaluated and a long-term strategy should be developed for the facility.

As for the northwest sector of the city, the city should first determine where residents currently go for active and senior recreation. If there is not demand for another facility, then programs at the Muhlenbeck Center could be reassessed and include more programming for both young professionals and seniors.

As with all parts of the parks system, recreation and aquatic facilities and programs should continue to be evaluated to determine needs, demands, and potential improvements.
TRAILS & BIKEWAYS
INTRODUCTION

A critical component of the City of Plano’s parks and recreation system is the network of trails and bikeways that connect key destinations, parks, schools, and city facilities. The City offers diverse options for commuting and recreational cyclists, joggers, and pedestrians including trails in utility easements, along creeks, and within parks. Today, there is a comprehensive network of signed on-street bike routes, approximately 80 miles of shared use paths, and several more miles planned for additional connectivity. This chapter reviews the existing trail and bikeway system, assesses needs, and identifies additional opportunities for connectivity.
GOALS AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this chapter is to identify strategies to complete the trail system in Plano and to identify needed improvements to the existing system. While this chapter does not serve as a formal trail and bikeway master plan that would analyze and prioritize trail segments in detail, the information presented can be used as a foundation to determine trail and bikeway corridors to analyze in more detail.

The overall master plan goals that are relevant to this chapter are to:

- Encourage healthy lifestyles by providing an appropriate mix of facilities and range of activities throughout the city.
- Expand upon trail and bikeway linkages between parks, schools, commercial areas, and other cities.
- Utilize sustainable practices for developing and maintain parks, trails, and facilities.
PERTINENT CITIZEN INPUT

Feedback heard throughout the plan development related to trails and bikeways included:

- Complete planned trails
- Fill in gaps in existing trails
- Connect to other cities, downtown, and near Collin College
- Provide better east-west connection in southern part of the City
- Widen sidewalks that connect to trails
- Provide more shade trees and pet waste stations along trails
- Better identify on-street bike route system and ensure safety
- Add trail lighting where appropriate
- Improve safety of trail crossings at major thoroughfares
- Incorporate new technology into trails (mapping apps, QR codes, E-bikes)
- Ensure trail safety
TRAIL AND BIKEWAY NETWORK

It is important to establish the existing network to identify gaps and opportunities prior to making recommendations for new facilities. This section describes the user groups in Plano, the universe of trail and bikeway facility types, the existing and planned network, and identifies opportunities and constraints to expand the system.

USER GROUPS

Due to their multi-purpose nature, shared use paths in Plano serve a variety of users including walkers, joggers, hikers, inline skaters, casual and avid bicyclists, and bicycle commuters.

Comfort of bicyclist users is directly correlated to the level of stress of the facility. Elements that influence stress include separation between motor vehicle traffic and motor vehicle traffic speed. Users that are more confident in their ability are more likely to feel comfortable in a higher stress environment. For example, you typically see bicycling groups like the Plano Bicycle Association and Plano Athletic Cycling Club riding on the street rather than on a trail. National research into interest in bicycling has shown that the majority of people are ‘interested, but concerned’ in bicycling and do not want to interact with motor vehicle traffic when riding a bicycle.
In Plano, the City and NCTCOG collaborated to conduct a survey of residents’ opinions of bicycles. Completed in Fall 2017, the major findings of the survey included:

- **14%** of respondents had **COMMUTED BY BICYCLE in the PAST MONTH**

- **48%** of respondents had **BICYCLED at least ONCE in the PAST YEAR**

- **34%** of respondents **RODE FOR FUN OR EXERCISE in the PAST MONTH**

- **Over 60%** of respondents thought it was **ESSENTIAL OR VERY IMPORTANT to INCREASE BICYCLE ACCESS**

- Hot weather was the most frequently cited reason for choosing not to bike

- The top aspects that respondents thought have a **NEGATIVE IMPACT on riding a bicycle more often are LACK OF ACCESS to bike lanes, VOLUME OF TRAFFIC on nearby streets, SPEED of traffic on nearby streets, and drivers exceeding neighborhood speed limits.**
FACILITY TYPES

The following describes the different trail and bikeway facility types; some of which exist in Plano today while others do not.

SHARED USE PATHS

Off-Street Trails

An off-street trail is a type of shared-use path that is located away from the street typically in an independent right-of-way such as a creek or river corridor, greenway, utility corridor, or railroad corridor. AASHTO minimum width standards is 10 feet, and NCTCOG standards suggest a minimum of 10 feet or 12 feet, depending on demand and if the path is a regional connection. Short loop trails in parks or those that make minor connections to other bikeways may be as narrow as 8 feet. Examples of off-street trails in Plano are the Preston Ridge Trail that is in a utility easement and the Chisholm Trail that follows Spring Creek.

Sidepath

A sidepath is a type of shared-use path that is adjacent to a roadway. Sidepaths can be used along roadways that have higher volumes or speeds where dedicated onstreet bikeways are impractical. Sidepaths often present increased conflicts between users and vehicles due to the number of intersections and driveway crossings, but these conflicts can be reduced by providing grade-separated or highly visible crossing treatments. AASHTO minimum width standard is 10 feet, and NCTCOG standards suggest a minimum of 10 feet or 12 feet, depending on demand and if the path is a regional connection. Short sidepaths that make minor connections to other bikeways may be as narrow as 8 feet. Sidepaths should have a 3-5’ separation from the roadway wherever possible. An example of a sidepath in Plano is the portion of Bluebonnet Trail that runs adjacent to Spring Creek Parkway.
ON-STREET BIKEWAYS

Bike Lanes

A bike lane designates space for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists most often designated by roadway striping. AASHTO standards require that a bike lane be a minimum of 5 feet, but wider lanes are recommended on higher volume or speed roadways. A variation of bike lanes is the buffered bike lane, which installs a buffer (up to three feet wide) between the vehicle travel lane and the bike lane and protected bike lanes, which uses a physical barrier to separate the vehicle travel lane from the bike lane. Buffered and protected bike lanes are the preferred on-street bikeway treatment in Plano due to the added separation and safety benefits for cyclists. Additionally, when on-street parking is prevalent, a buffer between the bike lane and parking lane is recommended to minimize bicyclists being hit by car doors. Currently there are no bike lanes within the City of Plano; but there are examples in Richardson, Dallas, and numerous other North Texas communities.

Bicycle Boulevards

As per the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidance, a bicycle boulevard is a designation for a street with low traffic volumes and speeds that gives priority to cyclists and local motor vehicle traffic. These boulevards typically have signs, shared lane markings, and traffic calming treatments such as speed humps, medians, traffic circles, chicanes, or curb extensions. Enhanced bicycle boulevards benefit neighborhoods by reducing cut-through traffic and speeding without limiting access by residents. There are currently no bicycle boulevards within the City of Plano, but there are examples in Grapevine and McKinney.

ON-STREET BIKEWAY TREATMENTS

Shared Lane Markings

Also known as ‘sharrows,’ these are markings that are added to a roadway to indicate that the road is meant to be shared by motorists and cyclists. Shared lane markings are not intended to be a standalone facility, but rather are meant to be applied on bicycle boulevards and signed routes to increase awareness of the presence of bicyclists. There are no shared lane markings in Plano currently. Recently TxDOT has indicated a strong preference for a minimum 14’ outside lane when implementing shared lane markings on federally-funded projects.

Bikes May Use Full Lane Signs

State law allows bicyclists to use the full lane when the driving lane is less than 14 feet wide or when roadway conditions make it unsafe to ride next to the right edge of the roadway. The placement of ‘Bikes May Use Full Lane’ signs increase awareness of the law but are not required. In Plano, several roads are designated as bike routes and notify drivers and bicyclists with a bike route sign along with Bikes May Use Full Lane signs.
EXISTING AND PLANNED NETWORK

As mentioned previously, the City has a robust system of trails and on-street bike routes. Major trails in the City include Preston Ridge, Bluebonnet, Chisholm, Breckinridge, Shady Brook, and Legacy. There are also significant trail systems within Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve, Bob Woodruff Park, and Arbor Hills Nature Preserve and smaller trail loops in numerous parks. Some trails also connect to neighboring cities including Allen, Frisco, and Murphy. NCTCOG has designated several trails in Plano as part of the Regional Veloweb, which is a network of nearly 2,000 miles of shared use paths in the Dallas-Fort Worth region. Table 6.0 depicts the approximate mileage of each type of existing trail or bikeway facility and Figure 6.0 shows the existing and planned trail and bikeway system.
Table 6.0: Current Trail Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Miles (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Trails</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Trails</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mileage - Trails</td>
<td>81.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart Paths</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Surface Trails</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike Routes</td>
<td>150.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned Bike Routes</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 2017, seven trail counters exist in different parts of the city to collect user counts for both bicyclist and pedestrian activity. The counts for the seven locations in 2016 are listed below. Chisholm Trail experienced the most bicyclist and pedestrian activity in 2016, 2015, and 2014. In 2016, there were an average of 208 pedestrians and 232 bicyclists that passed by the trail counter on the Chisholm Trail at Jack Carter Park daily. Additionally, from 2014 to 2016, the Legacy Trail experienced the greatest percentage growth in both pedestrian and bicyclist users.

Even with nearly 80 miles of existing trail, there are still some gaps within the City. Major gaps in existing trails include portions of the Legacy Trail and the connection between the Bluebonnet Trail and the Legacy Trail. Other gaps are within rapidly growing areas like the two special area park study areas discussed previously in this master plan. The City has opportunities to better connect to surrounding cities, including Dallas, Richardson, and Frisco. Overall, there are approximately 55 miles of planned trail in the current Bicycle Transportation Plan, but the segments are in various stages of development and most are not designed or funded yet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Counter Location</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm Trail at Jack Carter Park</td>
<td>77,285</td>
<td>81,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm Trail at Orlando Drive</td>
<td>63,026</td>
<td>60,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebonnet Drive at US 75</td>
<td>21,675</td>
<td>24,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Trail</td>
<td>21,831</td>
<td>10,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Point Park and Nature Preserve Trail</td>
<td>53,603</td>
<td>49,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowlett Trail</td>
<td>8,733</td>
<td>2,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Creek Trail</td>
<td>43,793</td>
<td>22,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Plano. 2017.
OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

Plano has already taken advantage of many of the existing trail and bikeway opportunities in the community such as utility easements and creek corridors. While additional opportunities exist, several constraints to trail and bikeway developments should be taken into consideration by the City.

OPPORTUNITIES

The major opportunities in Plano are filling in the remaining gaps in the trail system to create a better connected system. This includes Legacy Trail and Bluebonnet Trail. Additionally, existing trails could be extended, including Preston Ridge Trail, Legacy Trail, and Chisholm Trail. Connections to other communities should also be seen as an opportunity to increase trail and bikeway connectivity. Finally, the Cotton Belt Railroad that is planned through the southern part of the City could be an additional trail opportunity to provide an east-west connection. Since stations are proposed within the City, connections should be prioritized around the stations.

Other opportunities include partnerships with developers, surrounding cities, and other agencies such as Collin County, DART, TxDOT, and NCTCOG to construct trails.
CONSTRANTS

Potential obstructions to additional trail and bikeway connectivity include private property, barriers such as roadways and railroads, and trail intersections with major thoroughfares. In the southwestern part of the City, the Gleneagles Country Club Golf Course imposes a barrier to connecting White Rock Park Trail to Windhaven Meadows Park and Legacy Trail to the north. The current Bicycle Transportation Plan shows this as a sidepath along Willow Bend Drive, but right-of-way is limited. Additionally, Central Expressway, Dallas North Tollway, President George Bush Turnpike, and Sam Rayburn Tollway are major barriers for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. Finally, there are many trail intersections with major roadways in the city where additional safety measures could be implemented.
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Similar to the analysis conducted for parks and recreation facilities, a needs assessment is also conducted for trails. This section includes an assessment of trail needs using a standards-based approach, considering demand from public input, and a comparison to the benchmark communities introduced in the Community Context chapter.

STANDARDS-BASED APPROACH

Trail level of service is expressed as ‘1 mile per X number of residents’. In 2017, the trails level of service was 1 mile per 3,489 residents. If all of the currently planned trails are built, in 2040 the trails level of service would be 1 mile per 2,243 residents. The Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex average is about 1 mile per 2,000 residents. In 2017, the City is approximately 58 miles deficient of meeting that regional target and in 2040, if all of the currently planned trails are built there would still be a deficiency of approximately 15 miles.

