

City of Hanover

Park Dedication Fee Study

December 2018

Prepared by:

Collaborative Planning, LLC

PO Box 251

Medina, MN 55340

763-473-0569

Section 1: Introduction

INTRODUCTION

The City of Hanover updated the Comprehensive Plan in 2018. The purpose of this study is to provide recommendations to the City of Hanover concerning park dedication in furtherance of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. This document serves to update the existing Park Dedication Fee study prepared by Collaborative Planning in 2011.

New developments are required to participate in park dedication by either dedication of land, construction of improvements, payment of fee-in-lieu of land dedication, or a combination of these methods. The purpose of this study is to ascertain the improvements that are necessary due to new development as opposed to those that are required for existing dwelling units, as well as to recommend to the City Council the implementation of these improvements using both park dedication funds and other funding sources.

Section 2: Statute and Case Law

STATUTORY LAW - MINNESOTA STATUTES SECTION 462.358

The enabling legislation permitting municipalities to require parkland dedication or a cash equivalent for park acquisition and development is set forth in Minnesota Statutes Section 462.358 Subd. 2b. and 2c. as follows:

Subd. 2b. Dedication.

(a) The regulations may require that a reasonable portion of the buildable land, as defined by municipal ordinance, of any proposed subdivision be dedicated to the public or preserved for public use as streets, roads, sewers, electric, gas, and water facilities, storm water drainage and holding areas or ponds and similar utilities and improvements, parks, recreational facilities as defined in section [471.191](#), playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space. The requirement must be imposed by ordinance or under the procedures established in section [462.353](#), subdivision 4a.

(b) If a municipality adopts the ordinance or proceeds under section [462.353](#), subdivision 4a, as required by paragraph (a), the municipality must adopt a capital improvement budget and have a parks and open space plan or have a parks, trails, and open space component in its comprehensive plan subject to the terms and conditions in this paragraph and paragraphs (c) to (i).

(c) The municipality may choose to accept a cash fee as set by ordinance from the applicant for some or all of the new lots created in the subdivision, based on the average fair market value of the unplatted land for which park fees have not already been paid that is, no later than at the time of final approval or under the city's adopted comprehensive plan, to be served by municipal sanitary sewer and water service or community septic and private well as authorized by state law. For purposes of redevelopment on developed land, the municipality may choose to accept a cash fee based on fair market value of the land no later than the time of final approval.

(d) In establishing the portion to be dedicated or preserved or the cash fee, the regulations shall give due consideration to the open space, recreational, or common areas and facilities open to the public that the applicant proposes to reserve for the subdivision.

(e) The municipality must reasonably determine that it will need to acquire that portion of land for the purposes stated in this subdivision as a result of approval of the subdivision.

(f) Cash payments received must be placed by the municipality in a special fund to be used only for the purposes for which the money was obtained.

(g) Cash payments received must be used only for the acquisition and development or improvement of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space based on the approved park systems plan. Cash payments must not be used for ongoing operation or maintenance of parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space.

(h) The municipality must not deny the approval of a subdivision based solely on an inadequate supply of parks, open spaces, trails, or recreational facilities within the municipality.

(i) Previously subdivided property from which a park dedication has been received, being resubdivided with the same number of lots, is exempt from park dedication requirements. If, as a result of resubdividing the property, the number of lots is increased, then the park dedication or per-lot cash fee must apply only to the net increase of lots.

Subd. 2c.Nexus.

(a) There must be an essential nexus between the fees or dedication imposed under subdivision 2b and the municipal purpose sought to be achieved by the fee or dedication. The fee or dedication must bear a rough proportionality to the need created by the proposed subdivision or development.

(b) If a municipality is given written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication before the municipality's final decision on an application, a municipality must not condition the approval of any proposed subdivision or development on an agreement to waive the right to challenge the validity of a fee in lieu of dedication.

