

SRP Connector Bridge Online Evaluation Survey

General Comments

Don't care for any of the alignment options:

(25 comments)

1. Should have NONE OF THE ABOVE
2. Don't like any, way too long, won't be used, waste of money
3. None of the designs presented are optimal for the park or the community garden.
4. All of these options take away precious park space from current use.
5. NO RAMP -- WILL LEAD TO TOO MUCH PARK TRAFFIC!!!
6. No ramp inside the park
7. I now don't think this should be built. It will chew up a lot of the park and not matter. The park can be accessed in lots of ways
8. I must question the wisdom of spending millions of dollars of public funds for this purpose at all.
9. Huge supporter of access to trail but never supposed to take away park space
10. Plenty of entrances already -- put signs up telling people to use Walnut St when Locust St entrance is blocked by trains.
11. The ramp should not in any way cut-up the park. The park should be allowed to remain as open as possible!!!!!!!!!!!!
12. If CSX will do what they say, ie minimize times when train blocks the tracks, then a connector bridge isn't really necessary. The city could then spend \$5 million on something worthwhile.
13. None of the above, favor using South Street Bridge
14. None viable, move South Street bridge north one block
15. Wait until South street bridge work is completed and integrate design
16. Wondering more and more if this bridge is even necessary, given the plans to extend the River trail to South Street and beyond.
17. This bridge is a complete waste of money, could be fulfilled by an entrance from the new South Street Bridge
18. Wait and include another ramp at South Street, concerned about the impact on the park as a whole and the existing activities there.

19. Use the money to finish the trail to South Street instead of ending it in the park.
20. Extend South Street Bridge and extend bicycle path
21. Look ahead to connection opportunities that may arise
22. I would like an alternative to be selected that doesn't take up space in the park. For example, over the parking lot north of the park
23. Get Dranoff to sell portion of parking lot, bring out of park
24. Why interfere with park, use land on both sides of track
25. Should coordinate with the new foot bridge to the Univ of Pennsylvania

Aesthetic Issues: (11 comments)

1. Less disruptive option from visual/aesthetic park. No radical visual element. Visual and noise buffer needed.
2. Should be unobtrusive, not distract from park
3. The ramp design (size, colors, materials, etc.) should be done in harmony with the park
4. As little green space as possible will be taken away from the park.
5. High quality addition, not simply to serve a function, artistic
6. The ramp/bridge structure should be as short as possible and it looks like it would be shorter if the bridge ran perpendicular to the tracks instead of at an angle. It is important to appropriately design the relationship between the start of the ramp and the Locust at the grade crossing. There seems to be some conflict in the plan now.
7. There is most probably an alignment/design, perhaps not yet shown, that combines the most positive features of the present designs while having the least impact on current park activities/constituencies
8. Ramp should tread as lightly as possible on the park and embody lightness and transparency to the greatest extent possible
9. Do not let the ramp dominate the park visually or practically. The green option is the only one that does that
10. Least visual and physical impact
11. I think it is important to keep the entrance to the trail at the edge of the park so the center of the park is not intruded on by all the bikers, joggers, etc. As a jogger, I prefer not to have to cut through the park either.

Security Issues: (4 comments)

1. Security and lighting crucial. Lighting and maintenance important for safety.
2. No open space under ramps, will attract muggers and homeless
3. I think that having bikers, joggers, walkers etc enter into Judy Garland park will create too much congestion. Is there a way to have bikers at least, feed out to regular streets and allow the bikers, joggers to stay on towards the park.
4. Visibility is critical for perceived and real safety within the park. If people don't feel safe, don't use the park, that's a big problem

Bicycle Issues: (11 comments all together)

Bike friendly: (8 comments)

1. Bike friendly key
2. No 90 degree turns, not safe for bikes
3. Must allow bikes to ride carefully and widen enough to pass ped.
4. Bicycle commuter route to move bikes out of traffic
5. Worried about collisions between toddlers, dogs and bikes if ramp is not close to street
6. Should be wheelchair & bicycle accessible
7. Accommodate walking and bikes, no zig zag, entrance within body of park reduces usefulness for bikers, increases hazards for peds.
8. Any ramp on which one may ride bicycles from the roads onto the trails and back is fine. A speed limit for bicycles on the ramp is also fine (and appropriate), but a ramp on which cyclists would be required to walk (or carry their bikes up stairs) would be extremely frustrating for cyclists.