Table 6.2: Benchmark Community Trail Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Trail Level of Service (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>1 mile per 3,489 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td>1 mile per 4,570 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco, TX</td>
<td>1 mile per 8,011 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
<td>1 mile per 1,472 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville, IL</td>
<td>1 mile per 2,450 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMAND-BASED APPROACH

Trails were one of the most frequently mentioned desired amenity by survey respondents and public meeting attendees. 86% of online survey respondents and 79% of telephone survey respondents felt that multi-use trails were very important. Additionally, when asked to identify which amenity is the most important, multi-use trails was the most frequently selected out of a list of about 15 amenities. As for the types of bicycling facility opportunities respondents seek, connecting to existing trails was ranked first among both telephone and online survey respondents, followed by facilitating trail crossings of major roads and connecting to schools. Pertinent feedback from the stakeholder and public meetings was related to trail amenities. Desired amenities included more shade, pet waste stations, water fountains, benches, trash receptacles, and lighting.

COMPARISON TO BENCHMARK COMMUNITIES

As discussed in the Community Context chapter, this plan defines five benchmark communities across the country to compare Plano’s park system. As shown in Table 7.2, the trails level of service in Plano falls in the middle of the benchmark communities. Henderson, Nevada has the highest level of service with 1 mile of trail per 1,472 residents and Frisco has the lowest level of service with 1 mile per 8,011 residents.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of the existing and planned system, additional opportunities for trail and bikeway connectivity were identified. This section presents the recommended updates to the Bicycle Transportation Plan and other recommendations related to trail and bikeway development.

EXPANSIONS TO TRAIL NETWORK

The following recommendations for expanding the trail network were developed by assessing the remaining gaps in the overall trail and bikeway system. Each of these recommendations are conceptual in nature and should be reviewed in more detail in a specific trail and bikeway master plan to determine feasibility and cost of implementing the trail and bikeway corridors.

SHARED USE PATHS (A paved trail located away from the street typically in an independent right-of-way)

Legacy Drive: There is a narrow shared use path currently on the north side of Legacy Drive from Parkwood Boulevard to Dallas North Tollway in the Shops at Legacy shopping area. This shared use path should be widened and extended from Parkwood Boulevard to the Legacy Trail. In order to provide additional connectivity to the Legacy West area, it is also recommended to extend the shared use path on Legacy Drive from the Dallas North Tollway to the Sam Rayburn Tollway. This shared use path should be a minimum of 12 feet wide.
**Parkwood Boulevard:** This corridor serves as the eastern boundary of the Shops at Legacy development and is also a reliever road for the Dallas North Tollway. The existing Bicycle Transportation Plan identified a shared use path on the eastern side of the roadway from the Sam Rayburn Tollway to Spring Creek Parkway. As more development occurs along the Dallas North Tollway, it will be critical to provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity in the area. Therefore, this plan recommends extending the planned shared use path from Spring Creek Parkway to Plano Parkway. This shared use path should be a minimum of 10 feet wide.

**Plano Parkway:** Currently the only major east-west bicycle and pedestrian connection in Plano is the Bluebonnet Trail, which is in the northern half of the city. Therefore, in order to provide connectivity in the southern portion, the feasibility of adding a shared use path on one side of Plano Parkway should be assessed. This plan recommends a shared use path from Parkwood Boulevard to K Avenue. Depending on right-of-way, this path should be a minimum of 10 feet wide with 8 feet portions in constrained areas.
K Avenue: This roadway serves as a core linkage through downtown to northern parts of the city. As identified in the downtown special area park opportunity map, this plan recommends a shared use path from President George Bush Turnpike to the northern city boundary. If expansion of the DART rail corridor moves forward, a study for future trails within the ROW should be pursued to determine if it has potential for adjacent trail development. This shared use path should be a minimum of 12 feet wide where possible.

Legacy Business Park: If the opportunity arises, the City should partner with existing property owners in the Legacy Business Park area to provide additional trail connectivity. The city/corporation partnership could include the City widening existing paths and maintaining them if made publicly accessible.
ON-STREET BIKEWAY ACCOMMODATIONS
(shared lane markings or bike lanes)

Old Shepard Place/Preston Ridge Trail/Cheyenne Park Connection: Ventura Drive and Tulane Drive are four-lane roadways with no residential frontage which makes them ideal candidates for further evaluation and study for an on-street bikeway accommodation such as a bike lane or shared lane marking. This would provide a connection between Old Shepard Place Park and White Rock Trail Park (via the future Plano Parkway shared use path) and Preston Ridge Trail. This connection could be extended past Coit Road on Matterhorn Drive to connect to Cheyenne Park, although Matterhorn is only a two-lane road and has residences fronting the street on one side.

Los Rios Boulevard from Jupiter Road to Parker Road: Los Rios Boulevard is a two-lane road with no sidewalks or trail adjacent to the street. With increased bicycle traffic for commuters, it is an ideal candidate for further evaluation and study for on-street bicycle accommodations such as a dedicated bike lane.

These trail and bikeway recommendations are incorporated into the updated Bicycle Transportation Plan as shown in Figure 6.2.
MAJOR THOROUGHFARE CROSSINGS

Many of the existing trails cross major thoroughfares and the City currently uses a range of strategies to provide safe crossings. Current treatments on roadways include crosswalk striping, signage, median refuges, pedestrian signals, and textured pavement. Additional treatments to consider for roadways include:

**Speed tables:**

These are flat-topped speed humps designed to slow traffic but still allow cars to maintain slightly higher speeds than regular speed bumps. When accompanied with appropriate signage, speed tables can help alert motorists to be aware of bicyclists and pedestrians.

**Pedestrian hybrid beacons (PHB):**

A pedestrian hybrid beacon is a traffic control device to aid in mid-block crossings or uncontrolled intersections. A trail user activates the beacon by pushing a call button, which then turns on the red lights on the beacon to alert motorists to allow for a person on the trail to cross. According to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), PHBs are appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are too high for pedestrians to safely cross. Placement of these devices must be coordinated with and vetted through the Transportation Department.
Additionally, other safety control measures can be implemented on the trail to alert trail users of an upcoming major intersection. In Plano, features such as trail bollards, pedestrian-scaled stop signs, and paint are used. Additional treatments to consider for trails include:

**Medians:**

The City has begun to move away from trail bollards and instead has started to install low medians at road intersections. This helps to alert trail users of the upcoming intersection and reduces the chance of crashing into the bollard while distracted.

Whichever of these crossing treatments the City uses in the future for both roadways and trails, there should be consistency throughout the City so both motorists and trail users know where a crossing occurs.
FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

This final section includes additional considerations for the City as the planned network is built out.

Review on-street signed bike routes:

The system of on-street signed bike routes has not been updated in over ten years. Since more development has occurred in Plano and traffic has increased, a detailed review of all the designated signed routes needs to be conducted.

Implement aesthetic improvements to trails in utility easements:

A limited amount of landscaping is allowed in utility easements so as to not interfere with the infrastructure. Some treatments could be applied to make the trails more aesthetically pleasing, including low-lying brush as well as hardscape treatments. These types of treatments have been implemented in Richardson and Austin.

Capitalize on robust trail network tourism opportunities:

As more of the trail network is built out, there will be long stretches on continuous trail. The City could capitalize on this feature by hosting marathons and half marathons completely on trails. Most cities in the Metroplex that host long races rely on using parts of roads, so this would be a unique selling point for Plano and further enhance the economic benefit of parks and trails.
Continue to review local trail standards:

NCTCOG has adopted design considerations for regional and community pathways. For regional pathways, which are defined as trails that travel through cities and provide connections to major destinations, NCTCOG recommends 12-14 feet minimum width. For community pathways, which are generally shorter in length and may terminate within a community, NCTCOG recommends 10-14 feet width. When the City of Plano reviews trail standards in the future, staff should consider adopting these regional design standards.

Address ADA accessibility of existing trails:

As trails age, distressed and crumbling pavement can become an ADA issue. The City should maintain an inventory of trail pavement condition and repair ADA concerns as they arise.

Conduct a trails and bikeways master plan:

This plan should include a detailed inventory, analysis, criteria for selecting treatments on corridors, trail and bikeway standards for the City to adopt, cost estimates, and prioritization of key corridors for funding.
IMPLEMENTATION
INTRODUCTION

The recommendations in this master plan are meant to be realized over a period of 25 years. Therefore, action items must be prioritized to assist with budgeting for improvements. This chapter summarizes all of the recommendations in this plan, assigns a relative priority, and discusses potential funding sources. The resulting implementation action plan is meant to serve as a guide for future budgeting, capital expenditures, and development of bond proposals.
ACTIONS PLAN

The action plan is divided up into three timeframes and includes the following types of implementation items:

**Policy Actions:**
Official procedures or policies used to guide City decisions.

**Land Acquisition:**
Land to be purchased or dedicated for use as parkland.

**Studies/Plans:**
An official investigation or analysis needed to determine the most appropriate solution.

**Park Development and Improvement:**
Recommendations to develop parkland and to make improvements to existing park infrastructure.

**Recreation and Aquatic Facilities:**
Recommendations to develop recreation and aquatic facilities and to make improvements to existing facility infrastructure.

**Trails and Bikeways:**
Recommendations to develop trail and bikeways and to make improvements to existing trail and bikeway infrastructure.

1 TO 5 YEARS

The action plan for the initial five years includes policy actions, individual park master plans, larger city-wide studies, park improvements, facility enhancements, and trail construction.

**LAND ACQUISITION: 1-5 YEARS**
- Acquire land in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map to provide additional park and open space, particularly in the downtown area and the Northwest Legacy area.

**POLICY ACTIONS: 1-5 YEARS**
- Park Fee Ordinance Revision: In order to reflect a more accurate cost of parkland acquisition and park development, the City should assess the existing park fee ordinance and propose changes.
- Interdepartmental Collaboration: Many of the special area park strategies discussed in Chapter 4 can only be realized as a collaborative effort with other departments. The Planning and Engineering departments will be critical partners in realizing the recommendations.
- Review Standards for Sidewalks, Trail Widths: NCTCOG has updated trail and bikeway standards that the City should consider incorporating into their existing standards.
- Open Space Requirements: Plano currently has open space requirements for new development; these requirements should be reviewed and updated to ensure that meaningful, usable open space is required.

**STUDIES/PLANS: 1-5 YEARS**
- Conduct park master plans for currently undeveloped parkland, including Legacy Drive Park, Moore Park, and South Central Community Park.
- Conduct an assessment of senior recreation needs to further define and address senior facility and programming needs.
- Conduct a Trail and Bikeway Master Plan study that includes a review and update of the on-street signed bike routes and meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Conduct an assessment of leisure programming and schedules to evaluate new requests from citizens.
- Conduct an assessment of leisure programming and schedules to consider diverse accommodation in response to demographic changes.

**PARK DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT: 1-5 YEARS**
- Construct the Rowlett Creek Greenbelt Park in accordance with the master plan and design for the park.
- Implement park infrastructure improvements to renovate up to 10 neighborhood parks and to develop and enhance up to 5 community parks. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
- Implement streetscape enhancements on K Avenue near downtown and on Headquarters Drive in the Northwest Legacy area.
• Construct one site-specific maintenance facility and one new maintenance facility.
• Construct the Windhaven Meadows Park playground and splashpad in accordance with the master plan and design for the park.

RECREATION AND AQUATIC FACILITIES: 1-5 YEARS
• Implement recreation and aquatic facility infrastructure improvements to renew recreation facilities. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
• Make improvements to the Harry Rowlinson Natatorium, to include updating signage, renovating the locker rooms and office area, and addressing ventilation.

TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS: 1-5 YEARS
• Design and construct trails as funds allow.
• Implement thoroughfare crossing improvements at five trail crossings with pedestrian hybrid beacons and enhanced paving.

6 TO 10 YEAR ACTION PLAN
The action plan for years 6-10 includes land acquisition for a neighborhood park, additional master plans and feasibility studies, park development, improvements to existing recreation facilities, and trail improvements.

