



**SECTION
3.**

Benchmark Comparisons

Introduction

The analysis of the existing parks system began with site visits to each park with parks department staff. These visits allowed the design team to experience the park setting and inventory the park facilities to provide a clear understanding of the parks system. This information, in conjunction with staff and community input and review of state and national park benchmarks allowed the design team to draw conclusions regarding the needs and desires for the parks system. Improvements that correspond to parks deficiencies and opportunities could therefore be recommended in the master plan phase of this plan documents.

The following pages contain analysis and summary of the existing parkland and park amenities within the City of Overland parks system. This population based benchmarking identifies opportunities for the parks system that can support recommendations based on needs and desires identified with the community during this planning process. These benchmarks also provide support for funding applications for future implementation of the improvements recommendations.

A summary of the input received from staff and the community for each park is included in the final master plan section of this document. A complete record of input received is included in the appendix.



Benchmark Comparisons and Statistical Needs

The statistical evaluation of the existing parks system included the 2008-2012 State of Missouri Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) for overall parkland and park amenities. These standards are based on a statewide inventory and identify a target number of each component type for a parks system based on population. In addition, the NRPA Urban Standards for Parkland Comparison and Recreation Components was used to evaluate the parks system and opportunity for additional parks and green space within the City of Overland. Combined these two standards identify a range in which the City of Overland can target goals for the parks system. This range is a typical benchmark used by grant programs in defining need when scoring grant applications.

While these comparisons provide a target range for a quantity of each component and amount of park land it is important to understand that every community is unique. The comparisons identify opportunities and provide the statistical support for need and funding, but any improvements should meet identified needs and desires of the City of Overland. The Parks and Recreation Staff, Parks Commission, City Council, and residents will determine the actual need and schedule for implementation. Consideration will also need to be given to long term maintenance and staffing of any park improvements or new park development.

The benchmark comparisons for the City of Overland parks system are provided below and on the following page. A summary of these comparisons is included following the analysis.

¹ Based on 2008 Estimated Population of 15,600

² These park classifications have no benchmark standards due to their unique focus.

* Does not include Overland Community Center property.

Table 3.1 - NRPA Urban Standards for Park Land Comparison

Park Classification (size)	Existing Facilities	Proposed Standard	2010 Existing Acreage	2010 Calculated Demand ¹	2010 Surplus / (Demand) ¹
Pocket Park (up to .5 ac.)	1	0.3 ac. / 1000	0.25 ac.	4.7 ac.	(-4.45 ac.)
Mini Park (1-5 ac.)	3	0.25 ac. / 1000	8.2 ac.	4 ac.	+4.2 ac.
Neighborhood Park (5-20 ac.)	4	1.5 ac. / 1000	33.9 ac.	23.5 ac.	+10.4 ac.
Community Park (20-80 ac.)	0	2.5 ac. / 1000	0 ac.	39 ac.	(-39.0 ac.)
Metropolitan Park (80-175)	0	5 ac. / 1000	0 ac.	78.0 ac.	(-78.0 ac.)
Special Use Park ²	0	N/A	0 ac.	0 ac.	n/a
Historic Park ²	0	N/A	0 ac.	0 ac.	n/a
Natural Resource Area ²	0	N/A	0 ac.	0 ac.	n/a
TOTAL	8*		42.35 ac.*	149.2 ac.	(-106.85 ac.)



Table 3.2 - City of Overland Component Target Standards 2010

RECREATION COMPONENT	STATE OF MISSOURI SCORP # of facilities/ # of people	URBAN PARK STANDARDS # of facilities/ # of people	2010 FACILITY BENCHMARK	2010 OVERLAND FACILITY INVENTORY	2010 BENCHMARK NEED FOR FACILITY
Parkland Acres	1 acre / 47	Per Classification	149 – 331 acres	42.35 acre	(106 - 288 acres)
Walking/Nature Trails	1 mile / 4,446	1 mile / 2,000	4 - 8 miles	1 mile	-
Bicycle / Exercise Trails	1 mile / 2,624	1 mile / 4,000	4 - 6 miles	1 mile	(3 - 7 miles)
Swimming Pools	1 pool / 6,500	1,000 sf / 1,000	2 pools / 15,600 sf	0 pools ³ / 0 sf	(2 pools / 15,600 sf)
Picnic Tables	1 table / 128	1 table / 125	122 – 125 tables	50 tables	(72 - 75 tables)
Ball Diamonds	1 field / 1,545	1 field / 1,500	10 fields	6 fields	(4 fields)
Playgrounds	1 playground / 1,379	1 playground / 1,000	11 – 15 playgrounds	8 playgrounds	(5 - 7 playgrounds)
Tennis Courts	1 court / 2,333	1 court / 2,000	7 – 8 courts	5 courts	(2-3 tennis courts)
Play Fields	1 field / 7,886	--	2 fields	5 fields	3 play fields
Volleyball	1 court / 4,659	1 court / 3,000	3 - 5 courts	0 courts	(3 - 5 volleyball courts)
Basketball	1 court / 4,410	1 court / 3,000	4 - 5 courts	0 courts	(4-5 basketball courts)
Football / Soccer Fields	1 field / 3,274	1 field / 4,000	4 - 5 fields	1 fields	(3-4 football / soccer fields)
Multi-Use Courts	1 court / 6,073	1 court / 10,000	2 - 3 courts	0 courts	(2-3 multiuse courts)
Horseshoe Pits	1 pit / 2,810	1 pit / 2,000	6 - 8 pits	0 pits	(6-8 horseshoe pits)
Shuffle Board Courts	1 court / 4,251	1 court / 3,000	4 - 5 courts	0 courts	(4-5 shuffle board courts)
Skateboard Park	1 park / 34,435	--	N/A	0 park	N/A
Golf Course	1 course / 26,647	1 course / 25,000	N/A	0 courses	N/A

