



**Randolph Tot Lot Site Plan**  
**Schemes Questionnaire Results**  
**Conducted August 27 through September 9, 2009**

**1. What do you like about Scheme 1?**

1. The selection and layout of the play equipment and the picnic area in the playground. The direct flow between the two areas, the entry courts and the alee of trees on the passive side. Common to all three, the chess tables.
2. I do like the formality of the passive area.
3. I like the play area and the flowering trees.
4. -I prefer the feel of page 5 scheme 1 to the look of page 5 scheme 2  
-I like the lawn in the corner of the tot section
5. Straight path  
more trees than other options
6. I'm sure whatever you come up will be serviceable, as long as you keep in mind that kids amuse themselves without extensive encouragement from elders.
7. The separation of the tot area and other seating space would make this spot usable for a variety of social groups not just tots and their caregivers. I like the balance of tot space and other space.
8. entry courts, more play areas than at present , fountain and more trees
9. cleanliness of design and good sight lines.
- 10.It's ok.
- 11.Able to see everything and everyone,liked curved entry,no gates please on alley,seemed easiest to maintain.No water feature,opt for more rubber cushioned play areas.
- 12.linear, very clean design; layout of play equipment is nice. There was talk about moving the picnic area and adding another set of swings; perhaps the fountain in the passive area could go and make that a lawn picnic area. Like the added play equip (more than double from the existing park).

## **2. What do you dislike about Scheme 1?**

1. Nothing.
2. Too formal in play area
3. The partial fences at the alley--especially in a tot lot designed for younger children, there should be a continuous fence separating the park from the alley.
4. Chess Tables do not do anything for me, but perhaps someone else likes them.....Having a table in shade where a person could sit down and do work would be nice (picnic table)
5. Fountain
6. See 1.
7. Move some of the picnic tables into the non-tot space as well.
8. (train line) straight axis, picnic area so separate from play areas, would prefer that the passive area be more open at the front facing Randolph-fewer bushes there
9. boring!
10. There doesn't seem to be any difference.
11. Nothing.
12. not much, it looks good. seems a little plain, but I agree with the statements made that it provides good site line through the park.

### **3. What do you like about Scheme 2?**

1. The berm, curved walkway and climbing net in the playground. The fountain and the benches facing it in the passive area.
2. I do like that the gates open the alleyway to connect both sides
3. I like the open areas, the roll mound and lawns. I also appreciate the fence along the alley.
4. I like the idea of a fountain..maybe bricks could be sold like at the harrison street library ..haven't been by to see it though
5. See 1.
6. Nice use of space for mixed groups- adults with and without kids would feel welcome.
7. curving design, style of play equipment, alley with gates helps it feel like one park- easier to walk between the two areas, chess table on the play side , fountain
8. curved paths and good use of space, interesting design and equipment kids would like.
9. Seems to be the best park for the kids.
- 10.Liked the slightly curved path,no mounds-add more table space or play equipment.
- 11.not much.

#### **4. What do you dislike about Scheme 2?**

1. The absence of a picnic area, the inclusion of chess tables in the playground area, the enclosed lawns (apparently serving no purpose) bracketing the fountain.
2. not enough in play area - play toys or seating
3. Not much!
4. gates seem excessive
5. Curved path  
too much grass  
the gates
6. See 1.
7. If this is the one with the train tracks - that could get to be a bit much. It might end up less park like and more amusement park like - making less accessible to other types of groups.
8. needs more seating on Oak Park Av. side, would it be feasible to have fountains on both sides of park?- that would be even better. Formal shrubs around fountain cut it off from the park, prefer more open to Randolph so it would be more inviting to enter park
9. I think the gate has been taken off the board - I hope so! One entrance on the alley is enough - two entrances are asking for trouble.
10. The weird rope toy -- again, we're afraid kids would get hurt. The fountain was ugly. I'd prefer a different fountain.
11. HATE THE ALLEY GATES! Maintenance headache! Does any park in Oak Park have a situation like this? No. People would crash thru like they do in the parking garages occasionally.
12. the curves don't make as much sense; don't like the hedges on the passive side

### **5. What do you like about Scheme 3?**

1. The entry court and reintroduction of the picnic area.
2. Love the train crossing for alley crossover and the train/safety town theme. Love the tricycle path, stations, and tunnels. Love the idea of a Wisteria tunnel. Love the curvy paths on both the play area and the passive area. Like having lots of seating - some of the new parks still don't have enough which is hard for parents. Like the train play pieces that have a slide and stairs.
3. I like the fence along the alley and the curvy paths. The crazy tunnels are sort of fun.
4. lack of formality/ Lawn space in "adult section"
5. Lack of fountain
6. See 1.
7. Same as question 2 I think - It seems less like a public space for everyone and more like an amusement park than the other options.
8. curves, informality, play areas look fun( hope the train signals do NOT include sound.)seating in passive area more evenly distributed, trees on Randolph side of passive area give a more inviting feel than cutting off that side of park with shrubs- even if low growing,
9. Very fun for kids - love the layout, and ideas.
- 10.The curvilinear design and many trees
- 11.Don't like it-see-below
- 12.looks like tons of fun! Would be a destination park.