(c) An application may proceed as if the fee had been paid, pending a decision on the appeal of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, if (1) the person aggrieved by the fee puts the municipality on written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, (2) prior to the municipality's final decision on the application, the fee in lieu of dedication is deposited in escrow, and (3) the person aggrieved by the fee appeals under section [462.361](#), within 60 days of the approval of the application. If such an appeal is not filed

by the deadline, or if the person aggrieved by the fee does not prevail on the appeal, then the funds paid into escrow must be transferred to the municipality.

RELEVANT CASE LAW

Relevant case law establishes a two-prong analysis with respect to determining the amount of parkland dedication. First, the City must establish that the proposed development will create a rational nexus for additional park facilities. Second, the City must be able to prove that the amount of the dedication is roughly proportionate to the impact from the development.

Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U.S. 825 (1987).

In *Nollan*, the United States Supreme Court reviewed a regulation under which the California Coastal Commission required that an offer to dedicate a lateral public easement along the Nollans' beachfront lot be recorded on the chain of title to the property as condition of approval of a permit to demolish an existing bungalow and replace it with a three-bedroom house. The Coastal Commission had asserted that the public-easement condition was imposed to promote the legitimate state interest of diminishing the "blockage of the view of the ocean" caused by construction of the larger house. The Court held that in evaluating such claims, it must be determined whether an "essential nexus" exists between a legitimate state interest and the permit condition

Dolan v. City of Tigard, 114 S. Ct. 2309 (1994).

In *Dolan*, the U.S. Supreme Court found that land use extractions must be reflective of a development impact on the infrastructure system. In this respect, park dedication extracted from a land use must reflect the demand they generate for park and recreational facilities. This case established that a rational nexus or relationship must exist between the fees charged for parks and the related impacts that are generated by the use.

Collis v. City of Bloomington, 246 N.W.2d 19 (Minn. 1976).

In *Collis*, the Minnesota Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Bloomington's Ordinance that set forth a ten (10) percent park dedication requirement "as a general rule." The Court found for this particular case and developer/project, that "as a general rule, it was reasonable for the City to require dedication of ten percent of land or payment of ten percent of the value of undeveloped land for park dedication." The Court noted that the ten percent requirement might be arbitrary as a matter of law because it does not consider the relationship between the particular subdivision and recreational need in the community.

Kottschade v. City of Rochester, 537 N.W.2d 301 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995).

In *Kottschade*, this case, the Minnesota Court of Appeals noted that in the case of a dedication, the City is requiring a property owner to give up a constitutional right – the right to receive just compensation when private property is taken for a public purpose. In order to uphold a dedication requirement the City has the burden of proving the required relationship between the

property development and the City's need for land dedication. To meet that burden, the City must show that an "essential nexus" exists between the need for the land and the dedication requirement. If the nexus can be demonstrated, the City must also demonstrate a "rough proportionality" between the development and the City's dedication requirement.

The City must be able to prove that the proposed project will create a need for additional park facilities and that the amount of dedication required is roughly proportionate to the need that will be generated from the development. A precise mathematical calculation is not required, however.

Section 3: Parks Plan

2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The City of Hanover 2018 Comprehensive Plan sets forth the framework for the continued development of the City's park and trail system.

COMMUNITY GROWTH

The demographic statistics set forth in the City of Hanover 2018 Comprehensive Plan serve as the basis for the population and household statistics. The following relevant data is set forth in the City of Hanover Comprehensive Plan:

- Hanover was home to 3,456 residents living in 1,065 households in 2017 according to the U.S. Census Bureau. This would equate to 3.25 people per household.
- Total households in 2040 is projected to be 2,800, which would equate to a population of approximately 8,400 at 3 persons per household.
- The City can accommodate the forecasted level of growth within the existing corporate boundary.
- The City has planned for significant future expansion by annexing portions of Rockford Township. These future annexation areas are not accounted for in this study.

PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

Parks are classified according to factors including size, use, service area, location and site improvements. Generally accepted park classifications include the following:

Mini Park. Mini parks are intended to provide specialized facilities that serve a concentrated or limited population or specific group such as tots or senior citizens. These parks have an area of two acres or less, are typically located within neighborhoods and serve people living within less than ¼ mile of the Mini Park.