LAND ACQUISITION: 6-10 YEARS
• Acquire land for a neighborhood park in underserved areas.
• Acquire land in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map to provide additional park and open space, particularly in the downtown area and the Northwest Legacy area.

STUDIES/PLANS: 6-10 YEARS
• Conduct a park master plan for the currently undeveloped FM 544/14th Street Park Site.
• Develop a study focused on demand for recreation in the northwest part of the city.
• Conduct feasibility studies for a downtown area activity center, US 75 signature pedestrian bridge, and Legacy Deck Park.

PARK DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT: 6-10 YEARS
• Construct Legacy Drive Park and Moore Park in accordance with the master plans and designs for the two parks.
• Implement park infrastructure improvements to renovate up to 10 neighborhood parks and to develop and enhance up to 5 community parks. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
• Work with developers to incorporate meaningful open space in the Downtown and Northwest Legacy areas.
• Install 6-8 artificial turf fields

RECREATION AND AQUATIC FACILITIES: 6-10 YEARS
• Implement recreation and aquatic facility infrastructure improvements to renew recreation facilities. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
• Construct an indoor court facility with a minimum of six courts.
• Implement improvements to existing centers, including the addition of shade structures at Jack Carter Pool and the addition of a multi-purpose exercise room at the Muehlenbeck Center.

TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS: 6-10 YEARS
• Design and construct trails as funds allow.
• Implement thoroughfare crossing improvements at five trail crossings with pedestrian hybrid beacons and enhanced paving.
• Construct intersection enhancements to enhance aesthetics for trails in utility easements.
11 TO 25 YEARS

The action plan for years 11-25 includes land acquisition for a neighborhood park, new recreation center, signature special area park elements, and additional trail improvements. It is important to note that a new park master plan will likely be conducted before these actions are realized, so the recommendations may change in accordance with future needs and context.

LAND ACQUISITION: 11-25 YEARS
- Acquire land for a neighborhood park in underserved areas.
- Acquire land in accordance with the Park Master Plan Map to provide additional park and open space, particularly in the downtown area and the Northwest Legacy area.

STUDIES/PLANS: 11-25 YEARS
- Conduct a comprehensive parks, recreation, trails, and open space master plan update to reflect updated trends and community context.

PARK DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT: 11-25 YEARS
- Construct the South Central Community Park and FM 544/14th Street Park in accordance with the master plans and designs for the two parks.
- Implement park infrastructure improvements to renovate up to 15 neighborhood parks and to develop and enhance up to 10 community parks. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
- Depending on the results of the feasibility studies, construct the US 75 signature pedestrian bridge and the Legacy Deck Park.
- Install 6-8 artificial turf fields
- Construct one new maintenance facility.

RECREATION AND AQUATIC FACILITIES: 11-25 YEARS
- Implement recreation and aquatic facility infrastructure improvements to renew recreation facilities. The ‘Sample Improvements’ table lists recommended improvements and an approximate cost range.
- Depending on the results of the feasibility study, construct an urban-oriented center in the downtown area to serve both the Douglass Community residents and downtown residents.

TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS: 11-25 YEARS
- Design and construct trails as funds allow.
The below table shows the sample improvements referenced in the previous section for renovating neighborhood parks, developing and enhancing community parks, and renewing recreation facilities.

**SAMPLE IMPROVEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovate Neighborhood Parks</th>
<th>Develop &amp; Enhance Community Parks</th>
<th>Renew Recreation Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Artificial turf field</td>
<td>Adaptive recreation space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique play structures</td>
<td>Outdoor classroom</td>
<td>Inclusionary programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>Nature viewing areas</td>
<td>Space for outdoor programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade structures</td>
<td>Trail markers</td>
<td>Flexible space in centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Wi-Fi enabled parks</td>
<td>Technology in centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native landscaping</td>
<td>Wayfinding signag</td>
<td>Life-long learning opportuities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice space</td>
<td>Splash pad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible space</td>
<td>Updated restroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking paths</td>
<td>Updated pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: $500,000 to $1,250,000  
Range: $3,000,000 to $6,000,000  
Range: $1,000,000 to $3,000,000
FUNDING SOURCES

There are a variety of funding sources that can be utilized to realize the plan implementation actions. This section describes typical city-generated funding sources, funding opportunities from the state and federal government, and additional opportunities such as shared use agreements and partnerships. All park land acquisitions and improvements are funded through voter-approved bond authority initiatives and the City’s annual budget process, with City Council approval.

CITY GENERATED FUNDING SOURCES

General Fund Expenditures are primarily used for improvements or repairs to existing parks and facilities. Typical general fund expenditures are for smaller repair and replacement efforts.

Bond Funds are primarily targeted for new facilities. The City of Plano has a strong history of successful bond programs.

Electric Utility Partnerships can be established for utility easement trails. This partnership typically does not involve monetary contributions. However, it does include use agreements for easements held by utility companies.

Park Donations Funds can be used for applicable projects, equipment, and general facility improvements.

Park Fee Ordinance is an ordinance a city can enact to impose a fee on developers when a new development is built to pay for developing or improving parks. Depending on the structure of the ordinance, the city can require land to be dedicated for parks, cash in lieu of land for park development, or park development fees.

Tree Mitigation Funds are fines that a city levies against developers for removing quality trees for development. The revenue generated is used to plant trees and to irrigate City properties.

STATE FUNDING SOURCES

TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT (TPWD) funds the following grants:

Outdoor Recreation Grants provide 50% matching grant funds to cities, counties, Municipal Utility Districts (MUDs), and other special districts with a population less than 500,000 to acquire and develop parkland or to renovate existing public recreation areas. There are two funding cycles per year with a maximum award of $500,000. Projects must be completed within three years of approval. Application deadlines are October 1st of each year (the master plans submission deadline is 60 days prior to application deadline). Award notifications occur 6 months after deadlines.

Indoor Recreation (Facility) Grants provide 50% matching grant funds to municipalities, counties, MUDs and other local units of government with a population less than 500,000 to construct recreation centers, community centers, nature centers and other facilities (buildings). The grant maximum is $750,000 per application. The application deadline is October 1st each year (with master plan submission deadline 60 days prior to application deadline). Award notifications occur the following January.

Community Outdoor Outreach Program (CO-OP) Grants provide funding to local governments and non-profit organizations for programming that introduces underserved populations to environmental and conservation programs as well as TPWD mission-oriented outdoor activities. This is not a land acquisition or construction grant; this is only for programs. Grants are awarded to non-profit organizations, schools, municipalities, counties, cities, and other tax-exempt groups. Minimum grant requests are $5,000 and maximum grant requests are $50,000. The application deadline is February 1st.

Recreational Trail Grants are administrated by TPWD in Texas under the approval of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This federally funded program receives its funding from a portion of federal gas taxes paid on fuel used in non-highway recreational vehicles. The grants can be up to 80% of project cost with a maximum of $200,000 for non-motorized trail grants and currently there is not a maximum amount for motorized trail grants. Funds can be spent on both motorized and non-motorized recreational trail projects such as the construction of new recreational trails, to improve existing trails, to develop trailheads or trailside facilities, and to acquire trail corridors. Application deadline is February 1st each year.
Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Grants are administered by TPWD through the Texas Recreation Park Account. If an entity is applying for an Indoor Grant, Outdoor Grant, or Small Community Grant, TPWD may consider the application for LWCF funding. No separate application is required.

OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING SOURCES

Collin County Parks & Open Space Project Funding Assistance Program allows cities within Collin County to apply for Parks and Open Space bond funds. Such funds are allocated on a competitive basis to assist cities in implementation of Parks and Open Space Projects which are consistent with the Collin County Parks and Open Space Strategic Plan dated October 2001.

Regional Transportation Council Partnership Program

Through the Local Air Quality Program, NCTCOG’s Regional Transportation Council will fund transportation projects that address the new air quality standard, including traffic signal timing, trip reduction, air quality outreach and marketing programs, vanpool programs, bicycle/pedestrian regional connections, high-emitting-vehicle programs, diesel freight programs, off-road construction vehicle emissions reduction programs, park-and-ride facilities, and other air quality strategies.

Transportation Alternatives Program

The Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA Set-Aside) Program was authorized under Section 1109 of Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) and provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives. NCTCOG is sub-allocated program funds to award to cities in the Dallas-Fort Worth region. General types of projects eligible under this program include on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure associated with Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects that will substantially improve safety and the ability for students to walk and bicycle to school.

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

National Park Service (NPS) Programs include the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act (UPARR), which provide funds for parks and recreation. Congress appropriates both funds. Typically, the funding sources have supported traditional parks rather than linear systems. Funding for the State of Texas exceeded $1.2 million in 2008.

Environmental Protection Agency can provide funding for projects with money collected in pollution settlements.

OTHER FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Organizations and shared-use agreements are other funding opportunities that have proven successful in many communities. Organizations that could be utilized to partner on funding opportunities include:

- Adopt a Park
- Friends Groups
- Service Groups
- Business Sponsorship Opportunities
- Youth Service Providers

Plano currently has agreements in place with other entities such as Plano ISD and the Boys and Girls Club of Collin County to provide services. Other opportunities include:

- Joint Programs: Programs that are jointly planned and executed by two or more entities (i.e. wellness activities with local hospitals or special events with Chamber of Commerce).
- Social Issue Action: Opportunity for entities to partners to take on a critical or important social issue.
- Joint Facility Usage: Agreement to share facilities, often with school districts or other recreation providers.
- Inter-City Partnerships: Opportunities exist to partner with surrounding cities to pursue joint-use park and recreation facilities.
TPWD COMPLIANCE AND CAPRA ACCREDITATION COMPONENTS

As discussed in Chapter 1, the City of Plano seeks to be accredited by CAPRA and to be eligible for TPWD grant funding. This master plan is an important component to both CAPRA accreditation and TPWD funding eligibility.

CAPRA Accreditation:
The Parks Master Plan is one required element of the accreditation process and plans must include the following items:

- Agency mission and objectives (see Department Mission and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Recreation and leisure trends analysis (see Trends and Lifestyle Benchmarking section in Chapter 2)
- Needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4, 5, and 6)
- Community inventory (see Natural & Cultural Resources, Physical Development, and Demographics sections in Chapter 2)
- Level of service standards (see Needs Assessment section in Chapter 4)

TPWD Compliance: Minimum requirements for the plan include:

- Summary of accomplishments since previous plan (see Previous Master Plan section in Chapter 2)
- New, pertinent public input (see Public Input section in Chapter 3)
- Inventory data (see Parks Inventory section in Chapter 4)
- Updated needs assessment (see Needs Assessment sections in Chapters 4, 5, and 6)
- Priorities (see High Priority Needs List section in Chapter 7)
- Implementation plan (see Chapter 7)
- Demographics (see Demographics section in Chapter 2)
- Goals and objectives (see Goals and Objectives section in Chapter 3)
- Standards (see Recommendations section in Chapters 4-6)
- Maps (see Figures 4.20 and 6.2 for recommendation maps)

HIGH PRIORITY NEEDS LIST

Consistent with TPWD requirements, the 1 to 5 year Action Plan in this chapter lists the top priorities for parks, recreation, open space, and trails in Plano. These priorities have been determined based on extensive stakeholder and citizen outreach, needs assessments, and staff input in order to provide an effective set of actions to enhance quality of life in the community.

CONCLUSION

This parks, recreation, and open space master plan represents a defined vision of what Plano citizens, stakeholders, staff, and elected officials seek for the future of the parks system. As Plano continues to evolve as a city, maintaining park infrastructure and keeping up with demand for parks and recreation services will be a critical component to preserving the city’s established quality of excellence.
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SPECIAL AREA PARK EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section includes additional analysis and discussion of the two special area park study areas discussed in Chapter 4.
EXISTING STUDIES

There are several planning studies that have already been conducted for the downtown area. The Downtown Plano Vision & Strategy Update (2017) provides an update on the accomplishments and refined vision for the downtown area. A few of the vision strategies included parks and open space components; the vision calls for pedestrian-friendly streets and prioritizes connecting the current and future DART stations and sidewalk connectivity in neighborhoods. The vision also calls for common open space that is flexible and isn’t too large as to not separate the downtown fabric.

