

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PARK COMMISSION
Village Hall, Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158
Wednesday, November 2, 2005
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Wednesday, November 2, 2005, at 6:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Rita Christiansen, Glen Christiansen, Michael Russert and William Mills. Kathleen Burns and Alex Tiahnybok were excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. MINUTES - OCTOBER 4, 2005**

Michaeline Day:

In your packets you were given the minutes for the September 6, 2005 meeting. If you've had a chance to review the minutes, I'd like a motion to accept them.

Rita Christiansen:

I'd like to make a motion to accept them.

Michael Russert:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**
- 5. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **Review Major Changes, Updates, Additions Background Chapters of the Master Park Plan and the Needs Assessment (Vandewalle & Associates)**
- b. **Review Concept Site Plans for Five Village Parks (Vandewalle & Associates)**

Michaeline Day:

Earlier, Mike, before you came in we were discussing kind of like the logistics of this, so we had thought that we would put the microphone there and turn our microphones and head down there because it would be a little easier for it to be explained to us. So we're all going to step down there and we'll probably handle Items a and b from the floor. If anyone is going to make comments, I would ask that we speak up a little loudly so that we don't have any trouble with the transcribing of minutes because we did have some issues before with not being able to hear.

Megan MacGlashan:

Good evening everyone. In the last month or so I've been working really hard to flush out the background chapters of the plan, as well as go over the various issues that we addressed at last month's Commission meeting. However, the primary purpose of this meeting is to go over the concept plans that we have been working on. I guess now would be a great time to introduce you to Jim Schaefer. He is our landscape architect and park designer, and he has put together these nice sketches for you and preliminary concept plans.

However, I did send you one document in your packet, and that is the goals, objectives and policies which is now part of the plan. This is an important section because it's really the foundation for two things in the plan. First off the recommendations. We base our recommendations off of these goals, objectives and policies, which in turn have been based off all of the input we've received from you up until now, as well as public input and all of our previous conversations.

The second thing that it does for us is it helps us refine our methodology for the needs assessment. We have these excellent standards that SEWRPC has provided for us. However, if we want to do a more thorough assessment, we need to have a more subjective analysis that we kind of saw with our conversation in the last Commission meeting.

So this portion of the plan is pretty self-explanatory if you've all had a chance to look at it. I don't want to take a lot of time to review it. However, if there are questions about it, or if there are any glaring omissions or things that you think should be in this portion of the plan that aren't in there I would certainly like to take those comments at this time.

Michaeline Day:

Did any of the Park Commissioners have any questions on the goals or objectives?
Thank you, Megan, no.

Megan MacGlashan:

Great. What I will do then is I will hand you over to Jim and he's going to give you an overview of the concept plans that he's put together. And we would really like this to be an open dialogue. We'd like to hear your feedback. We recently just this afternoon had a meeting with some staff with John and Jean and Kathy, and they have given us their feedback, but we would certainly appreciate getting some feedback from you. It's important to note that these are very, very rough preliminary sketches at this point, so there's a lot of room for change and improvement. With that I'll hand you over to Jim.

Jim Schaefer:

Thanks, Megan. I basically have taken up the reigns on the project in terms of park design. Recently there was a vision workshop, park plan workshop, where a lot of comments and ideas for future park spaces were absorbed, given out and shared. I received a list of everybody's thoughts that was basically condensed off of a lot of maps and looked over all the maps. People did exercises. Were you all involved in those exercises, most of you? Okay, so you know what happened. I basically got the summarized list, and I then also combined it with another list of park impact fee budget estimates for future park projects done over the years by the park staff as well as comments from the Rec Department for future goals, program uses, event ideas, things they may want to incorporate into the park plan as physical space and event space in the park spaces long term. I condensed that all into one list which will actually show up in all of these maps that I'm going to share with you.