Neighborhood Park. Neighborhood parks are intended to provide areas for intense recreational activities such as field games, courts, apparatus areas, skating, etc. These parks are intended to serve a population of 1,000 to 2,500 people with a service area range from ¼ to ½ mile. The existing Hanover city parks are all neighborhood parks with the exception of Settlers Park.

Linear Park. Linear parks are typically developed for one or more varying modes of recreational travel such as hiking, biking, skiing, canoeing, etc. Trails are linear parks.

Special Use Park. Special use parks are generally areas established to provide specialized or single purpose recreational activities such as a golf course, nature center, marina, zoo, display gardens, etc.

Community Parks. Community parks are generally intended to provide areas of natural or ornamental quality for outdoor recreation activities including walking, picnicking, fields and court athletic activities. Settlers Park is a community park.

Regional Park. Regional parks are areas of natural or ornamental quality for nature oriented outdoor recreation including swimming, picnicking, hiking, fishing, boating, camping and trail use. These parks are designed to serve three to five communities and typically include 200 to 500 acres of land (100 acres minimum).

Regional Park Reserve. Regional park reserves are areas of natural quality for nature/outdoor recreation including viewing and studying nature, wildlife habitat, conservation, swimming, picnicking, hiking, fishing, boating, camping and trail use. These parks are designed to serve one or several counties and typically include 1,000 or more acres of land.

Open Space. Open space is defined as area set aside for the preservation of natural open spaces to counteract the effects of urban congestion and monotony.

EXISTING PARKS WITHIN THE CITY OF HANOVER

Several parks currently comprise the existing Hanover park system. The majority of these parks are classified as neighborhood parks. Settlers Park, when considered together with the Hanover Athletic Association Complex, serves the function of community park. Hanover also has a county park (Riverside County Park) and a portion of a regional park reserve (Crow-Hassan Park Reserve) within its corporate limits.

Eagle View Park

Eagle View Park is a neighborhood park located on the southern side of the Hanover Hills Development overlooking the Crow River. Eagle View Park consists of approximately 3.68 acres and primarily serves the residents of Hanover Hills, White Tail Preserve and other nearby residents. In addition to the playground and gazebo, this park offers a popular sliding hill in the winter months.

Pheasant Run Park

Pheasant Run Park is a neighborhood park located in the Pheasant Run neighborhood east of downtown Hanover. Pheasant Run Park consists of 2.01 acres and primarily serves residents located on the eastern side of downtown Hanover.

Settler's Park

Settler's Park serves community park functions in conjunction with the adjacent Hanover Athletic Association Complex. Settler's Park itself consists of 4.99 acres and serves as a neighborhood park to the downtown Hanover area and surrounding neighborhoods. This park is the site of larger community events and gatherings. There is a shelter with a small kitchen area and restrooms available. Several fields are located between this and the Athletic Association Complex.

Cardinal Circle Park

Cardinal Circle Park is located in the Crow River Heights neighborhood and contains approximately five acres. This park contains more extensive facilities than other neighborhood parks in Hanover but is also within the service area for future developments to the west. Additional development of this park is needed as new development occurs.

Mallards Landing Park

This park is slightly smaller than two acres and primarily serves residents in the Schendel's Fields neighborhood in the northeastern side of Hanover. The park contains a gazebo, playground, and basketball court.

Bridgeview Park

Bridgeview Park is located on land owned by the Bridges at Hanover homeowner's association that is leased to the City. This small park contains playground equipment.

Riverside County Park

Riverside County Park is small regional park located in the northeast quadrant of Hanover. Riverside County Park, maintained by the Wright County Parks Department, consists of 17 acres with 1/4 mile of river frontage, a picnic area, a canoe and camping site, and toilets. Wright County Parks are open to everyone, free of charge and Wright County does not permit pets or alcohol within Wright County Parks.

Crow-Hassan Park Reserve

Crow-Hassan Park Reserve is a regional park reserve located along the eastern boundary of the City of Hanover. The Crow-Hassan Park Reserve, maintained by Three Rivers Park District, consists of 2,600 acres and offers nature-oriented outdoor recreation.