### **6. What do you dislike about Scheme 3?**

1. Too much focused and thematic equipment in the playground, which not only limits free play, but inteferes with circulation. Also, the absence of the fountain and lack of focus in the passive area. (Too much in the playground, too little next door).
2. Not sure about the ticket window - would like it to be interactive not just empty hut. The two sets of swings are apart from eachother which makes it hard if you have two diff. aged kids - unless perhaps each side could have one bucket and one regular swing.

## 6. What do you dislike about Scheme 3?

3. I don't see the tricycle track getting nearly as much use as a climbing play area. It seems to force one idea of what to do on trikes. An open sidewalk--perhaps with some tunnels, but no need for the ticket booth and stuff--around a playground provides trike space and leaves the details up to the kids' imaginations.
4. seems like too much stuff
5. Curved path  
Not a fan of the train thing
6. See 1.
7. Same as question 2 I think. Just a bit to amusement park - not public park
8. worst treatment of the alley-needs larger landing areas on either side of the alley for safer crossing since there are no gates, miss having fountain
9. I think it may be too crowded and might only be useful for kids who ride trikes, etc. Need a sandbox with a bottom for the little kids. Also concerned about upkeep of all the equipment - probably more expensive than the other plans.
10. Speed table -- we worry about the kids. We like the ideas with gates.
11. Too curvy for the amount of space. equipment is too kitschy for the space
12. seems a little too packed; too much stuff. Might get more expensive. It does look fun, though!

## Randolph Tot Lot Schemes

What overall scheme do you prefer for Randolph Tot Lot?			Response Percent	Response Count
Scheme 1			50.0%	6
Scheme 2			25.0%	3
Scheme 3			25.0%	3
			<i>answered question</i>	12
			<i>skipped question</i>	1

## 8. Do you have any other comments?

1. All are very creative responses and lay out some clear alternatives.
2. We really like the creative ideas in scheme 3 and think that it makes the most of a small space. Really think about finding some way for businesses to get involved on a lowkey level. Kids would really love playing here and I would love to see this tot lot better used and I think it will be great to have such a nice park much closer to home. Great job listening to everyone's ideas.
3. Fencing in the tot lot is key to most parents I talk to!
4. -I would like the decision on raised platform or speed bump to be made by selecting the lower cost option..no reason to go overboard  
-The Look of the entrance at oak park and randolph is important to me because my building looks out on it  
-Lighting issue not addressed?  
-check out the fountain behind The EyeGlass Shoppe on Lake Street...I don't really like the look of the fountain in the picture of scheme 2  
-I think a pull up bar is pretty passive :)
5. Will the trees be native species?

What will the lighting be like? Will it minimize light pollution, focusing the light where it should go instead of up at the sky?

Will there be any animal habitats, like bat/bird houses or the like?

6. Doubts about safety: No one at the 8/26 meeting made much of the danger factor, though most comments were from people living close to the lot.

It's a busy alley, however, serving several large apartment and condo buildings. In fact, the whole block, Randolph to Washington, has only one single-family residence on the alley's Oak Park Ave. side.

Among vehicles who use the alley regularly are autos, garbage trucks, and moving vans, the latter more in some seasons than others, of course.

7. I think in general schemes 1 and 2 have the most benefit for the most diverse social groups - with kids, without kids, larger groups, smaller groups-- and isnt that the goal of a public park space.

I love the picnic tables. And I think some "play" equipment for grownups of all ages would be good. Many parks offer pullup bars and stretching places for outdoor work-outs and that might be a great feature. It would open the space up to broader use and

encourage the community to live healthier lifestyles - maybe.

8. If the alley gates are not possible as in plan 2 (my best choice), I prefer the alley treatment of plan 1 with larger entry areas, including at both sides of alley, and a larger speed table that covers the alley for the whole width of the park. For the passive side of the park it's important that it feel inviting to enter--shrubs around the perimeter make it feel like a private space that belongs to the apartment building. Curves feel more inviting than the more formal rectilinear style. Like scattered seating areas. Important to minimize the long, narrow feeling of the two spaces- another reason for more curving lines and maybe well placed soft berms.
9. Nice work on all of the plans, would like to see elements of all of them in final plan. Worry about sight lines in park - don't want any covert drug deals or other crimes committed there.  
The tot lot hasn't been maintained well for years and I worry that might happen again.
10. I'm looking forward to the changes.
11. PLEASE NO GATES blocking the alley. Gates on the surrounding fence are fine.  
Hope the fence is attractive!
12. can't remember which scheme had the entry curved courtyards, but do like that.  
no dog water bowl is needed.  
no fountain is needed here.  
no gates, but speed table and set-backs; liked the idea of seating near the set-backs.  
some seat swings might be nice vs. all just bucket swings.