Additionally, the Downtown Plano Arts, Culture, and Events Plan (2015) discusses the importance of cultural spaces and public art in the downtown area. Goals and recommendations relevant to parks and open space in this plan include using public spaces to further the arts, creating a unique identity and sense of place through the arts, and expanding and improving downtown signage and kiosks.

Other plans that address downtown include the Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Plano Retail Action Plan, and Downtown Plano: Creating a Transit Village.
EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS

Within the downtown area there are several mixed-use multi-family developments. Together, these complexes comprise about 742 units and are within walking distance to the Downtown Plano DART station.

Planned developments in downtown include an additional apartment complex with ground floor retail on the site of a former municipal building. The complex will have about 184 residential units and additional restaurant space.

Planned developments outside of downtown but within the study area include the master planned Heritage Creekside development located in the northwest corner of Custer Road and the President George Bush Turnpike. The first phase of this 156 acre planned development is underway and when the entire development is completed it will include 1,300 apartment units, several hundred townhomes and single-family homes, retail, and 2,500,000 square feet of corporate office space. According to the development plan from 2016, there will be open space around Pittman Creek and scattered throughout the development, but there will not be formal public park space.
FUTURE LAND USE

According to the 2015 Land Use dataset from the North Central Texas Council of Governments, approximately 175 acres of land is undeveloped, which is roughly 6% of the entire study area.

Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan developed a future land use map to determine appropriate locations for future uses and activities while establishing a set of design characteristics for district areas within the City.

EMPLOYMENT CENTER

The industrial area to the southeast of downtown is categorized as ‘Employment Center’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. The description of this category states that primary uses should be corporate office campuses, medical centers, educational facilities, technology centers, research facilities, and manufacturing and warehouses uses. There is no mention of parks, open space, or connectivity for this category.

COMPACT COMPLETE CENTER

The portions of the study area west of US 75 that aren’t categorized as current or future parkland are identified as ‘Compact Complete Center.’ The area along Shiloh Rd and 14th Street is also designated as Compact Complete Center since redevelopment in this area is expected once the Cotton Belt rail line is completed. The description of this category from the comprehensive plan describes these areas as those that ‘may see new growth or experience significant redevelopment.’ Mixed-use development is most appropriate in these areas with usable public space and neighborhoods should be easily navigable by walking or biking.

TRANSIT CORRIDOR

The most amount of land in the downtown study area is categorized as ‘Transit Corridor’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. This includes the downtown business district and the areas along the future Cotton Belt passenger rail line. The description of this category from the comprehensive plan describes the vision of downtown Plano as a ‘distinct and authentic urban center’ and seeks to ‘expand the vision for transit-oriented development within the entire corridor.’ Additionally, bike trail and sidewalk improvements are emphasized to create a more ‘accessible, walkable, and unified corridor.’ Interesting and active public spaces are recommended for the district as well.
**REGIONAL CENTER**

The southeastern corner of the study area is designated as ‘Regional Center’ in the plan. This category applies to large commercial developments within high traffic corridors that are intended to have a mixture of large shopping centers, restaurants, theaters, offices, and mixed-use residential development. New apartments were recently built in this area and it is expected that more commercial development will occur. The description also notes that usable open space should be included to create ‘active and interesting public spaces.’

**OPEN SPACE NETWORK**

Haggard Park, Douglass Community Center, Stimpson and Drake Park, Chisholm Trail, and the potential future parkland west of US 75 are designated as ‘Open Space Network.’ The comprehensive plan description states that these areas are ‘intended to retain their character to provide regional recreation and leisure opportunities.’

**SOCIAL NETWORK**

Harrington Park is categorized as ‘Social Network’ in the future land use map. The plan describes these areas as colleges, universities, major public schools, athletic complexes, recreational facilities, libraries, golf courses, country clubs, and large private open spaces. Again, these areas are ‘intended to retain their character to provide regional recreation and social opportunities.’
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY

The Chisholm Trail is a 5.4-mile long shared use path that begins just south of Harrington Park in the downtown study area. There are also walking paths located within Haggard Park. The City has also recently constructed a sidepath along 15th Street from the Chisholm Trail to Haggard Park and the Downtown Plano DART station and along Park Boulevard to connect the Chisholm Trail to the Park Boulevard DART station. Overall, there are about 2.4 miles of walking paths within the downtown study area. There are also portions of streets designated as signed bike routes. Major streets with signed bike routes in the study area include G Avenue, 14th Street, 10th Street, Summit Avenue, and K Avenue. Sidewalk connectivity is best within the core part of downtown and is lacking toward Central Expressway and within older neighborhoods.

There are also several planned trails and bikeways within the downtown study area. These include another branch of the Chisholm Trail on the other side of Spring Creek, a connection through the current Collin Creek Mall, trails along the Cotton Belt and DART rail lines, and a trail within the utility easement in the very southern portion of the study area. Portions of the Regional Veloweb, which is a network of shared use paths that NCTCOG compiles, also go through the downtown study area. This includes the planned trails along the DART Red Line and the Cotton Belt Line as well as the Chisholm Trail west of US 75. Figure I.1 shows the existing trails and bikeways in the downtown study area.

Figure I.1 Downtown Study Area: Trails and Bikeways
Additionally, there are a number of events that occur in downtown that draw in people from across Plano and beyond. As with many events, these events close down parts of streets to traffic to allow for more activity. These events and associated road closures include:

- Plano ArtFest, H Ave between 15th and 16th streets closed
- Asia Fest, H Ave between 15th and 16th streets closed
- Night Out on 15th, 15th Street between K Ave and H Ave closed
- North Texas Come As You Are Festival, H Ave between 15th and 16th streets closed
- Plano International Festival, H Ave between 15th and 16th streets closed
- SteinFest, 15th Street, H Ave, I Ave, K Ave, and J Place closed
- Dickens in Downtown Plano, 15th street from H Ave to K Ave closed

**TRANSIT ACCESS**

The Downtown Plano area is currently accessible by the DART Red Line and bus routes. The Downtown Plano Station is located on the east side of Haggard Park and the average daily ridership as of 2012 was 829. Multiple agencies are also working to make the Cotton Belt Rail line a reality. This regional rail would connect Plano to DFW Airport and beyond to Fort Worth. The planned stops in Plano are the 12th Street Station at the intersection of 12th Street and K Avenue and the Shiloh Road station in the northeastern corner of the study area.
LEGACY STUDY AREA
EXISTING STUDIES

One existing study for the Legacy area is the Plano Legacy Business Area Mobility Study. The study boundaries for this report covers roughly the same area as the special area park boundary and was conducted to assess existing and projected traffic and recommend solutions for continued mobility and accessibility as the area continues to grow. Many of the recommendations were related to transportation demand management strategies since continuing to add capacity is not a viable option. There is also a section in the report on Active Transportation; the plan called for safer pedestrian infrastructure that connected employees to retail and residential areas. According to the report, within the Legacy Business Area there is 148,000 LF of existing sidewalk, 26,600 LF of sidewalk in conjunction with proposed development, and 128,700 LF of needed or priority sidewalks. High priority actions related to bicycle and pedestrian recommendations included filling in gaps in the existing sidewalk network, adding bike racks to offices, creating bike sharing programs, and adding pedestrian equipment at intersections.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS

Until about ten years ago, the Legacy area was primarily corporate campuses, but the area has become more diverse with additional retail and residential. The Shops at Legacy was the first major mixed-use development in the area just east of the Dallas North Tollway. The area east of the tollway also features several restaurants, bars, and boutiques. The recently completed Legacy West development is just across the tollway from the Shops at Legacy and includes one existing (Grand at Legacy West) and another planned (LVL 29) residential complex. Finally, Granite Park is a development southeast of the Dallas North Tollway/Sam Rayburn Tollway interchange that includes offices, hotel, retail, and restaurants.

Additionally, plans are in motion to develop the existing farmland owned by the Baccus family in the northwest corner of the Tollway and Spring Creek Parkway. This will include retail, restaurants, and office development.
FUTURE LAND USE

According to the 2015 Land Use dataset from NCTCOG, approximately 129 acres of land are undeveloped, which is roughly 3% of the entire study area. Additionally, JC Penney has sold a significant amount of land that was once part of their corporate campus; as a result, retail, office, and residential development is occurring. Other corporate campuses in the area may decide to take this approach as well, which could mean additional residential in areas that are currently just office.

Employment Center

The largest amount of land in the Legacy area is categorized as ‘Employment Center’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. This encompasses the existing corporate campus areas, including the area between Preston Road and Parkwood Boulevard, and west of Communications Parkway. The description of this category from the plan states that primary uses should be corporate office campuses, medical centers, educational facilities, technology centers, research facilities, and manufacturing and warehouses uses. There is no mention of parks, open space, or connectivity for this category.
Compact Complete Center

The area bordered by SH 121 to the north, Parkwood Boulevard to the east, Tennyson Parkway to the south, and Communications Parkway to the west is categorized as ‘Compact Complete Center’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. This area encompasses the Shops at Legacy and Legacy West developments. The description of this category from the plan describes these areas as those that ‘may see new growth or experience significant redevelopment.’ Mixed-use development is most appropriate in these areas and usable public space should be included as well as neighborhoods that are easily navigated by walking or biking.

Expressway Corridor

The area to the south of Spring Creek Parkway surrounding the Dallas North Tollway is designated as ‘Expressway Corridor’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. These areas are meant to classify development along major expressways and may include a mix of retail, service, office, restaurant, medical, hotel, and technology based uses. Parks and open space are not mentioned in this category.

Neighborhood

Existing single-family neighborhoods and other areas in the southern part of the study area are categorized as ‘Neighborhood’ in the comprehensive plan future land use map. The plan description states that these areas consist primarily of residential areas with well-maintained infrastructure, housing, open space, schools, and limited service/institutional users.

Open Space Network

Future trail corridors in the southern part of the study area are designated as ‘Open Space Network.’ The comprehensive plan description states that these areas are ‘intended to retain their character to provide regional recreation and leisure opportunities.’
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY

Within the Legacy study area, there are both existing and planned trails already in place. The Bluebonnet Trail, an 8.3 mile trail that traverses east-west throughout the city, follows along Spring Creek Parkway in the Legacy study area. In the very eastern part of the study area, the 1.6 mile Legacy Trail follows White Rock Creek. There is also a sidepath on Legacy Drive between Parkwood Boulevard and the Tollway. There are also many streets designated as signed bike routes within the study area, including: Headquarters Drive; Corporate Drive; Tennyson Parkway; Communications Parkway, Parkwood Boulevard; and, Windcrest Drive.

Planned trails and bikeways in the study area include a continuation of the sidepath on Legacy Drive to go from the Legacy Trail all the way to the Sam Rayburn Tollway access road. A sidepath is also planned along Parkwood Boulevard from Spring Creek Parkway to the Sam Rayburn Tollway access road. There is an existing gap in the Legacy Trail just south of Legacy that is planned to be completed, as well as a connection from the Bluebonnet Trail east of Preston to the Legacy Trail west of the roadway. Portions of the Regional Veloweb that go through the Legacy study area include the Bluebonnet Trail and the Legacy Trail. Figure 4.17 shows the existing and currently planned trails and bikeways in the Legacy study area.

Figure 4.17 Legacy Study Area: Trails and Bikeways
No passenger rail service currently serves the Legacy study area. However, there is a large DART bus transfer station called the Northwest Plano Park and Ride located west of the Tollway between Tennyson Parkway and Spring Creek Parkway. Routes that are served at this park and ride include 183, 208, 211, 346, 347, 451, and 452. DART also operates a small shuttle between Legacy West and the Toyota headquarters.