¹ Based on 2008 Estimated Population of 15,600

The following is a summary of the benchmark comparisons for park land and recreation components:

Park Land

There is an opportunity to add 106.5-288 acres of park land to the parks system based on the estimated population. The breakdown of acres by park type based on NRPA (Table 3.1) is shown below.

- There is an opportunity to add 4.45 acres of Pocket Parks (0.5 acre or less in size). This park type is typically a passive recreation space that serves a small residential or commercial area. Typical features of Pocket Parks are seating, planting and pedestrian access. Erickson Plaza is a Pocket Park.
- The city meets the statistical need for Mini Parks (1-5 acres in size) and provides an additional 4.2 acres above the benchmark. This park type serves all ages and may have a specific function. Typical features of Mini Parks are play areas, passive recreation and limited sports fields. Canter Way Park, Legion Park and Brooks Park are Mini Parks.
- The city meets the statistical need for Neighborhood Parks (5-20 acres in size) and provides an additional 10.4 acres above the benchmark. This park type is typically a multiple use recreation facility for all ages and may serve organized sports. Typical features of Neighborhood Parks are playgrounds, sports fields, courts, trails picnic areas, etc. Jacobs Park, Myers Park, Woodson Park and Wild Acres Park are Neighborhood Parks.
- There is an opportunity to add 30 acres of Community Park (20-80 acres in size). This park type is similar to a Neighborhood Park in function, but larger in scale and number or size of amenities. Typical features of a Community Park are recreation centers, aquatics, sports fields, trails, playgrounds, etc. The City of Overland Parks System does not currently contain any parks that classify as Community Parks.
- There is an opportunity to add 78 acres of Metropolitan Park (80-175 acres in size). This park type is oriented towards providing overall recreation opportunities and often includes significant natural areas. Typical features

of a Metropolitan Park are aquatic centers, recreation centers, picnic areas, playgrounds, sports fields, trails, natural areas, etc. The City of Overland Parks System does not currently contain any parks that classify as Metropolitan Parks.

Based on this breakdown by park type the opportunity for an additional 121.45 acres of parks is focused on Pocket Parks and the potential for one Community Park and one Metropolitan Park. If we take into account the park types where the City of Overland exceeds the benchmark the total demand acreage is closer to 106.5 acres.

The acreage identified for a Metropolitan Park is below the minimum size for this park type, and if we reduce this 78 acres by the additional acres of Mini Parks and Neighborhood Parks this total falls into a Community Park classification at 63.4 acres. This creates a more accurate view of the opportunities for future park development focused on Pocket Parks and Community Parks, and is more consistent with existing mission of the parks system which provides more unprogrammed recreation for individuals, families and small groups. Metropolitan Parks typically include large athletic field complexes, aquatic centers, recreation centers, ice rinks, or golf courses along with significant areas of woodland or preserved open space. This focus does not meet the current programming needs of the Parks Department and existing open space within the city is not conducive to this park type. The potential for future park land acquisition should focus on properties that would meet Pocket Park and Community Park classifications, and in locations that would best serve the residents of Overland.

With limited open space in Overland the potential for the development of smaller Pocket Parks or Play Lots within existing residential or commercial development may be more feasible than the development of larger Community Parks. While the City may look for opportunities to purchase or receive property that meets the classification of Community Parks consideration should be given to the recreation needs these parks will meet, and the possibility for acquisition as preservation of open space with the potential for future park development.



Recreation Components

Overall a statistical need can be made for all but one of the inventory components. The component that meets standards within the parks system is Play Fields. Based on the data collection phase of this project and input from residents and city staff the focus of this plan is to improve the existing parks system first and then look to provide additional parks to meet the needs of the community. With this direction in mind opportunities to meet the needs for recreation components within the existing parks should be the explored first.