Bike Control: (3 comments)

1. Turns will force people to slow down
2. Bikers must be forced to dismount and/or slow down at the end of the ramp.
3. As a cyclist, I value an efficient, uninterrupted entrance to the path.

Dog Issues: (6 comments)

1. Dog run should stay.
2. Any entrance as long as it doesn't encroach on any part of the dog parks.
3. Maintain dog run.
4. My priority is that the dog run stays in tact. It is not fair to reduce this already limited ability.
5. Please don't make the dog run any smaller.
6. Don't disrupt gardens and dog run

Garden issues: (3 comments)

1. Don't disrupt gardens and dog run
2. The garden must not be damaged - better to enhance it --has that been considered?
3. Which ever scheme is decided upon, there is an opportunity not to be missed to collect storm water run-off and store it for use in the garden.

Other: (5 comments)

1. Get it built fast, thanks for all you do
2. Would continue to use stairs at Walnut if Locust is blocked
3. The park and Schuylkill Banks are for General public use. (That is anybody can enjoy them) The community garden is limited by a group and to be a member you have to live in the limited area
4. Too many homeless people sleeping on path. homeless need to be removed from park
5. The remainder of the park is dedicated to playing fields, courts, dog run, playground, and gardens. The argument could be made that neither the gardens nor the dog run can spare a lot of space, but there is no reason to drop a massive structure into the middle of the park.

About Survey: (5 comments)

1. Survey not user friendly
2. Cannot tell where I can get on to the bridge, how about indicating street names and location

3. Unable to attend the meetings about the ramps and find the drawings and photos less than helpful, so I don't feel knowledgeable enough to fill in the second set of checks
4. Images provided bias survey. Not possible to judge.
5. This is great what you've done here but I feel like my choices in #2 might not be accurately reflecting my choices in #1. It's kind of difficult to make a well-thought out decision without a little more clarity on the schematics

Thanks: (3 comments)

1. Hard work appreciated. Thank You.
2. Thanks for allowing citizens to participate in planning
3. Keep up the good work

Comments Made about Specific alignments:

Red Option (54 comments all together)

Negative: (37 comments)

1. Totally opposed
2. Abysmal, hogs green area
3. Look like it will use up heart of the park
4. Takes over the green space, most intrusive, least desirable
5. Do not like, destroys neighborhood park
6. Please don't use, cuts beautiful park in half
7. Destroys park by breaking it up
8. Least pleasing, source of nature, shouldn't be cluttered with cement.
9. Too disruptive
10. Will take over the park. Based on what I can see, I would strongly oppose it.
11. Building a huge loop in the center of the park will virtually destroy the very nature and openness of the park. That has got to be the WORST idea anyone could come up with!!!
12. Would take away large, highly utilized field in middle of park.
13. Disruptive by constructing elevated ramps right through the park.

14. Extremely destructive of the park - really bad judgment in making this an option
15. Red and yellow options seem to be more intrusive to the park, seeming to take up too much space in the park.
16. Interferes with the overall aesthetics of the park
17. Will divide physically the park
18. The graded bowl also takes away area that's used for active and passive recreation
19. Aesthetically unacceptable because it builds on the only open green space in the park.
20. Will increase traffic through the park and also impinge upon the usable open space in the park

21. The red option, while sculptural would ruin the center of the park and make the dog run dangerous

22. Very concerned about the red scheme in that it creates a wall and breaks up the already small park.
23. It looks like it would cut the park in half - blocking views, use, safety, etc
24. Visually cut large area of park in half and safety concern
25. Unacceptable from aesthetic and safety standpoint

26. Creates areas under it for undesirable element, blind spots from street, destroying open space feel of park
27. Very unsafe, half of park hidden behind bridge and will divide open area in two, would lose at-grade open area
28. Safety/security concerns
29. Destroys integrity of park and provides space for loitering and sleeping
30. Combine with yellow, interrupts the park, could pose safety issues, breaks continuity of park.
31. Safety hazard, not possible to look across park, not desirable
32. Nice but hill blocking sight line is unsafe
33. Security disaster, ruin openness of park
34. The red or yellow options will bring homeless people seeking shelter under the bridge near the dog run

35. Would be a disaster by splitting the open space within the park. It would also result in a safety (crime) hazard by creating hiding spots near or under the ramp.

