



## **ALEXANDER PARK SKATEPARK**

### **GOOGLE FORMS SURVEY SUMMARY – PRELIMINARY DESIGN DIRECTIONS**

Three (3) Preliminary Design Directions have been prepared for Alexander Park Skatepark. These Design Directions were presented at a Focus Group Meeting held November 23rd, 2021. Following the meeting all participants were invited to complete a Google Forms survey with added opportunity to view the design options, provide comments on each option individually and complete a ranked survey to shortlist the preferred Design Directions. The objective of the survey is to gain constructive feedback on each Design Direction individually and determine the best two design direction options to be advanced in the process and prepared as 3D modeled renderings. The final two (2) Design Direction options will be presented at a PIC Meeting January 13<sup>th</sup> 2022. The following is a summary of comments received through the survey and voting results for the Preferred Design Directions:

#### **DESIGN DIRECTION #1**

Design Direction #1 scored the HIGHEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL with the second-most 1<sup>st</sup> preference votes, the most 2<sup>nd</sup> preference votes and the fewest 3<sup>rd</sup> preference votes.

The most common feature that people LIKED in this option was the bowl feature.

The common aspects of this option that people DISLIKED include: a “tight-entry point”, somewhat “congested flow” in the Street Area, and a general leaning more in favour of the plaza/street terrain offered in option #3, as opposed to the obstacle/street terrain offered in option #1.

## **DESIGN DIRECTION #2**

Design Direction #2 scored the SECOND-HIGHEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL with the second-most 1<sup>st</sup> preference and 2<sup>nd</sup> preference votes and the second-fewest 3<sup>rd</sup> preference votes.

The common aspects of this option that people LIKED were the two-bowl approach and the unique/organic nature of the Flow Bowl with its variety of transition features.

The common aspects of this option that people DISLIKED include: a somewhat limited carrying capacity (i.e. one rider at a time in each bowl), and the limited options for street terrain features.

## **DESIGN DIRECTION #3**

Design Direction #3 scored the LOWEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL with the most 1<sup>st</sup> preference votes, the fewest 2<sup>nd</sup> preference votes and the most 3<sup>rd</sup> preference votes.

The common aspects of this option that people LIKED were the plaza/street terrain features.

The common aspects of this option that people DISLIKED include a general leaning more in favour of the bowl design offered in option #1, as opposed to the bowl design offered in option #3.

## **PREFERRED DESIGN DIRECTIONS**

Through the Google Forms Survey, all participants were able to rank their preferred Design Direction Options. The consultant team applied a weighted scoring system to evaluate voting preferences and conclude the following:

1. Overall, Design Direction #1 scored the HIGHEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL; however, popular comments suggested opportunities to combine the best elements of Design Direction #1 in combination with the best elements of Design Direction #3. THIS OPTION WILL BE TAKEN FORWARD.
2. Overall, Design Direction #2 scored the SECOND-HIGHEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL and was generally acknowledged as the most individually unique design option. THIS OPTION WILL BE TAKEN FORWARD.
3. Overall, Design Direction #3 scored the LOWEST COMBINED VOTE TOTAL; however, popular comments suggested opportunities to combine the best elements of Design Direction #3 in combination with the best elements of Design Direction #1.