So we've been base mapping the sites, looking at the sites a little bit. Basically what you're getting is first pass design concept stuff here. Did you already get a chance to look at all this in your packets? I hope so. I think I'm going to just tackle these one by one. I'm just going to do it alphabetically because it's easier for me. Creekside would be first.

Everybody knows where Creekside is and what the bigger picture is for where it sits and what the goals for this site are. The uses that basically came out of the process of the vision workshop were soccer was identified, baseball, play field, tot lots, picnic areas and basketball. These are active sport uses. So basically my goal is to try and show how all of these would fit on this space. And it turns out, as I'm sure you're probably already aware, there's a large park area to the north of the site, and then there's a connection that's not actually parkland, but there is sort of an open space linear connection along a stream to another piece south. The goals really were to do sort of more tot lot, picnic area uses in the south piece, because it's really not large enough to support a lot of active sport uses. This is a condominium project, so it's condos so it's not really going to be an intensive use area as far as we can guess at this point. But the key thing was to connect it to what would be an active space to the north.

The big constraint here was we knew that there were wetlands designated as DNR floodplain wetlands in this location and this location. And we were hoping we would be able to use what's left over as open space play fields, and possibly if you wanted to, and

keep in mind these are sort of ambitious plans. Everything I drew here was trying to pack everything in and think in terms of long term. I wasn't even really thinking about budgetary constraints. It was just what would the park look like if we actually tried to show all those uses, and let's subtract from there after our discussion. So this is showing everything we could possibly fit into this space. So it shows active sports like tennis, basketball, a parking area that comes off of this road which I'm not sure of the name of but off of the circle. Entrance lined up with the cul-de-sac entrance to make a safe intersection. And these would be spaces that would serve these active uses as well as maybe perhaps a large pavilion possibly with a restroom. I can't remember if we settled on whether there would be a restroom here, but it looks like a big enough park that there could be and there might be a need for that.

We show a tot lot in the same area near that pavilion, and then a circulation system or pathway that loops around the entire site and, again, connecting down to the lower area. As well as we thought it was very critical to show the east/west path connection that we're working on as part of the master plan. We thought it was a vital connection that needs to be planned for. I really don't want to do all the talking. If people want to start chiming in about whether they think this looks right or looks right. I think this is primarily a visual thing, and that's why I thought we could spread this out on the table. It might be a little awkward with the microphones, but if you want to start drawing on top of this and interacting that's fine with me.

Michaeline Day:

You had stated earlier you met with the staff for about three hours this afternoon?

Jim Schaefer:

That's correct.

Michaeline Day:

And perhaps either Mike or John can join in if there was any of these topics that they had said would or would not work at this point, or what some of the changes are that you were interested in. Instead of having just one person talk, if we all wanted to get together, if there was stuff that you guys liked in here or didn't like as staff.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I can go through and kind of get to some of the changes. Jim, do you want to go through and make those design changes? Jim can head up any summarizations that we did and anything that he had missed in our conversations I'll just jump in and add onto it. I guess one of the biggest changes in Creekside Park, though, is where we have the two soccer fields and the softball fields like Jim had said, I believe there might even be some sort of a retention basin that's going in there. It's kind of a floodplain area, so we really can't do any sort of grading in there. It's kind of based on the elevation of the field now. We're not really sure how that's going to lay out. But anything that's east of that wetland area and down lower in the southeastern portion I think for areas that Mike wanted planned.

Jim Schaefer:

For each of these concepts we had a really productive meeting just now. I almost wish it had happened a month ago. But in some ways it's better that you see that this is evolving literally on the spot. We're going to have another crack at this at the next Park Commission. But some of the other changes were it might turn out that this is actually a big body of water, so these fields wouldn't make sense then unless you wanted to play water polo. I didn't know about that until today, literally, so we'll be rethinking that. That's not even known for sure as near as I can tell. We have to make contact with a key person who is actually still solving this issue about floodplain management.