FUTURE PARKS ANTICIPATED BY THE CITY OF HANOVER

Following is a summary of the future parks planned by the City Hanover Park Board. A map showing the future parks and trails included within this Study is attached as Exhibit A and a more detailed description of the amenities in each of the following future parks is attached as Exhibit B.

Future Park 1 – Neighborhood Park (East Hanover)

There is an anticipated need for a neighborhood park (3 acres) in eastern Hanover to serve primarily future developments. It is anticipated that this park can be constructed adjacent to Riverside Park, as a way of expanding the opportunities already available there but also providing for more typical neighborhood park needs. However, it could also be located within future residential development planned for the area to the northwest of Riverside Park.

Future Park 2 Special Use Park (Southwest Hanover)

There is an anticipated need for a park (3 acres) located west of downtown Hanover and adjacent to the north side of the Crow River to provide access to the river. This will be a special use facility to provide nature-based recreation and access to the river. The location, commonly known as “the tube”, is susceptible to spring floods and is a popular fishing site for residents and visitors. The property itself is sandwiched between the river on the south and County Road 20 on the north with around 60-100 feet of land separating the two.

Future Park 3 – Special Use Park (Downtown Riverfront)

This is a special use park located adjacent to the historic bridge over the Crow River that serves as a specialty riverside park with minimal amenities. The park will have trail access and will be primarily used for a sitting and resting area along the Crow River.

Future Park 4 – Community Park (Southeast Hanover with School District)

There is an anticipated need for a community park (20 acres) located in the southeast side of Hanover in conjunction with a future school. Improvements of the site will be for active recreation uses typical of an athletic complex. It is unknown at this time as to whether there would be a contribution from the City for the construction of a park associated with this school. This would be subject to negotiation between the City and the school district and no contribution for this park is included in this study at this time.

Future Park 5 – Neighborhood/Special Use Park (West Hanover)

There is an anticipated need for a park (3 acres) located in the recently annexed areas west of CR 20 as development progresses. It is envisioned that this park would have some amenities as a neighborhood park to serve the new residences, but that it will also be used as a special use nature park.

Future Park 6 – Neighborhood (North Hanover)

There is an anticipated need for a park (3 acres) located in the northern portion of the community near areas planned for higher density housing.

Future Park 7 – Neighborhood (South Hanover)

There is an anticipated need for a park (3 acres) located in the southern portion of the community near areas planned for neighborhood residential development.

TRAIL SYSTEM

In the past decade, the City of Hanover added miles of trails to its existing trail system creating linkages throughout the City. The City of Hanover future trail plan includes the addition of a trail system that would connect the various parks and recreation facilities together. In addition to the trails shown in the map in Exhibit A, there are also anticipated to be linking trails and sidewalks that connect from the neighborhoods to the circulation trails that would be constructed coincident with new development.

Section 4: **Park Dedication Analysis**

RESIDENTIAL PARK DEDICATION ANALYSIS

Park dedication is collected as a condition of subdivision approval. In this respect, the park dedication fee is estimated on the basis of new housing units or households. Currently, the City has completed approximately 44.5% of its ultimate park system based on estimated value and future improvements (see Table 1 on the following page). According to the U.S. Census, there were 1,065 housing units in the City of Hanover in 2017 which represents 38% of the projected 2040 housing units of 2,800 anticipated by the City of Hanover. Housing units yet to be constructed represent 62% of the 2040 households in Hanover. This indicates that the current park system is adequate to serve the current population but also does not have capacity to accommodate future growth.

To determine the equitable distribution of future park system value to residential units, the ultimate system value is divided by projected household counts. The City of Hanover Park Board provided a list of existing and proposed future park facilities that was used to establish the value of the existing park system and to identify costs reasonably expected to complete the future park system. Existing and potential park sites identified by the City of Hanover Park Board are set forth on Exhibit B, City of Hanover Park Facilities Cost Matrix. The anticipated total acreage, facilities and values of each park are also identified. It should be noted that the information contained therein is the best estimate of future facilities that can be made at this time and that the specific facilities and dollar figures may be subject to change/revision as time goes by and market conditions fluctuate.