36. Obstruct views into and out of the park

37. Unnecessary to have such a long ramp

Mixed positive and negative about Red Option: (7 comments)

1. Looks intrusive but most pleasing aesthetically. Others ugly concrete
2. Looks pretty but dangerous with pedestrians, pets and bikes
3. Prettiest, most gentle slope for bikes but would break up park visually and functionally to unfortunate degree
4. Most modern and naturally aesthetic, less safe for peds with cyclists and skaters.
5. If underpass properly lit, could be safest and least isolated, stairs need same lighting and would ease congestion between wheel and foot peds
6. Aesthetically pleasing, wouldn't want any structure to encourage loitering
7. Concept is good but creates too much of a barrier and take valuable space away from the garden (sic)

Positive about Red Option: (10 comments)

1. Looks rad
2. Great design, beautiful skyline view with new hill
3. Love option. Most graceful and organically integrated.
4. Most graceful, natural, visually integrated with environment.
5. Integrates ramp with park, provides additional feature (the bowl)
6. The red option clearly looks the least intrusive because the viewer can get no sense of the height of the bridge as it crosses the tracks and enters the parkland
7. OK but requiring substantial reconstruction of the park
8. The yellow or red options are best /c they would not change the community garden
9. The bowl option presents the best overall solution, in terms of access and bicycle friendliness.
10. The graded bowl (red option) circular path is the best compromise between all options. It takes away very little space from both the dog run and the community garden. The graded bowl design will also reinvigorate the design of the park-the graded slope will add a new, aesthetically

pleasing and useful dimension to the park that will look good from all sides. Further, the graded slopes along the side walk side will allow for planting = gardening opportunities. Further, the slope will allow mild sledding for children in the winter time, and a view all year round which we haven't had heretofore. It will also allow for more trees to be planted in the park at the top and sides of the circular slope-giving shade, protection, beauty, and mitigating water run off, as well as attract more birds.

Green Option (56 comments all together)

Negative: (22 comments)

1. Third choice
2. Green is my least favorite
3. Please remove the GREEN option. It would destroy the views into the park from 25th St. and is visually unappealing.
4. Obstruct views into and out of the park
5. Seems so long. Try to put in steps
6. Awkward entrance, improved version wanted
7. Unnecessary to have such a long ramp
8. Is too isolated and will not be used
9. Green emptying onto the street makes no sense (congestion on sidewalk/risks of street crossings/loss of garden)

10. Switchbacks make serious safety issue for bikes and pedestrians
11. Think the green option is awful - the switchbacks are ugly and inconvenient
12. Switchbacks terrible for bikes, can't pass on turns
13. Unfriendly to the user with the multiple switchbacks and circuitous inefficiencies
14. Alignment seems to be very dangerous for cyclists due to the switchback style walkway at the street end.
15. The north border option makes it very difficult for bikers to maneuver.
16. Sacrifice, loss of sunlight, people up and down over head
17. Would impinge on beauty of the garden

18. Terrible changes to garden, unacceptable
19. Wretched, hard to use, safety issues on corners, why take garden space?
20. Hate to see gardens lost to ramp.
21. Building over the gardens destroys them.
22. Damages an award winning Philadelphia institution.