The other issue was the bridge. We were showing a nice little connection. We thought it would be kind of a neat thing to be able to cross the stream and shortcut off to this direction. But it turns out this stream is maybe a little more significant than I was aware of. It's actually wide enough that this would be a pretty severe and difficult undertaking. So it's easy enough to just sort of loop people around out to the road. So that's the direction it sounds like it should be. Don't worry about a little pedestrian bridge. And maybe we stripe a little pedestrian walk I believe out on this road maybe five or six feet wide. We'll have to think about that. But we'll route people this way.

William Mills:

How much of the space is usable land I guess? Because when you just look at this map it looks like there's quite a lot of useful land. But based off of the conversations it sounds like it's a very limited space.

Jim Schaefer:

For active recreational use all you have is this piece here and this piece here. So if I had to guess I'd guess that's about a dozen acres.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think the bottom is 2.4 acres and the top around maybe 4.5.

Jim Schaefer:

This is 4.5 in this zone here.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes.

Jim Schaefer:

That sounds fine.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

But two acres is still pretty large. If you think how many city lots it would take to acquire two acres it's still a relatively decent sized area.

William Mills:

I don't remember the exact definitions of our parks, but this almost looks like not a regional but a larger scale sort of park where the land is probably more suited for a community sort of park. Is that kind of what the changes in terms of your thought process is for this park then?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think that the definition of a community park by SEWRPC standards was anything over 25 acres.

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes, a community park is much larger. This falls under our neighborhood park category which is pretty small. But you're right, usually it's the larger parks that focus on the more natural features of the environment, and our smaller parks tend to focus more on the developed aspects. But those are loose definitions. You have situations like this where you have to make special accommodations. You just have to work with that.

Michaeline Day:

Did anyone have any other questions about Creekside?

Mike Pollocoff:

I just have one comment. We pay want to take a look at the trail that's coming down to that south part, the smaller one. I know we have a big bridge there. I'm assuming that we want to cross that Creekside Circle down at the bottom there, and then be able to tie up eventually to High Pointe, so just delineate that. Even though we have that bridge there, actually as expensive as that bridge may be, if you look at the bridge that the road is under, we may want to look at some of the geometrics in there.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Mike brings up a good point. We are looking at a large community park around 40 acres with an elementary school that's just to the south of the Creekside neighborhood area. And 93rd Street is right at the bottom of the map here running east and west, so it makes a lot of sense to tie into the High Pointe neighborhood park with the Creekside Park. Ultimately we're going to have a corridor that's going to go from Lake Michigan to the bike trail to the Village Green Park and High Pointe Park and to Prairie Springs Park. So that ties all these recreation facilities in together very well. So we'll definitely make that addition.

Mike Pollocoff:

When you keep it on that access road, and I don't know if we're going to signalize that eventually, or if we keep it along the stream, that's going to be a good point to cross 93rd. I guess that's really the question. Do we want to cross 93rd or do we want to cross father west where the street it?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think it makes a lot of sense to pile it onto High Pointe along that creek. I think that creek leads right into where the High Pointe neighborhood park or community park would be.

Mike Pollocoff:

The other thing that's a little deceptive here is that there's a lot of open space that's private in this development surrounding all the condominiums. So at least for the people living there that push that they might need for open recreation space, they'll have private open space and this is the public portion. I don't feel so bad about losing--it would be nice to have that space up above, but I really think that's going to all be wet. Not all of it, but what we identified as wet.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We would be able to do any grading on it anyway so it is what it is.

Jim Schaefer:

It was going to be my suggestion that if it were possible to develop fields there, even if they were flooded in the spring and then they dry out in the summer and then they're usable as flexible open space. Maybe not really competitive fields, but would that be a direction you'd want to proceed? Or, should we just think of this as prairie/wetland/open space? We can go either way.