The estimated value of the complete park system is approximately \$10,230,627. Based on such estimated value of the complete park system, Table 1 illustrates that the park system is currently 44.5% developed.

Park	Estimated Existing Value	Estimated Future Improvements	Estimated Completed Value
Cardinal Circle	\$410,550	\$277,725	\$688,275
Mallards Landing	\$234,025	\$100,625	\$334,650
Bridgeview	\$77,500	\$0	\$77,500
Eagle View	\$206,856	\$43,125	\$249,981
Pheasant Run	\$176,666	\$28,750	\$205,416
Settlers	\$521,123	\$431,563	\$952,685
FP 1: East Hanover -- Near Riverside	\$0	\$296,290	\$296,290
FP 5: Southwest Hanover	\$0	\$177,875	\$177,875
FP 3: Downtown Riverfront	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
FP 4: SE Hanover -- With School District	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included
FP 2: West Hanover	\$0	\$383,094	\$383,094
FP 6: North Hanover	\$0	\$311,219	\$311,219
FP 7: South Hanover	\$0	\$311,219	\$311,219
Trails	\$2,926,485	\$2,315,939	\$5,242,424
Totals	\$4,553,205	\$5,677,422	\$10,230,627
Percent of Completed Value	44.5%	55.5%	

A portion of the 2040 completed park system is attributable to existing development. The portion of the park system attributable to the existing development in the City can be determined by calculating the percentage of housing units existing as compared to those that will be in place in 2040, and then further determining if those existing units have paid their share of the park system, or whether there is a portion that remains to be funded. Table 2 below outlines the calculations for the existing share of development.

A. Existing Housing Units	1065
B. 2040 Housing Units	2800
C. Percent Existing (A/B)	38.0%
D. Estimated Value of 2040 Park System (from Table 1)	\$10,230,627
E. Estimated Value of Park System Attributable to Existing Development (C*D)	\$3,891,292
F. Estimated Existing Park System Value (from Table 1)	\$4,553,205
G. Amount of Future Park System to be Funded by Existing Development (E-F)	(\$661,913)

As evidenced from Table 2 above, existing development has already paid its share of the cost of the 2040 park system outlined in Table 1.

To determine the equitable distribution of future park system value to residential units, a comparison is made to determine the lower value between how much of the future park system is attributable to future development and the actual cost of constructing the remainder of the park system. The lower value is then divided by the projected additional housing units to be created to estimate a park dedication fee needed to construct the share of the park system attributable to future development. Table 3 shows these calculations.

Table 3. Park Dedication Calculation

A. Estimated Value of 2040 Park System (from Table 1)	\$10,230,627
B. Future Household Percentage (2040 Projections less existing households)	62.0%
C. Estimated Value of Park System Attributable to Future Development (A * B)	\$6,339,335
D. Estimated Value of Park System Remaining to be Constructed (from Table 1)	\$5,677,422
E. Lesser of Line C and D.	\$5,677,422
F. Number of Additional Future Households	1,735
G. Park Dedication Fee per Housing Unit (C/D)	\$3,272

It is important to note that the City should re-evaluate the system value, current land values and system needs on a periodic basis and adjust the park dedication fees accordingly.

Park maintenance and replacement of existing equipment should not be financed using park dedication funds. The operational and future improvement costs must be budgeted within the City's general funds with costs shared by all community residents.

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PARK DEDICATION ANALYSIS

The City of Hanover Comprehensive Plan indicates that the existing commercial and industrial acreage within the City of Hanover is relatively limited.

Many metropolitan communities collect commercial/ industrial park land dedication or a fee in lieu thereof. When implementing a commercial/industrial park land fee, a nexus between commercial and industrial use and the benefit received through the city's park system must be established. Factors to be considered include commercial or industrial league programs. There are discussions that suggest that there is intrinsic benefit to all land uses from a quality park system related to quality of life within a community. The issue at hand is to determine the proportionate need that commercial/industrial developments generate for the community park system.