Additionally, when many of the existing corporate campuses were built, sidewalk requirements were waived; this resulted in lots of sidewalk gaps in the area. However, all development that has occurred in the past three years has required either a sidewalk or trail to be built.
Page left blank on purpose
SPECIAL REVIEW PARK AND RECREATION
FACILITY ASSESSMENT

Since there are over eighty parks in the city’s system, the project team
worked with staff to identify ten parks that would be reviewed more
closely. The recommendations for these parks discussed in this section
could be applied to other parks in the system as well. This section also
includes a more in-depth review of each of the existing recreation and
aquatic facilities.
BOB WOODRUFF PARK

AMENITIES

- 4 Backstops
- 1 Multi-Purpose Court
- 1 Lighted Sand Volleyball Court
- 1 Playground Area
- 3.6 Miles of Shared-Use Paths
- 1 Stocked Fishing Pond
- 1 Fishing Pier
- 1 Sculpture
- 2 Large Pavilions
- 1 Small Pavilion
- 120 Picnic units
- 10 BBQ Grills
- 14 Benches
- 5 Drinking Fountains
- 5 Plaques/Monuments
- 3 Foot Bridges
- 2 Restroom Buildings
- 220 Parking Spaces

ADDRESS: 2601 SAN GABRIEL DRIVE
ACREAGE: 324.16
YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1976
BOB WOODRUFF PARK

DESCRIPTION

One of the largest parks in Plano, Bob Woodruff is named for a former City Manager and is divided into a north and south section split by Park Boulevard. In the smaller southern portion, there is a large wooded area with perimeter trail, parking lot, restroom, and pavilion. The setting in this part of the park is very quiet and peaceful, allowing for idyllic walks along the expansive trail system and includes an orienteering course for more adventurous park patrons.

In the larger, more programmed northern portion, there is a stocked pond and fishing pier, sand volleyball court, basketball court, backstops, playground, pavilion, wooded area, and trails. Additionally, Plano ISD operates an environmental learning center in the northwest corner of the park property. The park is referred to as parque de patos or ‘duck park’ by Hispanic patrons and the pavilion on the northern side is among the most frequently rented in the city. Newer park amenities include terraced seating next to the pavilion, WiFi access, and the opportunity to use canoes and kayaks in the pond. The city plans to construct a dog park just across from the park at Shiloh Rd and Park Blvd. Additionally, the park is used frequently by outdoor summer camps.
Areas of opportunity for the park include updating older facilities such as the two restroom buildings, fishing pier, and trails that no longer meet standard minimum widths and have ADA compliance issues. There are also gaps in connectivity where the park trail ends and is not connected to adjoining sidewalks in the southern portion of the park. The park would also benefit from a robust wayfinding signage program; since it’s such a large park, the amenities would be better utilized if they were more discoverable. If there is enough demand, a kayak launch and rental structure could also be added next to the pond to encourage the recently sanctioned activity.

Additionally, the park is part of the open space network that spans nearly the entire eastern border of Plano. The city can leverage the presence of the environmental learning center and orienteering course by installing interpretative, educational signage throughout the park in both English and Spanish. Additionally, the natural beauty of Rowlett Creek should be made more accessible through observation points.
BOB WOODRUFF PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

OVERALL PARK RECOMMENDATIONS

- Conduct a **master plan** effort to redevelop the park (focus: enhance what’s working, replace what’s not working)
- Implement **wayfinding** signage to direct to amenities, etc.
- **Replace site furnishings** (trash receptacles, benches, older picnic tables)
- Add **mile markers** along trail
- Construct **lighting** along walking trail where needed
BOB WOODRUFF PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

BOB WOODRUFF NORTH
- Replace fishing pier and make it more ADA accessible
- Add shade toppers to playground equipment
- Add lighting near playground to deter vandalism
- Add interpretative signage about the types of ducks/wildlife/plants you can see at park

BOB WOODRUFF SOUTH
- Install plaque with artist information by tree stump art installation
- Replace older picnic tables and BBQ grills to match newer equipment
- Better organize site furniture
- Install a marked soft-surface trail into the part of the park south of the pavilion
- Remove white fence by parking lot
- Provide better ADA access to site amenities throughout park
- Add interpretative signage to go along with orienteering course (i.e. tree identification, wildlife, history
- Replace restroom facilities (2)
BOB WOODRUFF PARK

OVERALL PARK RECOMMENDATIONS

- Develop a theme or design style unique to Bob Woodruff
- Replace trail to upgrade to standard minimum width and fix ADA issue
- Stabilize erosive pond edge with permanent solution
- Expand trail opportunities

BOB WOODRUFF NORTH

- Construct 30-40 seat amphitheater to be used by the Boy Scouts of America day camps
- Consider adding additional practice field
- Construct paddle boat launch and rental structure

ESTIMATED COSTS

$5.3 Million
CLEARVIEW PARK

ADDRESS: 4000 EAGLE PASS
ACREAGE: 6.88
YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1978

AMENITIES

2    Backstops
1    Multi-Purpose Court
1    Climbing Boulder
1    Playground Area

0.6 Miles of Shared-Use Paths
1    Small Pavilion
4    Picnic units
2    BBQ Grills
8    Benches
1    Drinking Fountain
Located just west of US 75 in central Plano, Clearview Park was recently updated in 2013. The park serves as a model for what neighborhood parks adjacent to schools in Plano can look like after a master plan is implemented due to the clustered program elements, playground equipment that is suitable for children of all ages, and a well-lit walking trail with ADA accessible connections to the exterior network. The condition of the playground equipment and basketball court is very good since it is so new. A unique feature at Clearview is a trellis that acts as an extension to the pavilion to provide additional gathering space.

Potential Improvements: Minor improvements could be made to enhance the park even more. There are several ADA-accessible ramps leading from the park perimeter walking trail to the adjacent street but there are no crosswalks to clearly mark the crossing point. Additionally, there are some lights along the walking trail but more could be installed for safety. Also, the park is newly renovated but it lacks unique features that reflect the character of the surrounding, well-established neighborhood. Such features could include interpretative signage about the history of the neighborhood or information on nearby Bowman Branch Creek.
CLEARVIEW PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Add shade toppers to playground area
- Update entry signage (system-wide recommendation)
- Add attractive, native landscaping and planting
- Add interpretative signage as a unique element
CLEARVIEW PARK

LONG-TERM GOALS
- Update equipment as needed

ESTIMATED COSTS:
$370,000
Hackberry Park is one of the few neighborhood parks in Plano that is not adjacent to a school; instead, it is surrounded by a mix of different residential types including garden-style apartments, an existing single-family neighborhood dating from the 1970’s, and a new residential subdivision currently under construction. While these adjacent residents all benefit greatly from the open space, they are likely to utilize the park in different ways.
Currently, the park is in good condition. Portions of the perimeter walking trail were recently repaved due to the construction of Kerr Drive on the south side of the park; new ADA-compliant connections to the exterior sidewalks were installed and landscaping was included as part of the road construction. Observations revealed that the perimeter walking trail is well-used by neighbors as well as the playground equipment and pavilion structure which have been replaced in recent years. The park has no dedicated parking lot, so users tend to walk here or park along the street.

Potential Improvements: Although the park is well utilized, there are areas within it that can be improved to better serve the residents. These include repositioning the multi-use court slightly farther away from the street, adding shade toppers and more mulch to the playground, and lastly, adding elements to make the park unique to its setting. These could include programming items such as workout stations, separate seating areas within the mature trees, and screening of the alley along the northern edge of the site. The open play field should also be fine-graded to fill in holes and even out the surface for a better play experience. Finally, to provide safer access from the neighborhoods and apartments, clear crosswalk striping and signage should be implemented at primary access points.
HACKBERRY PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Add shade toppers to playground
- Add more mulch to the playground to make it more barrier-free
- Add elements to make park unique to its setting
- Update entry signage
- Update BBQ grills and trash receptacles
HACKBERRY PARK

APPENDICES

LONG-TERM GOALS

- Reposition the multi-use court so it's not so close to the street
- Complete reconstruction of rest of the perimeter walking trail
- Add interpretative signage

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$330,000
SOUTHCENTRALCOMMUNITYPARKSITE  

**ADDRESS:** NORTHWEST CORNER OF PARK BOULEVARD AND ALMA DRIVE  

**ACREAGE:** 51.10  

**DESCRIPTION**  
The city acquired this land in 2010 and intends to begin a master plan process in 2019 to develop a vision for the future community park. Prior to being purchased, the land was used for agriculture, so the site is primarily flat without vegetation. Spring Creek, a naturalized stream, runs through the northeast corner of the site as does the existing Chisholm Trail. The current Bicycle Transportation Plan shows a perimeter walking trail around the park site that will connect to the Chisholm Trail. The site is also close to Collin Creek Mall, which may be redeveloped in the future, so connectivity to the south on Alma Drive should be a priority.
SOUTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK SITE

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

The vision for this park site should be a multi-use community park. The area around the park is relatively dense and would complement nearby parks with scheduled athletic fields, including Harrington Park and Cheyenne Park, both of which are within three miles of the site.

Other opportunities that should be considered during the future park master plan process include preserving visual access to the naturalized Spring Creek and keeping as many of the existing trees as possible, which may result in a significant reforestation effort. Additionally, some constraints include potential soil remediation from agricultural products, lack of existing trees on most of the site, no existing sidewalks on the perimeter, and security concerns related to the alley that faces much of the northern boundary of the site. Finally, the power lines along Alma and Park could be buried to create a tree-lined promenade leading to the park; these improvements along with the park development would increase the value of adjacent homes.

LONG-TERM GOALS

• Construct community park
• Trail connectivity to Chisholm Trail

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$7.2 Million
HOBBLITZELLE PARK

ADDRESS: 7500 RED RIVER DRIVE
ACREAGE: 139.27
YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1970

AMENITIES

2 Soccer Fields
2 Playground Areas
3.8 Miles of Shared-Use Paths
1 Lacrosse Field
4 Football Goal Posts
1 Large Pavilion
5 BBQ Grills
1 Fire Pit
9 Benches
12 Bleachers
1 Drinking Fountain
2 Memorial Monuments
5 Foot Bridges
2 Restroom Buildings
250 Parking Spaces
Located in northeast Plano adjacent to Hendrick Middle School, Hoblitzelle is a large park with sports fields and abundant open space. The park is diverse programmatically; the active, ‘social’ section includes lacrosse and flag football fields and a large pavilion while the expansive passive areas feature walking trails that offer views of Russell Creek, wildflower areas, and an attractive pond. The pristine wooded areas serve as the key focal points of the park. Other positive aspects include the large pavilion that is unique both in style and function, the excellent condition of the restrooms, and plentiful parking.
Hoblitzelle Park is in a wonderful setting, however, there are still many opportunities for improvement. First, the existing playgrounds are outdated and should be replaced with newer equipment and barrier-free entry points. The site furniture is in fair condition and should be replaced over time. Screening is needed for the extra goal posts, bleachers, and trash cans. Another high-priority improvement is reconstruction of the trail; many portions are cracked and there are several instances where the trail width changes along the path. This should be made to be a continuous uniform width. Finally, wayfinding is a critical element that is needed to alert park visitors of all the different amenities available.
The park would also benefit from additional programming such as an amphitheater, interpretative walks, and playground equipment. An amphitheater could be built in the open space just downhill from the pavilion to host events. Additionally, there are two wildflower areas within the park that could be enhanced through interpretative signage as a ‘wildflower walk.’ Finally, there is a small extension of Hoblitzelle east of Alma Drive that needs a lot of attention. The playground equipment is very outdated and there are gaps in the sidewalk network connecting to the park. While this portion of the park serves as a convenient connection for the neighbors to access the larger park, it is in need of extensive updates.
HOBLITZELLE PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Conduct a master plan for the redevelopment of this park
- Consider feasibility of adding an amphitheater in the open space just downhill from the pavilion
- Update playground equipment (all 3 areas)
- Add interpretative signage around the wildflower areas & pond area
- Add benches to area next to pond for relaxation
- Power-wash/paint rusted light posts next to athletic fields
- Provide screening and secure extra goals, bleachers, & trash cans
- Add shade structures to the bleachers by the athletic fields
- Include wayfinding signag
- Ensure proper care for wildflower area
- Update entry signage
- Provide lighting along trail
HOBLITZELLE PARK

LONG-TERM GOALS
- Construct amphitheater
- Address ADA accessibility to the athletic fields
- Implement a tree planting plan
- Connect all segments of park with a continuous, uniform pedestrian trail

ESTIMATED COSTS:
$3.7 Million
ROWLETT CREEK GREENBELT PARK

ADDRESS: 1700 COUNTY CLUB DRIVE
ACREAGE: 196.50
YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1974

AMENITIES

1  Clubhouse
18  Holes

DESCRIPTION

Los Rios is an existing golf course that sits on approximately 200 acres with a club house. Over time, the course has seen less activity and the club has come to an agreement with the City to sell the land to be transformed into a public park called Rowlett Creek Greenbelt Park. Potential amenities that the city is considering include a trail connection to the Rowlett Greenbelt, disc golf course, and passive open space. The city is currently undergoing a park master plan effort for the site.
ROWLETT CREEK GREENBELT PARK

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

The site includes many existing ponds, existing parking, and mature trees. The condition of the cart paths would prevent them from being repurposed into walking paths. This site is the largest gap in the Rowlett Greenbelt in the eastern part of the city, so once it is repurposed as a park and includes a trail connection, the eastern greenbelt as a whole will increase dramatically in size. Potential constraints that should be considered include the existence of floodplain within the property, site access, and traffic management.