Rita Christiansen:

I'm thinking about the maintenance, John, in trying to do it. It might be better just to leave it natural. I also have a question, too. At the bottom we have this small area that we're looking at. Because of the park that's going to be placed down below, what is the distance between the top part of the park, this smaller one, and then the next one on the way down? Is it several miles? It would end up being three parks in this short area?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'd say it's around a half mile at the most maybe. She's talking about if you're going from the north park to the south park. If you have section lines at 93rd and then another half section line up here, it's about one mile from here to here around the section ranges. So if you're shooting from about here to here, I'm guessing just over a half mile based on

that. Probably just under a mile to High Pointe, even closer to a half mile because you're back half way through that section line again.

Rita Christiansen:

So, Mike, when we're talking about how many homes or residents we're looking in this area to have potentially, does that match up adequately, or is it just too many parks for that area?

Mike Pollocoff:

If you look at the neighborhood plan for this area where 89th goes through you've got a whole other area for close to almost 400 lots. So north/south it looks to be pretty close, but if you think about that trail moving east and west, we'll end up with some kind of other park down the road east of there, but that park there would be for that kind of east/west traffic along that trail that would kind of follow Jerome Creek that would handle that. So maybe it would be closer than you think if this was the only thing you ever had. But I think once this goes up and the sewer gets put in kind of where the ball fields are going, that's going to open up the ability of that other land to the east to develop. I think at that point it's not as redundant as it would be with just this one here.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you.

Jim Schaefer:

Any more comments on the Creekside design? Those are good comments. I guess I will move it on to the next one and that would be Momper's Woods. Everybody knows what Momper's Woods is and where it is and it's history all of that? I'm just sort of learning about it, but my initial feelings was in discussions with Village staff was it should be a nature center. I've had nice experiences with the Schlitz Audubon Nature Center if any of you have ever had a chance to visit that. But that's sort of the picture I have in my mind of what this site has the potential to become. It might be a little bit smaller site. It might be a little bit more intimate.

The uses that were listed from the vision workshop were nature center building, picnic shelter, outdoor education, natural area preservation, museum, ceremony or wedding space, trail connect to other parks and Green Bay Road which is a wonderful program. I can't believe I've actually had an opportunity to sort of possibly do what would be the first drawing of a really interesting nature center and trail system. The theory I have is to serve the natural open space that could be utilized to create sort of an iconic building that could be an education center, a lecture center. Raise your hand if this is coming out of left field. There's probably been lots of discussions over the years about just this kind of thing with maybe lecture halls. This is brainstorming stuff, but it could be something where people could come and use it almost as a small conference center where there could be catered events and lectures and groups. It could really become something to draw people from far away to really buy into the natural peace that you've been able to

save as well as the wonderful park system that you're trying to create. And this could actually tie into that park system. That would be wonderful.

This is a natural opportunity to bring a road in where there's already a gravel road cut in from the old farm use on the site. I thought it would be a good idea to sort of pull people in a little bit and give them a little bit of a break and a little turn of the road anyway, so I like that curve. Rather than hitting them right over the head with any kind of big development, let them drive through the woods and just sort of get a first glimpse of the nature center. Then use that existing opening in the woods to do a parking lot. Bring people up to a drop off and split the parking so it's not a lot of cars and taillights in your view as you're entering the site.

And having just been on the site recently, Megan and I stopped there right before the meeting, this really does feel like a natural to me for locating a building and push the building right up to the edge of the existing woodland edge. I think it would be really nice to have the woods right out the back windows or the back doors of a facility. This is sort of a hypothetical building. We don't know how big it would be. It would probably evolve over years and would need to be something that would grow over years. Maybe you'd do one piece in year one and maybe there's another wing that gets donated later. Unless there's some ground swell that emerges it might be something you could pave over time, different wings at different times.

And there could be outdoor spaces that would extend towards the pavilion in the woods that could be rented. I could imagine people taking a seminar at the center or maybe a corporate event or a business event where someone would rent a pavilion or a wedding and rent a pavilion and bring in catered food and have an event on this wonderful site so everybody could enjoy it as well as it could be a revenue source to help fund the use of the facility. So feel free to jump in with comments. There's a trail system obviously that's a given that you're going to have a trail network through the woods as well as any open spaces that would have different characters and different themes. There's the existing Hathaway Trail, the Seabrown Atlas Trail and the Jumbo Trail. Everybody knows about the historic boulder.