In Hanover, there is no empirical data that currently illustrates whether a direct park benefit to the commercial and industrial properties either exists or does not exist. It is likely that employees of local businesses use city parks for lunch breaks, walking and/or recreational purposes. The ultimate question is whether commercial and industrial development generates the same need/demand on the park system as an equivalent residential development. The proportionate benefit is unknown for the City of Hanover, due to the lack of information about the degree to which the commercial/industrial developments use the system. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the City will continue its past policy of imposing a park dedication fee on new residential development only. If the City implements a commercial/industrial park dedication fee in the future, the residential unit fee must be reduced proportionately.

RELEVANT ORDINANCE PROVISIONS

It is recommended that the City's ordinances be updated as appropriate to reflect this study.

Section 5: Summary and Recommendations

SUMMARY

- Minnesota Statutes and case law provide that park dedication requirements can be applied only to facilities that will be impacted by the specific project. Future park dedication fees cannot be utilized to maintain existing neighborhood park and trail systems.
- The total planned park system is estimated to cost \$10,230,627 based upon the park plan developed by the City of Hanover Park Board Park Plan, current land values and facility costs.
- The current policy of the City is to charge only residential developments for park dedication fees. If the City desires to charge park dedication fees for commercial and industrial development, it is suggested that this study be amended to determine the appropriate fee for those land uses and to reduce the residential fee to reflect a proportional distribution of costs.
- Park maintenance and replacement should not be financed using park dedication funds. The operational replacement costs should be budgeted within the City's general or capital improvement program funds with costs shared by all taxpayers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The current park system and plan is consistent with the City of Hanover 2040 Comprehensive Plan and as such, the park dedication fee structure for new residential developments should be based upon this analysis providing a park dedication fee of \$3,272 per residential unit to construct that portion of the City's planned park system that is attributed to new development.
2. A periodic review of land values and facility costs should be done to ensure that the park dedication fee remains current based upon market conditions.
3. The City should consider incorporating park redevelopment infrastructure planning as part of the 5-year Capital Improvements Plan. Minnesota Statutes specify that park dedication fees may not be used for maintenance purposes and therefore it is important for the City to continue to provide a separate budget fund for maintenance. Replacement of aging replacement facilities is not included in this study and it is assumed that these will be paid for by different funding sources than park dedication.

4. In the event that the City is contemplating park improvement upgrades, facility or equipment replacement in the future that are not substantially similar to those in Exhibit B, the City should include these improvements in the Capital Improvement Plan and budget for these improvements in the City's general funds. These improvements should not be funded out of the park dedication fees unless this study has been updated to include those improvements.
5. The City's ordinances should be amended to reflect the adoption of the new park dedication fee amount as well as to incorporate the other recommended ordinance changes.
6. In the event the City of Hanover determines to reduce the number, or size of the parks proposed by its current park plan, this park dedication study should be updated accordingly.
7. It is recommended that the City maintain an annual budget appropriation for the ongoing maintenance and replacement of existing facilities.
8. Park dedication fees should be placed in a separate segregated fund and appropriate accounting of the fund should be created on an annual basis.