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Complete the master plan for park development – consider disc golf, mountain biking, and trail connections

LONG-TERM GOALS

- Enhance trail connectivity
- Construct programmed elements as per master plan

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$4.3 Million
MOORE PARK SITE

ADDRESS: SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CHAPARRAL RD. AND CLOVERHAVEN WAY

ACREAGE: 113.11

DESCRIPTION

Moore Park is undeveloped parkland owned by the City of Plano and bordered on two sides by the City of Allen. Previous updates to the park master plan proposed lighted athletic fields on the park site and there are several signs notifying neighbors of this proposed purpose.

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

The site was previously agricultural land, so the terrain is mostly flat with few trees, making it ideal for athletic fields. However, the park should also include amenities that nearby residents will use such as playgrounds, walking trails, and nature walks. Timed lighting should be provided with the athletic fields as well as a buffer between the fields and houses to reduce the noise and light impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. Since the park is bordered on three sides by neighborhoods, community involvement will be especially important during the park design process.

Additionally, the current Bicycle Transportation Plan identifies a proposed trail along the northern park boundary and eastern edge along Cottonwood Creek, so connectivity to the future trail is important. There is a small drainageway running through the park that could be converted into a focal point by adding a walking trail adjacent to it and adding native plants. Potential constraints include soil remediation from agricultural products.
MOORE PARK SITE

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Develop a master plan for the community park to include:
  - 12 full-size lighted turf sports field with the capability to overlay cricket field
  - Restrooms
  - Shaded gathering areas
  - Parking
  - Playground area
  - Storage areas for soccer goals, lacrosse goals, bleachers, benches, and litter barrels.

- Other elements to consider for the park include buffers/screening for the adjacent neighborhoods, light placement, trail connections, practice space, and clustering programmed elements.

LONG-TERM GOALS

- Construct park amenities
- Trail connectivity

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$8.4 Million
Old Shepard Place Park is a smaller community park in southwestern Plano adjacent to Huffman Elementary and Shepton High schools. The playground equipment is almost 20 years old, yet well-shaded and sees a lot of use since the schoolkids opt to use the parks playground instead of the school-owned playground. There are three softball fields and two soccer fields that are for scheduled use only and a perimeter walking trail provides access to exterior points throughout the park. The parking lot is also owned by the Parks Department but the school uses it.
OLD SHEPARD PLACE PARK

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

The vision of this park should focus on outdoor learning as the underlying theme. An outdoor classroom for students from the elementary school and high school could include terraced seating between the playground and Field A to serve as a ‘learning node’ for the park. Interesting pavement textures and color stains can also add to uniqueness of the park and help designate areas for children to line up after recess.

The soccer fields have some issues with uneven surfaces, partially due to an outdated irrigation system. In order to remedy the uneven fields, city staff is considering using Fraise leveling. Other needed improvements include new backstops, bleachers, site furnishings, and a new restroom. Enhanced landscaping and planting along the perimeter walking path would also make the park more inviting to visitors. Additionally, there needs to be a better pedestrian crossing at Winding Hollow Lane and Plano Parkway; a neighborhood entry sign and associated landscaping present a barrier to a pedestrian crossing.
OLD SHEPARD PLACE PARK

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Update restrooms
- Improve uneven playing field
- Extend walking trails to the athletic fields for ADA accessibility
- Better organize site furniture
- Develop a tree planting plan
- Paint the pavilion
- Add interpretative signage
- Add shade structures for bleachers and dugouts
- Replace backstops
- Replace bleachers
- Add entry kiosk with amenities in park
- Make field number easier to see
- Add decomposed granite around playground area
- Stain rock path to make it stand out more
- Add additional benches
- Add interesting pavement features at intersections of walking paths
- Add storage for goal posts and other equipment
- Construct mile markers on trail
- Renovate Playground
OLD SHEPARD PLACE PARK

• Add lighting along walking trail
• Replace entry signage and add landscaping

LONG-TERM GOALS

• Construct outdoor classroom with terraced seating
• Create a ‘Learning node’ in between field and playground

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$2.1 Million
PRESTON RIDGE TRAIL

**ADDRESS:** NORTH-SOUTH UTILITY EASEMENT BETWEEN ALMA ROAD AND COIT ROAD

**ACREAGE:** 106.88 ACRES; 7.09 MILES

**YEAR ESTABLISHED:** 1978

**AMENITIES**

7.09 miles of hike and bike trail

**DESCRIPTION**

This trail built in a utility easement is the second longest continuous trail in the city and serves as a major north/south route. However, trail users have to cross six major roadways, as well as several smaller roadways. Along the route there are several parks including Rasor, Carpenter, and Preston Meadow and the trail intersects with the Bluebonnet and Legacy Trails.

Positive aspects of the trail is that it provides a continuous north/south route through the city and there is an opportunity to extend the trail further south within the easement in the future. There is also a well-landscaped, attractive parking lot near the southern terminus of the trail that is a benefit for trail users coming by car. Finally, there is a bike repair station in Carpenter Park near where the Preston Ridge and Bluebonnet trails intersect.
Since the trail is in a utility easement, opportunities to add landscaping is limited due to Oncor restrictions on planting under the powerlines. An alternative for making the trail more unique would be distinctive wayfinding signage and pavement treatment at intersections. The wayfinding signage used for the Preston Ridge Trail could set a standard for the city by being unique and distinguishable. Mile markers could be added along the trail for safety and exercise purposes, as well as more benches and trash receptacles at pause points.

Additionally, Preston Ridge Trail crosses Park Boulevard, Parker Road, Spring Creek Parkway, Legacy Drive, Hedgcoxe Road, and McDermott Road. Many of the existing roadway crossings are not as safe as they could be; improvements that should be implemented range from crosswalk striping, color and texture treatment to the pavement, and pedestrian signals. Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB) could be used to make crossing safer. Finally, some sections of the trail are older and should be replaced to meet current standards for minimum trail width (recommend at least 12’ wide).
SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Develop a planting plan for areas where landscaping is allowed
- Add distinctive wayfinding signage for amenities along trail
- Add mile markers along trail
- Include larger signs in areas where trails intersect
- Add interesting monument or pavement color at trail intersection with Bluebonnet Trail
LONG-TERM GOALS

- **Replace older sections** of trail as needed
- **Add pavement treatment** or at least crosswalk striping at Park Boulevard, Parker Road, Spring Creek Parkway, Hedgcoxe Road, and McDermott Road (use Legacy Drive crossing as an example)
- Look into **Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons** at all major roadway crossings
- **Extend trail** south from Eldorado Drive to Plano Parkway
- **Smooth out radii** where possible to meet AASHTO standards

ESTIMATED COSTS:

$4.5 Million
**FM 544/14TH STREET PARK SITE**

**ADDRESS:** Southwest corner of 14th Street and Rowlett Creek

**ACREAGE:** 20.00

---

**DESCRIPTION**

The city owns just over 20 acres of land south of 14th Street in the southeast corner of the city to complete the greenbelt on the eastern edge of Plano. This site serves as an important link between existing and planned trail systems in Plano and Richardson. Once the trail that currently ends in Bob Woodruff Park is extended south through Pecan Hollow Golf Course and the future park at Los Rios, this 14th Street site will serve to connect to the Breckinridge Trail. The site is a wooded area around Rowlett Creek and mostly in the 100-year floodplain. Adjacent land uses are a gas station to the east and a storage complex to the west.

---

**POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS:**

Since the majority of this site is located in floodplain, the only development that can occur is a recreational trail connection and related amenities such as parking, trailheads, benches, water fountains, lighting, and trash receptacles. Once this trail connection is complete, a continuous north-south trail along Rowlett Creek will serve Plano residents from the Allen to Richardson city border. The trail connection could go underneath 14th Street but feasibility requires further research to ensure the most appropriate connection is made to the south.
14TH STREET PARK SITE

APPENDICES

14TH STREET PARK SITE

SHORT-TERM GOALS

- Coordination with railroad related to future trail connection
- Master plan trail and associated park improvements
- Hydraulics and hydrology assessment

LONG-TERM GOALS

- Complete trail connection through the site

ESTIMATED COSTS

$2.7 Million
OAK POINT RECREATION CENTER

**ADDRESS:** 6000 JUPITER ROAD

96,000 SF (WITH RECENT EXPANSION)

OPENED IN 2000, RENOVATED AND EXPANDED IN 2017

**DESCRIPTION**

This facility contains both aquatic and recreational components. The aquatics portion includes an indoor 50-meter pool as well as a 2,000 SF recreational pool. Outside there is a leisure pool with access between the indoor and outdoor areas. Recreational components include a double gym, gymnastics room, weight room, racquetball courts, children’s activity room and classrooms, and meeting rooms.

**AMENITIES**

- Gymnastics Room
- Weight Room
- Climbing Wall
- Racquetball Courts
- Indoor Track
- Game Room
- Recreation Classes
- Gymnasiums
- Indoor & Outdoor Swimming Pools
- Room & Pool Rentals

**ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The center has recently been renovated and expanded, which has resulted in a renewed center that has addressed the majority of needs. A remaining issue is that the outdoor aquatic center is too small to provide a great aquatic experience. This area should be expanded to provide an exciting aquatic experience for all ages. The City is thus beginning a process to redesign the outdoor aquatics component.
LIBERTY RECREATION CENTER

**ADDRESS:** 2601 GLENCIFF DRIVE
31,000 SF
CITY OPERATIONS BEGAN IN 2004

**DESCRIPTION**
Liberty Recreation Center has served as a neighborhood center since 2004; prior to that it was a local YMCA. It is on the south end of a walking track on the same property as Vines High School. It is smaller than most of Plano’s other centers and serves as more of a neighborhood recreation center than a regional center.

**AMENITIES**
Gymnasium
Cardio Room
Weight Room
Game Room
Open Play table tennis, volleyball, pickleball, full court basketball
Outdoor seasonal swimming pool

**ASSESSMENT**
The center is not the same level of quality as other newer Plano recreation centers. The cardio/weight area is undersized with low levels of light and insufficient ventilation. Furthermore, evaluation of the future of the pool is needed as it is inadequate in size and function and evaluation of the future of the pool is needed. The center is slated for a renovation and should address these issues.
TOM MUEHLENBECK CENTER

**ADDRESS:** 5801 PARKER ROAD
82,000 SF
OPENED 2007

**AMENITIES**

- Multipurpose exercise room
- Adult strength area & free weight area
- Full size basketball court with cross courts
- Indoor jogging/walking track
- Indoor 25 yard pool & leisure pool
- Two outdoor pools with three large slides and shallow water play pool
- Game room
- Open play badminton, basketball, table tennis, and volleyball
- Classrooms, meeting rooms, and pool party rooms

**DESCRIPTION**

The site, located in the center of a community park surrounded by three schools, is split diagonally by a vegetated creek that provides a nice entrance into the center. The center has various recreation spaces, social lounges, arts/crafts rooms, pre-school area, and game rooms that were the result of both community and local school input. All of these spaces are centered around a main lobby control desk. Patrons are oriented at the moment they enter the building and are presented with a glimpse of all the active spaces. The flowing nature and free form of the leisure pool space experience is maximized by a strong visual connection between the inside and outside bodies of water as well as views to the adjacent wetland creek, which served as a shaping force for the site design.