I think I drew these curvy trails before I remembered to draw in the historic trails. If you're wondering why it's this shape it's really an accident. I won't lie. But I do think it would be interesting to actually recreate segments of those trails and use those as trails. So in my next version of this I'll probably do a better job of trying to show interpretive points that direct people towards the information. This used to be a historic wagon trail. I'm not actually that familiar with the specific uses of these specific trails, but obviously there should be some interpretive exhibits within the spaces. So that's pretty much it in a nutshell.

These trees that I've drawn are based on a survey of the site, and obviously we would take a lot of care to, or I should say a lot of care should be taken to not disturb any existing significant trees on the site.

Rita Christiansen:

I would like to comment. Looking at this I thought this was a wonderful interpretation of what we did at our workshop and what people asked for. I think you've really captured it. One of the big things was getting a nature education center, and this is a perfect piece of property to do that. So I'm very impressed with this. It looks really good.

Jim Schaefer:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Two comments. One is one of the revenue sources that we have at Lake Andrea that's really kind of plateaued over the last year just because of the location and the popularity is renting out some of those picnic areas around the lake. We do a lot of picnics anywhere from maybe 50 people up to 1,500 people. Granted, you really couldn't hold 1,500 people here, but for some of those smaller ones where a lot of the businesses that are in the corporate park that might want to take advantage of some other features that are right here in their backyard, I think this really opens up another revenue sources as far as having a corporate picnic. And you can use that revenue like you talked about to pay for the gas and electric and some of the maintenance on here. This plan, along with all the other plans we had talked about, maybe having our next version of them on the internet to try and get some more public participation. The Village has a great website and maybe this is something we can use as a cover story to say here is something that the Village is working on and if you want to be involved e-mail your comments so we can see what other ideas people might have. Just another way to get more input in a little bit cheaper way than hosting another little conference like we had at the RecPlex.

Michaeline Day:

Any other comments?

Michael Russert:

That sounds like a great idea to me.

Jim Schaefer:

That was a fun one. I would have been devastated if you were negative.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Everybody loves the Momper's Woods.

Jim Schaefer:

That one drew itself in about an hour or so.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Something else that we had talked about doing. Jean Werbie is one of the staff that met with us this afternoon, and Jean actually brought up the concept with Momper's Woods if we get some of these people from the nature conservation and some of these other groups involved in some of this planning, they might have a lot of history on where these actual trails were and laying out some information. I think it's something they would really enjoy and should be a part of laying out. So we'll probably contact them to find out what input that they would want on it.

Glen Christiansen:

I believe the museum has most of the records on that. I would also suggest that on the one map how it shows that overflow parking lot going over the Lambeau Trail—

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's kind of a wetlands there and we actually talked about scrapping that.

Glen Christiansen:

I would suggest that you don't show that to the public because you're going to get somebody wild over putting a parking lot or something over those trails.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You actually were going to be one of the people that we were going to be talking to about the history and some of these other areas. So we'll be contacting you more and any input you might have on it.

Glen Christiansen:

Bill Sanders had a lot to do with that boulder and that plaque being set out there. But I think most of what he knows is part of the record down at the museum.

Jim Schaefer:

Could you explain that to me a little bit better? I'm not sure I'm following what your comment is. You're saying that this area is wet?

Glen Christiansen:

I don't know if it's wet, but there are a number of people around if they saw a map like this displayed publically they would be pretty upset to see a parking lot go across this trail.

Jim Schaefer:

Oh, I understand now. It's going to change.

Glen Christiansen:

Some people would feel very threatened by seeing that.