EXHIBIT B

City of Hanover Park Study – Park Facility Cost Estimates

Settler's Park	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$30,000		4.99 acres of land	2 acres	\$150,000	\$60,000	
	Acre	\$7,500		site preparation		\$37,500	\$15,000	
	Each	\$18,000	1	Shelter		\$18,000		
	--	\$20,000	1	Kitchen		\$20,000		
	--	\$10,000	2	Restrooms		\$20,000		
	Each	\$12,000	1	Playground Equip		\$12,000		
	--	\$45,000	1	Little League BB Field		\$45,000		
	--	\$35,000	1	T-ball field		\$35,000		
	Each	\$200	4	Horseshoe Pits		\$800		
	--	\$15,000	1	VB courts		\$15,000		
	Each	\$2,000	30	Paved parking lot		\$60,000		
	Each	\$50,000	1		Bandshell		\$200,000	
		\$200,000			Lights and upgrade electrical		\$200,000	
		\$200,000			Trail connection - 19 to River Road		\$200,000	
	Each	\$1,300	4	Bleachers (15')		\$5,200		
	--	\$50,000	1		Restroom upgrade		\$50,000	
	--	\$50,000	1		Kitchen Upgrade		\$50,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities	\$34,650	\$116,250	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect	\$67,973	\$133,688	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$81,625	
					Subtotals	\$521,123	\$431,563	\$952,685

City of Hanover Park Dedication Study
December 2018

Cardinal Circle	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$30,000	5.00	5 acres		\$150,000		
	Acre	\$7,500	5.00	site preparation		\$37,500		
	Each	\$20,000	1	Gazebo		\$20,000		
	Each	\$45,000	1	ballfield		\$45,000		
	Each	\$25,000	1	soccer		\$25,000		
	Each	\$10,000	2		Restroom Facilities		\$20,000	
	Each	\$50,000	1		Warming House		\$50,000	
	Each	\$60,000	1	Playground Equip		\$60,000		
	Each	\$100,000	1		Field/Court Lighting		\$100,000	
	Each	\$40,000	1		Basketball/Multi-purpose court		\$40,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%		Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities	Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities	\$19,500	\$31,500	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%		Indirect	Indirect	\$53,550	\$36,225	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%		Construction Contingencies	Construction Contingencies		\$24,150	
					Subtotals	\$410,550	\$277,725	\$688,275

Mallards Landing	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	30,000	2	2 acres		\$60,000		
	Acre	7,500	2	site preparation		\$15,000		
	Each	20,000	1	Gazebo		\$20,000		
	Each	15,000	1	soccer		\$15,000		
	Each	40,000	1	Playground Equip		\$40,000		
	Each	20,000	1		Totlot		\$20,000	
	Each	40,000	1	Multi-purpose Court		\$40,000		
	Each	50,000	1		Field Lighting		\$50,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%		Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$13,500	\$10,500	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%		Indirect		\$30,525	\$12,075	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%		Construction Contingencies			\$8,050	
					Subtotals	\$234,025	\$ 100,625	\$334,650

City of Hanover Park Dedication Study
December 2018

Eagle View Park	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$30,000	3.68	3.68 acres of land		\$110,400		
	Acre	\$7,500	3.68	site preparation		\$27,600		
	Each	\$5,500	1	Gazebo (16')		\$5,500		
	Each	\$400	1	Picnic Table		\$400		
	Each	\$300	2	Bench Rest Areas		\$600		
	Each	\$16,000	1	Playground Equipment		\$16,000		
	Each	\$30,000	1		Nature-Based Paths and Educational Feature		30000	
	Stall	\$2,000	8	Parking Lot -- 8 car		\$16,000		
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities	\$3,375	4500	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect	\$26,981	5175	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		3450	
					Subtotals	\$206,856	\$43,125	\$249,981

Bridgeview	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$30,000	0.25	Land		\$7,500		
	Each	\$30,000	1	Playground		\$30,000		
	Project	\$40,000	1	Landscaping		\$40,000		
					Subtotals	\$77,500	\$0	\$77,500

Pheasant Run Park	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$30,000	2.01	2.01 acres of land		\$60,300		
	Acre	\$7,500	2.01	site preparation		\$15,075		
	Each	\$5,500	2	Gazebo (16')		\$11,000		
	Each	\$2,000	12	Parking spaces		\$24,000		
	Each	\$15,650	1	Playground Equip		\$15,650		
	Each	\$20,000	1		Totlot		20000	
	Each	40000	0.5	- 1/2 basketball court		\$20,000		
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities	\$7,598	3000	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect	\$23,043	3450	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		2300	
					Subtotals	\$176,666	28750	\$205,416

