
Park Commission Public Comment: 12-9-25 Meeting

From Russell Hinds [REDACTED]

Date Tue 12/9/2025 10:19 AM

To Makayla Rodriguez <mrodriguez@rollingwoodtx.gov>

Dear Park Commission Members,

I am writing in support of the adopted Park Master Plan. I hope my thoughts below are helpful as you continue your work on this important issue. Here is a copy of what I plan to say this afternoon

Tx

Russell Hinds

Good afternoon.

Thank you for the time to speak.

I want to address the proposal for a 0.6 acre dog park. I will be direct. This plan is out of scale, out of step with the purpose of our park, and out of alignment with what the community actually wants.

First, we should remember why we have a park. Parks exist for people. They exist for children to play baseball, for families to gather, for neighbors to exercise, socialize, and enjoy open space. When we have limited acreage, every square foot matters. If we only had one acre to work with, no one would reasonably give half of it to dogs and half to humans. Yet that is effectively what the 0.6 acre proposal does.

The original park plan contemplated a 0.25 acre dog park, and that seemed reasonable and balanced. Since then, a resident, Alex Robinette, proposed a 0.4 acre compromise option. That is something that could be evaluated as well. But jumping straight to 0.6 acres does not reflect community demand. It reflects the preferences of a very small minority of board members who are pushing for it. That is not how land use decisions should be made.

Second, there is the issue of impact. Dogs inevitably bring sanitation challenges. Even responsible owners can miss waste. Dogs may wander behind structures, have stomach issues, or leave residue on the grass. That directly affects how the shared space can be used by children and adults. In reality, only about 10 percent of residents actually use or would use a dog park, based on my opinion and a small poll that was done. Meanwhile, I estimate about 60 percent of the neighborhood would use the park for baseball, workouts, community gatherings, activities with children, and other human activities.

We should then ask a basic question.

Who does the City Council and Park commission serve?

The answer is the citizens of Rollingwood. And from everything I can tell, the majority of residents are not asking for a 0.6 acre dog park.

The Council has said they represent the silent majority, but the simplest way to determine what residents want is to ask them directly.

This does not need to be a divisive issue. There is a solution that respects everyone. Pause this vote. Step back. And poll the community. Or put forward a proposition with options such as no dog park, a 0.25 acre dog park, the 0.4 acre Robinette proposal, or the 0.6 acre proposal.

Let the residents decide. That is the cleanest and fairest path forward.

Right now, the process feels rushed, misaligned, and not reflective of community priorities. That is why so many of us felt the need to come here and speak. And honestly, it should not have to be this way.

Rollingwood is a close community. We can make decisions together, transparently, and based on real resident input.

I respectfully ask the Council to halt this vote, set aside the 0.6 acre proposal, and give the community the chance to make its voice heard.

Thank you.

Russell Hinds.