**ASSESSMENT**

Overall the center is performing well; at certain times it is very busy and there may be a wait time for equipment. A center this size is also limited in terms of programming since there is only one multipurpose exercise room. The City should consider a holistic review of a 10 year old center to understand what is needed and recommend improvements.
CARPENTER PARK RECREATION CENTER

ADDRESS: 6701 COIT ROAD
59,000 SF
OPENED 1990, RENOVATED IN 2011 AND 2018

AMENITIES
Art room
Gymnastics room
Indoor pool
Cardio room
Weight room
Two gymnasiums
Indoor track
Indoor pool
Racquetball courts
Squash courts
Game room
Open play badminton, basketball, pickle ball, table tennis, and volleyball
Classrooms and meeting rooms available to rent

DESCRIPTION
Carpenter Park Recreation Center is in a community park that provides many amenities to citizens including playgrounds, soccer fields, and ballfields. Recently, the center was showing signs of age and was not responsive to evolving needs. A recent renovation and expansion to the center addressed many of these needs that were also identified in the survey and public meetings as part of the master planning efforts. A major component of this expansion was an indoor aquatic center including locker rooms. Needs identified included: providing more lap lanes, expanding the cardio/weight area, and updating support areas all of which is part of the construction scope. An indoor pool was constructed and completed in 2018.

ASSESSMENT
With the completion of two recent expansions including interior renovations and construction of the pool area the center possesses no immediate needs.
JACK CARTER POOL

ADDRESS: 2601 PLEASANT VALLEY DRIVE
119,000 SF
OPENED 2016

AMENITIES

- Outdoor deep water pool with platform diving
- Outdoor leisure pool with some lap lanes
- Dual rider tube slide
- Body Slide
- Lazy River
- Climbing wall
- Rentable party areas and concessions
- Spray features
- Wet deck areas
- Flowrider

DESCRIPTION

Jack Carter Pool was originally opened in 1983 and reopened in 2016 in a new location within Jack Carter Park. The original pool closed in 2014 due to aging equipment, leaks, and issues with the pool originally being constructed in the floodplain. The new 1,000-person capacity facility includes three new pools as well as numerous water activities such as a Flowrider, lazy river, spray features, climbing wall, concession area, and party areas available for rent.

ASSESSMENT

This new outdoor pool at its new location in Jack Carter Park has been very successful. The only issue is that there is a shortage of permanent shading for patrons, especially for children’s areas. No other issues were noted.
PLANO AQUATIC CENTER

ADDRESS: 2301 WESTSIDE DRIVE
20,080 SF
OPENED 1978, RENOVATED IN 2013

AMENITIES
Splash pad
Outdoor leisure pool
Indoor leisure and lap pool
Party rooms available to rent

DESCRIPTION
The Plano Aquatic Center was one of the first indoor swimming venues to be built for Plano’s burgeoning population during the late 1970s. The original configuration contained an indoor 25-yard pool with shallow water training areas for younger guests and an outdoor splash pad available during summer months. The building and pool was renovated in 2013; the renovation included replacement of the indoor pool and reconfiguration of the interior space which resulted in a more functional facility with more features. Outdoor aquatic features that were added during the renovation included the addition of a new spray pad, deck, covered area, and landscaped gardens.

ASSESSMENT
The renovated aquatic center has been very successful.
HARRY ROWLINSON CENTER

DESCRIPTION

This facility is older, built in 1970 by Plano ISD and renovated in 2003. It is adjacent to Williams High School and was Plano’s first indoor pool. The Plano East High School swim team uses this facility. Admission is free to the public on weekends in the summer. While modern for its time, the design does not provide the amenities associated with indoor pools today. Both the exterior and interior of the facility is not consistent with the quality of a majority of Plano’s facilities. The facility is leased from PISD and the lease is set to expire in 2020.

ASSESSMENT

The facility is approaching its 50th anniversary and is very dated despite the renovations in 2003. Specific updates that should be addressed with future renovations include updating signage, updating the locker rooms and office areas, and addressing ventilation throughout the facility. Currently, the facility is ventilated by radiant heaters over the deck and by open doors in the warmer months. Since the lease expires in 2020 the City should evaluate its action to renew the lease or consider other alternatives. A primary consideration should be the shortage of lap lanes throughout the city.

ADDRESS: 1712 AVENUE P
14,323 SF
OPENED 1970, RENOVATED IN 2003

AMENITIES

Indoor 6 lane 25 yd lap pool
Connected body of water for learn to swim and aquatic programming
Toilets, lockers, office are
Limited parking
This facility has an extensive history. The community center component was built by Plano ISD in 1970 and later leased back to the City. The gymnasium was built by the City and the City leased the ground it was built upon. The entire facility is now operated by the Collin County Boys and Girls Club. The center currently offers a restricted schedule of use and there are also issues of nearby residents not knowing that the center is open to the public. Siting of the building is problematic for surface water drainage since it is substantially below street level access from the east. Parking is also limited at the center. Recent building renovations and landscaping has improved the exterior.

This older center has physical issues that should be addressed as well as opportunities to more efficiently arrange spaces to maximize its potential use. While some of these issues have been addressed, there is an opportunity to further improve the center. Needed improvements include:

- Limited hours of operation
- Drainage issues on east side of facility
- Lack of cardio workout area
- Visual observation and security is difficult with long hallways and 90 degree turns
- Lack of parking for a center of this size
- Outdoor covered basketball court’s location detracts from the entrance areas

Finally, the City can continue to support this older facility or consider building a new center to serve both the Douglass Community residents and downtown Plano residents.
PLANO SENIOR RECREATION CENTER

ADDRESS: 401 WEST 16TH STREET
26,000 SF
OPENED 1997, RENOVATION/EXPANSION IN 2018 (APPROX. 4,500 SF)

DESCRIPTION
The Plano Senior Recreation Center is located in Harrington Park near US-75. When the center was built it was a state-of-the-art facility that responded to the requirements of a generation that was less active. An extensive renovation and expansion will be complete in 2018 which will make it more responsive to current active senior needs. The Wellness Center for Older Adults is also located in the building and provides healthcare services to the senior community in Collin County.

AMENITIES
Current Amenities Include:
Classrooms/Crafts space
Large Multipurpose Space
Kitchen and Dining Area
Support Office
Wellness Center

2018 Renovations:
New fitness/weight room
New fitness class space
Additional dining space & expanded kitchen
New & updated restrooms
Additional parking
Expanded wellness center

ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The current Plano Senior Recreation Center design does not respond to the more active senior population of today and the future. Some of the improvements noted in the renovations list will help this center better serve this age group. The location in the eastern part of the city limits its accessibility to seniors that live further west. A study focused on senior recreation needs should be conducted to help guide future programming.
ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

OAK POINT NATURE AND RETREAT CENTER

Description: The Oak Point Nature and Retreat Center houses the Park Administration Offices, the Outdoor Recreation division, and several meeting rooms. However, the existing center does not provide a classroom that would support outdoor learning programs. Such a space could be developed with concrete floors, sinks, and the ability to set up into different configurations to support gardening, bug and plant identification, and other outdoor programs. Future consideration should be given to this need. The current conference room in the center also experiences challenging acoustical issues which will need to be addressed if the current corrective actions are not successful.

PECAN HOLLOW GOLF COURSE

Description: The clubhouse, which was constructed in 2004, needs renovation for the concessions area, support storage, and the upstairs patio area. A complete assessment of needs and subsequent action plan should inform the recommended improvements to the clubhouse. Additionally, newer technology such as indoor virtual training bays should also be considered to update the interior space. Finally, the course is scheduled for a new irrigation system to be installed in 2031 which may be considered for a future bond issue. The course itself currently has no pressing needs.

HIGH POINT TENNIS CENTER

Description: This comprehensive center includes outdoor tennis and pickleball courts as well as a well-stocked pro shop. The center provides programming opportunities for all ages with services ranging from private lessons to summer camps. Current renovations are addressing the current needs of the facility. One area that should be studied in more detail is the needs assessment and feasibility of adding indoor courts.
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SURVEY RESULTS

This section includes the survey summary results from both the telephone survey and the online survey.
2017 Plano PARKS MASTER PLAN ATTITUDINAL SURVEY – ONLINE VERSION (COMBINED SURVEYS)
CUMULATIVE RESULTS

1. Are you a resident of the City of Plano?
   Yes ........ 97%
   (If response is #2 or #3, discontinue) No ........ 2%
   Unsure ........ 0%

2. In which of the following zip codes do you reside?
   75023 ........ 20%  75075 ........ 15%
   75024 ........ 12%  75093 ........ 17%
   75025 ........ 21%  75094 ........ 0%
   75026 ........ 0%
   75074 ........ 14%

3. Click the response that describes the gender and age of the survey respondent(s)
   MALE
   Under age 35 ........ 14%
   36 - 45 ........ 23%
   46 - 55 ........ 23%
   56 - 65 ........ 23%
   66 - 75 ........ 13%
   Over the age of 75 ........ 3%
   FEMALE
   Under age 35 ........ 13%
   36 - 45 ........ 22%
   46 - 55 ........ 26%
   56 - 65 ........ 25%
   66 - 75 ........ 12%
   Over the age of 75 ........ 2%

4. How long have you lived in Plano?
   Under 1 year ........ 3%
   1 - 3 years ........ 10%
   4 - 7 years ........ 11%
   8 - 10 years ........ 9%
   10 - 20 years ........ 26%
   Over 20 years ........ 40%
   Decline to comment ........ 0%

5. As a new resident of Plano, choose the response that best describes how familiar or unfamiliar you are with the following aspects of the city.
   Click Very familiar, Familiar, Unfamiliar, Very unfamiliar, or No opinion.

   A) Its parks
      VF  23%  F  60%  U  14%  VU  2%  NO  0%
   B) Its recreational facilities
      13%  46%  31%  9%  0%
   C) Its athletic fields
      8%  29%  42%  19%  2%
   D) Its specific use recreational facilities
      6%  27%  45%  21%  1%
   E) Its multi-use trails
      19%  44%  30%  6%  1%
   F) Its aquatic facilities
      10%  33%  37%  19%  1%
6. Thinking about your current recreation activities and those in which you might wish to participate, choose the responses to show what you or members of your household would like to get out of those activities? (click all that apply)

Have fun ........ 82% Enjoy the outdoors ........ 84%
Develop new skills .... 35% Help others ........ 29%
Improve health/fitness .... 87% Improve specific skills .... 21%
Interact with friends .... 51% Participate in organized sports .... 23%
Meet new people .... 38% Find activity in which to excel .... 14%
Participate in competitions .... 13% Other_______________________ .... 0%
Experience being part of a team activity 17%

7. Choose the responses that best describe the park or recreational facilities in Plano you have utilized? If you have not utilized a park or recreation facility, please click the “Did not utilize” response. (click all that apply.)

A park ........ 90% Bike trail ........ 45%
A trail ........ 77% The senior center ........ 10%
A pool ........ 49% An athletic field ........ 33%
A recreation center .67% A specific-use facility .... 11
A recreation program .31% Did not utilize ........ 1%
Decline to answer/no opinion ........ 0%

8. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household: Click Yes, No, or Don’t remember ....