City of Hanover Park Dedication Study
December 2018

Future Park 1 (FP1)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
East Hanover -- Near Riverside Park	Acre	\$30,000	3		3 acres land acquisition		\$90,000	
	Acre	\$7,500	3		Site Preparation		\$22,500	
	Each	\$20,000	1		Shelter area		\$20,000	
	Space	\$2,000	10		Paved parking lot		\$20,000	
	Each	\$10,000	2		Restrooms		\$20,000	
	Each	\$45,000	1		Playground Equip		\$45,000	
	Each	\$20,000	1		Multi-purpose Recreation Field		\$20,000	
	Each	\$200	4		Horseshoe pits		\$800	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$22,245	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect		\$35,745	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$17,055	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$296,290	\$296,290

Future Park 2 (FP2)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
Southwest Hanover	Acre	\$7,500	2		land acquisition		\$15,000	
	Acre	\$5,000	2		site preparation		\$10,000	
		\$50,000			Debris removal/ decontamination		\$50,000	
	Each	\$10,000	1		Boat or Canoe Launch		\$10,000	
	Each	\$2,000	10		Parking Lot - Crushed Rock		\$20,000	
	Each	\$25,000	1		Internal trails through site		\$25,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$13,500	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect		\$21,525	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$12,850	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$177,875	\$177,875

Future Park 3 (FP3)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
Downtown Riverfront	Project	\$1,000,000	1		Acquisition/Landscaping / Hardscaping/ Amenities - enhancement of downtown riverfront and historic bridge area		\$1,000,000	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000

City of Hanover Park Dedication Study
December 2018

Future Park 5 (FP5)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
West Hanover	Acre	\$30,000	3		3 acres of land		\$90,000	
	Acre	\$7,500	3		site preparation		\$22,500	
	Each	\$20,000	1		Shelter		\$20,000	
	Each	\$30,000	1		Playground		\$30,000	
	Each	40000	1		Basketball court		\$40,000	
	Each	\$2,000	16		Parking Lot		\$32,000	
	Item	\$50,000	1		Woodchip trails throughout park and into open space area		\$50,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$29,175	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect		\$47,051	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$22,368	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$383,094	\$383,094

Future Park 6 (FP6)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
North Hanover	Acre	\$30,000	3		3 acres of land		\$90,000	
	Acre	\$7,500	3		site preparation		\$22,500	
	Each	40000	1		Basketball court		\$40,000	
	Each	\$30,000	1		Playground		\$30,000	
	Each	\$2,000	16		Parking Lot		\$32,000	
	Each	\$20,000	1		Multi-purpose Recreation Field		\$20,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$21,675	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect		\$38,426	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$16,618	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$311,219	\$311,219

City of Hanover Park Dedication Study
December 2018

Future Park 7 (FP7)	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
South Hanover	Acre	\$30,000	3		3 acres of land		\$90,000	
	Acre	\$7,500	3		site preparation		\$22,500	
	Each	40000	1		Basketball court		\$40,000	
	Each	\$30,000	1		Playground		\$30,000	
	Each	\$2,000	16		Parking Lot		\$32,000	
	Each	\$20,000	1		Multi-purpose Recreation Field		\$20,000	
	% of Subtotal of Development	15%			Landscaping/Hardscaping/Amenities		\$21,675	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect		\$38,426	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$16,618	
					Subtotals	\$0	\$311,219	\$311,219

TRAILS	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Existing Park Facilities	Future Park Facilities	Est. Value Existing	Est. Cost New Facilities	Total Park Cost/Value
	Acre	\$ 15,000			15 foot easements for trails	\$201,710	\$147,794	
	Lineal Foot	\$60	39051	Existing Trails		\$2,343,060		
	Lineal Foot	\$60	28613		Proposed Trails Constructed as City project		\$1,716,780	
	% of Subtotal of Development and Land	15%			Indirect	\$381,715	\$279,686	
	% of Subtotal of Development & Landscaping	10%			Construction Contingencies		\$171,678	
					Subtotals	\$2,926,485	\$2,315,939	\$5,242,424