Mixed positive and negative about Green Option: (3 comments)

1. May affect the community garden, I think it should be noted that there are no gardeners working at night. Although the green option seems to reduce some of the garden area, I think it is less of a safety hazard for park users.
2. Seems to leave the open spaces open but is complicated by the need for the switchbacks
3. Least obtrusive but entrance ramp too bulky

Positive about Green Option: (31 comments)

1. I've heard comments that the green option would shade the gardens but it's on the northwest side and wouldn't block the sun.
2. Best at staying outside main area of park , yet very accessible
3. Only acceptable option to preserve park
4. Simplest and least expensive, detracts least from the park
5. Best for getting where you want to go efficiently and safely
6. Only viable option. Others convoluted and destroy park, plots can be made up elsewhere in the park
7. Most efficient use of space without comprising park grounds
8. Like it, it will allow bikes to access road more directly without going through park creating safety hazard.
9. Least intrusive.
10. Best option, won't effect us of park by dog owners and families with small children
11. Least disruptive and most direct
12. Best preserves park, protecting from heavy bike traffic, least impact
13. Best choice
14. Most direct access to street for bikers

15. Prefer this option, thanks
16. Prefer, park busy enough without dedicated bike route
17. I strongly support the green alignment
18. Green appears to be the best alternative
19. Would be OK
20. OK but either less convenient
21. The green scheme is my second choice
22. The problem with all lines but the green one is that they cut it off from the rest of the park and/or put it in darkness under a bridge.
23. Options green and yellow are the best
24. Alignment appears to better connect bicycle traffic to the street grid and avoid disruption to the pedestrian and playground activities in the park
25. The least intrusive to the park seems to be the green one.
26. The only ramp that does not dominate the park visually or practically.
27. Takes up the least amount of space in the park while buffering the community garden from the north side, therefore it is the most integrally designed of the three options.
28. Best one by virtue of its proximity to the current crossing point
29. This scheme minimizes overall impact to the whole park. Gardens can be relocated and expanded, there is plenty of room for that to happen
30. Yellow or green would be the best compromise
31. Without switchback would be perfect!

Yellow Option (43 comments all together)

Negative: (11 Comments)

1. Having to go all the way to basketball court to exit feels awkward.
2. Too disruptive
3. Will increase traffic through the park and also impinge upon the usable open space in the park
4. Dog Park smells bad, not pleasant
5. The red or yellow options will bring homeless people seeking shelter under the bridge near the dog run.
6. Unsafe- deposits people too far from street at night
7. Safety/security concerns
8. Would increase bicycle traffic in park, increased potential for collisions
9. Will put bike riders in direct competition with peds

10. Disruptive to the existing public park by directing bicycle traffic through the pedestrian walkways
11. The west border option will create too much conflicting traffic (bikers/peds/dogs/etc.) within the park.

Positive and Negative mixed about Yellow Option: (4 comments)

1. Second choice
2. Combine with red, corners are difficult to manage
3. Favor but don't want to lose dog park
4. Red and yellow options seem to be more intrusive to the park, seeming to take up too much space in the park. Might be nicer if it allowed for more "flow" with an uninterruptible curve on the park side rather than a right-angled ramp

Positive about Yellow Option: (28 comments)

1. Preference.
2. Far and away the best
3. The the best of the three.
4. I most favor the yellow design
5. Appears to intrude least on other uses and is therefore the one I favor
6. Prefer
7. I favor the yellow because of its simplicity and less disruptive effect on the park as a whole.
8. The best
9. The best compromise for protecting the interests of the garden, dog walkers and other park users. It facilitates safety, shelter, storage, overlook and stair needs.
10. West Fence option best balances tying the entrance to the park and preserving the open greenspace that is so rare in the city today.
11. Options green and yellow are the best
12. The yellow or red options are best /c they would not change the community garden
13. Yellow or green would be the best compromise
14. Least intrusive.
15. Best compromise of aesthetics, safety and overall use.
16. The best because it's least obtrusive.

17. Minimal impact, encourage cyclists to dismount as they leave the bridge
18. Modest and unobtrusive
19. Acceptable compromise
20. Looks as though it does the least amount of damage
21. The yellow option is minimally invasive
22. Least impact on the park
23. Provides the least intrusion to the park.
24. Park will have the least negative affect
25. Could be acceptable too
26. Cuts off a view of the train tracks, no big deal. and by being the straightest crossing, it also offers the most visibility and safety to people actually using the bridge.
27. Best for bikers, shortest ramp, no 90 degree turns
28. Best for bikers to negotiate