A) Visited or used a municipal park or park facility 93% 7% 0%
B) Visited or used a municipal athletic field 37% 62% 1%
C) Participated in a youth athletic league 22% 78% 0%
D) Participated in an adult athletic league 7% 92% 1%
E) Participated in any class or program offered by the Plano Parks and Recreation Department 35% 64% 1%
F) Visited a city recreation center 69% 31% 1%
G) Used a municipal hike and bike trail 79% 20% 1%
9. The city is establishing a series of priorities to direct future park department actions. Choose the response that best describes how important or unimportant it is for Plano to address or implement each. Click Very important, Important, Unimportant, Very unimportant, or No opinion.

| A) Expand pedestrian trail connections between Collin Creek Mall and the downtown area | 18% | 27% | 23% | 14% | 18% |
| B) Create an urbanized park area in the Legacy West/Legacy East area | 21% | 33% | 18% | 11% | 17% |
| C) Expand pedestrian trail connections in the Legacy West/Legacy East areas | 25% | 32% | 16% | 10% | 17% |
| D) Increase the amount of public open space along major creeks | 31% | 41% | 13% | 4% | 10% |
| E) Construct a recreation center in northwest Plano to meet the needs of residents there | 14% | 29% | 24% | 12% | 21% |
| F) Renovate and expand existing parks in the city | 34% | 46% | 11% | 3% | 6% |
| G) Develop major trails in each sector of the city connecting to trails in other cities | 33% | 32% | 17% | 8% | 10% |
| H) Preserve environmentally sensitive areas such as natural creek corridors | 56% | 33% | 5% | 2% | 4% |
| I) Design and develop more parks & facilities that focus on passive experiences | 19% | 37% | 20% | 6% | 18% |
| J) Construct facilities in accordance with the demand as new residents move into the city | 19% | 51% | 14% | 6% | 9% |
| K) Develop signature parks, facilities that are specific to the reputation of the city | 24% | 36% | 20% | 8% | 11% |
| L) Improve and enhance maintenance of park facilities | 40% | 49% | 6% | 4% | 4% |
| M) Acquire land for future park and open space development | 44% | 38% | 8% | 4% | 6% |

10. In the space provided, write down the one recreational facility in your part of the city you believe is lacking?

Specific park named as needing attention/improvement (31%), trails/hiking/biking (14%), swimming pool/water park/splash pad (11%), general park improvements/facility updates (8%), nothing lacking/satisfied (7%),

11. Below is a list of recreational amenities or facilities which tend to appeal most to the general public. For each item, choose the response that best describes, in your opinion, how important or unimportant it would be for the city to construct more of these in the next five to ten years. Click Very important, Important, Unimportant, Very unimportant, or No Opinion.

| A-01) Youth baseball fields | 11% | 32% | 19% | 11% | 27% |
| B-02) Youth softball fields | 9% | 32% | 20% | 11% | 28% |
| C-03) Youth soccer fields | 15% | 35% | 16% | 9% | 24% |
12. From the previous list of recreational amenities or facilities (1-16), choose the response you would consider to be most important in terms of the city constructing additional ones in the future?

Natural habitat/nature areas (29%), multi-use trails (25%), senior recreational opportunities (10%), outdoor pools or other water amenities (10%), playgrounds (6%), multi-purpose fields (56%), (ten other responses of 3% or less)

13. The list of recreational facilities below appeal more to residents with specific interests. Please choose the response that best describes how important or unimportant it would be for the city to construct each in the next five to ten years. Click Very important, Important, Unimportant, Very unimportant, or No opinion.

A-01) Indoor volleyball courts
B-02) Disc golf course
C-03) Athletic fields
D-04) BMX bicycling facility
E-05) Mountain biking trails
F-06) Skate park
G-07) Outdoor performance area
H-08) A dog park
I-09) Equestrian trails
J-10) Recreation center
K-11) Paddling launches
L-12) Indoor basketball
M-13) Archery range
N-14) Senior center
O-15) Pickle ball courts
P-16) Indoor badminton
Q-17) Splash pads
14. From the previous list of specific use recreational amenities or facilities, (1-17), click the response you would consider to be most important recreational facility for the city to construct.

Senior center (14%), splash pads (13%), dog park (13%), recreation center (12%), outdoor performance area (10%), mountain biking trails (10%), athletic fields (5%), (ten other responses of 3% or less)

15. Regarding bicycle lanes or opportunities, choose the response that best describes how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statement: “The city should prioritize developing additional bicycling opportunities . . . .” Click Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, or No opinion.

A) So as to connect to schools
   - Strongly agree: 45%
   - Agree: 34%
   - Disagree: 6%
   - Strongly disagree: 6%
   - No opinion: 9%

B) So as to connect to downtown
   - Strongly agree: 26%
   - Agree: 33%
   - Disagree: 14%
   - Strongly disagree: 12%
   - No opinion: 15%

C) So as to connect to other retail centers
   or business centers
   - Strongly agree: 25%
   - Agree: 35%
   - Disagree: 15%
   - Strongly disagree: 10%
   - No opinion: 15%

D) So as to connect to existing trails
   - Strongly agree: 47%
   - Agree: 36%
   - Disagree: 3%
   - Strongly disagree: 6%
   - No opinion: 7%

E) So as to connect to neighboring cities
   - Strongly agree: 27%
   - Agree: 29%
   - Disagree: 18%
   - Strongly disagree: 11%
   - No opinion: 16%

F) So as to assist trail/bike facility
   crossings of major roads
   - Strongly agree: 51%
   - Agree: 30%
   - Disagree: 4%
   - Strongly disagree: 8%
   - No opinion: 7%

G) As bike lanes on low-volume roadways
   throughout the city of Plano
   - Strongly agree: 31%
   - Agree: 35%
   - Disagree: 13%
   - Strongly disagree: 10%
   - No opinion: 11%

H) As protected bike lanes on higher-volume
   roads throughout the city
   - Strongly agree: 35%
   - Agree: 25%
   - Disagree: 14%
   - Strongly disagree: 17%
   - No opinion: 10%

I) As a municipal bike share program
   - Strongly agree: 18%
   - Agree: 26%
   - Disagree: 19%
   - Strongly disagree: 13%
   - No opinion: 24%

16. Do you have any children under the age of 19 living in your home? (If yes: Into which of the following age ranges would they fall? Click all that apply)
   - 0 – 4 years: 8%
   - 5 – 9 years: 15%
   - 10 – 14 years: 19%
   - 15 – 19 years: 17%
   - No children: 54%
   - Decline to answer: 3%

17. Do you belong to a city-related athletic association, a non city-related athletic association, to both, or to neither? Click the appropriate response.
   - City-related: 15%
   - Non city-related: 19%
   - Both: 37%
   - Neither: 28%
   - Decline to answer: 1%

Thank you very much for taking the time to assist us in this endeavor. We appreciate your comments very much and take them very seriously.
### 2017 PLANO PARKS MASTER PLAN ATTITUDINAL SURVEY – TELEPHONE SURVEY
### CUMULATIVE RESULTS

#### Zip code
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75023</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75024</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75025</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75074</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75075</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75093</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75094</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sex
- Male: 47%
- Female: 53%

### Questions

1. **How long have you lived in Plano?**
   - Under 1 year: 1%
   - 1 - 3 years: 2%
   - 4 - 7 years: 8%
   - 8 - 10 years: 5%
   - 10 - 20 years: 32%
   - Over 20 years: 52%
   - Refuse to answer: 0%

2. **As a new resident of Plano, how familiar or unfamiliar would you say you are with the following aspects of the city?**
   - A) Its parks: VF: 42%, F: 33%, U: 8%, VU: 17%, NO: 0%
   - B) Its recreational facilities: VF: 17%, F: 42%, U: 33%, VU: 8%, NO: 0%
   - C) Its athletic fields: VF: 25%, F: 25%, U: 42%, VU: 8%, NO: 0%
   - D) Its specific use recreational facilities: VF: 17%, F: 42%, U: 25%, VU: 17%, NO: 0%
   - E) Its multi-use trails: VF: 8%, F: 58%, U: 33%, VU: 0%, NO: 0%
   - F) Its aquatic facilities: VF: 25%, F: 33%, U: 8%, VU: 8%, NO: 0%

3. **Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with recreational services provided by Plano for people in the following age groups.**
   - A) Young children (under age 6): VS: 36%, S: 36%, D: 2%, VD: 0%, NO: 27%
   - B) Children, ages 6 - 12: VS: 37%, S: 36%, D: 1%, VD: 0%, NO: 26%
   - C) Children, ages 13 - 18: VS: 30%, S: 38%, D: 4%, VD: 2%, NO: 27%
   - D) Adults, ages 19 - 45: VS: 31%, S: 47%, D: 8%, VD: 1%, NO: 14%
   - E) Adults, ages 46 - 65: VS: 32%, S: 44%, D: 7%, VD: 2%, NO: 15%
   - F) Adults over the age of 65: VS: 26%, S: 32%, D: 8%, VD: 2%, NO: 32%
4. Generally speaking, which of the following park recreational facilities in Plano have you utilized? If you have not utilized a park or recreation facility, please tell me that also. (circle all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A park</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trail</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pool</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A recreation center</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A recreation program</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike trail</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The senior center</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An athletic field</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific-use facility</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not utilize</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to answer/no opinion</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The city is establishing a series of priorities to direct future park department actions. Please tell me, how important or unimportant it is for Plano to . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) expand pedestrian trail connections between Collin creek mall and the downtown area</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) create an urbanized park area in the legacy west/legacy east area</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) expand pedestrian trail connections in the legacy west/legacy east areas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) increase the amount of public open space along major creeks</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) construct a recreation center in northwest Plano, to meet the needs of residents there</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) renovate and expand existing parks in the city</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) develop major trails in each sector of the city connecting to trails in other cities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) preserve environmentally sensitive areas such as natural creek corridors</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) design and develop more parks, &amp; facilities that focus on passive experiences</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) construct facilities in accordance with the demand as new residents move into the city</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) develop signature parks, facilities that are specific to the reputation of the city</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) improve and enhance maintenance of park facilities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) acquire land for future park and open space development</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In your part of the city, what one recreational facility would you say the city is lacking?

Satisfied/not lacking anything (34%), don’t know (16%), swimming pool/waterpark (14%), improved trails/hiking/biking (7%), specific parks named as needing improvements (5%), senior center/related programs (4%), ....

7. I would like to read you a list of recreational amenities or facilities which tend to appeal most to the general public. As I read each item, please tell me, in your opinion, in the next five to ten years, how important or unimportant it would be for the city to construct more of these. Here’s the first one . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-01) youth baseball fields</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-02) youth softball fields</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-03) youth soccer fields</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-04) adult soccer fields</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-05) tennis courts</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-06) multi-purpose fields</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-07) sand volleyball courts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. From the list I just read (1-16), which one would you consider to be most important in terms of the city constructing additional ones in the future? Multi-use trails (17%), natural habitat/nature areas (16%), senior recreational opportunities (13%), outdoor pools or other water amenities (12%), multi-purpose fields (11%), event picnic/reunion pavilions (7%), family picnic areas (5%),

9. Now I would like to read you a list of recreational facilities that appeal more to residents with specific interests. Please tell me how important or unimportant, in your opinion, in the next five to ten years, it would be for the city to construct . . . .

10. Now this time, what would you consider to be the most important new recreational facility (1-17) for the city to construct?

Senior center (27%), recreation center (14%), outdoor performance area (10%), splash pads (8%), dog park (7%), mountain biking trails (6%), indoor basketball (6%),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Description</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-08) outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-09) event picnic/reunion pavilions</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-10) playgrounds</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-11) family picnic areas</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-12) natural habitat/nature areas</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-13) senior recreational opportunities</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-14) practice fields</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-15) outdoor pools or other water amenities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16) multi-use trails</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Description</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-01) indoor volleyball courts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-02) disc golf course</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-03) athletic fields</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-04) bmx bicycling facility</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-05) mountain biking trails</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-06) skate park</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-07) outdoor performance area</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-08) a dog park</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-09) equestrian trails</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-10) recreation center</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-11) paddling launches</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-12) indoor basketball</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-13) archery range</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-14) senior center</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Description</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-15) pickle ball courts</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16) indoor badminton</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-17) splash pads</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Let’s talk about bicycle facilities. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements: “the city should prioritize developing additional bicycling opportunities . . . .”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) so as to connect to schools</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) so as to connect to downtown</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) so as to connect to other retail centers or business centers</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) so as to connect to existing trails</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) so as to connect to neighboring cities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) so as to assist trail/bike facility crossings of major roads</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) as bike lanes on low-volume roadways throughout the city of Plano</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) as protected bike lanes on higher-volume roads throughout the city</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) as a municipal bike share program</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In which of the following age groups do you fall?
- 18 – 24 years . . . . .3%
- 25 - 34 years . . . . .5%
- 35 - 44 years . . . .12%
- 45 - 54 years . . . .19%
- 55 - 64 years . . . .26%
- 65 and older . . . . .34%
- refused to answer . .2%

13. Do you have any children under the age of 19 living in your home? (If yes: into which of the following age ranges would they fall?)
- 0 – 4 years . . . . .4%
- 5 – 9 years . . . . .9%
- 10 – 14 years . . . .11%
- 15 – 19 years . . . .12%
- no children . . . . .72%
- refuse to answer . .2%

14. Do you belong to a city-related athletic association, a non city-related athletic association, to both, or to neither? (Select up to two responses)
- city-related . . . .13%
- non city-related . . .13%
- both . . . . .6%
- neither . . . . .67%
- refuse to answer . .1%
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