Jim Schaefer:

By the way, that was intended to be sort of temporary overflow, not even probably paved if it is, in fact, even an open space, because nobody actually seems to ever have laid eyes on it yet. It's not easy to get to it.

Glen Christiansen:

That's a pretty wooded area.

Jim Schaefer:

I got that feeling when I was there. It's hard to get in there. I was thinking I don't think that's really open. It looked open in the air photo so I need to investigate that a little deeper and will.

I guess we'll talk about Pleasant Prairie Park. We actually did two concepts for this. The uses for that that were requested were restroom, shelter and concessions venue. Softball, soccer, play field, playground centralized near ball fields, parking, dog park, basketball, tennis, skate park and splash park. That's a lot of stuff to fit on one site, so we actually had to divide it between two different concept drawings. I'll put both up at once. We're not going to get all that on one site so we have to make some decisions.

I'm not sure where to start with this. First we looked at it as sort of a blank piece of paper and some day this would be the park boundary. I know this would require some acquisitions that I'll point at and this piece which is 104th. I know there's a hold out here so you don't actually have all this land yet. I wasn't really thinking about that. We thought we'd just look at it as one park and think long term and not worry about right off the bat what exists now and just think about what is the ultimate best use. So this shows two soccer fields, one U18 and one 12. U18 is a pretty luxuriously large field. If you're not a soccer person, that's basically a full sized championship soccer. U12 is more like what you're used to seeing.

These are two softball fields. We're showing a dog park accessed by a parking area which takes us its access off this road off to the west, that's 88th. And that dead ends into a little parking lot that would serve that little dog park in basically this end of the park. We're showing a playground and a shelter centrally located as well as a splash park which could really mean anything, but I interpreted splash park as meaning a zero depth swimming pool basically that doesn't contain water but circulates water. It has lots of interesting and fun, artistic little features that are colorful that kids splash around. Is that what everybody thinks of as a splash park? So I really just threw a quick bubble in and just diagramed that. That would be a project in and of itself.

A parking lot organized pretty much where the parking lot is now except pushing it a little bit further to the west, as well as a change in the access point for the entrance road. Right now coming off of this road, Bain Station, right now there's a little jog where you come in. Everybody knows what I'm talking about? We think that's not really the best idea, so as long as we're going to be redoing things why not push the road to line up with Bain Station and be a safer intersection.

We also show two basketball courts, two volleyball courts, as well as we thought it would be a great idea to use the wetland as an interpretive trail loop with possibly even doing a boardwalk out to the wetter parts of the site.

The other concept, which is Concept B, basically started from the standpoint of maybe we really do need to live with these existing softball fields right where they are and try to build a park around them keeping the road where it is. Basically following the same program as the last one but splitting the soccer obviously because the softball is in the middle. We would have to split the soccer into two locations. We ran out of room for a dog park in order to do enough recreational stuff. This would probably have the same trail but I just didn't bother to draw it because maybe people don't want to see that kind of impact. So I thought maybe show this option without that.

This shows two tennis courts, two basketball and I can't think of anything else right now. I'm just looking for reaction at this point. The consensus from the staff was that they liked A better than B, although you probably do have to accept the reality of a short-term fix that does attempt to sort of get more immediate soccer use possible with larger fields that are needed right now. That would also work with a long-term solution, so we would probably need to rethink the layout of these fields, possibly pushing softball and baseball over to the east edge with the goal of soccer as a flexible use in the outfield somehow. It gets really complicated. It was sort of a map thing when we were all drawing, but basically they need baseball now as the message, bigger fields for softball and baseball.

Splash park was decided that Village staff thought that that's really not a good idea, and if that did happen that's would be something more like an urban design feature that would be more of something like a downtown feature, more of a fountain or a visual thing more so than a playground element that would actually occur in the Village Center was the comment we heard from planning staff. So splash park as their recommendation would probably go away. That this was probably not the best use but maybe a skate park. Is that right, John? That a skate park was something worth investigating for the site instead.

And tennis was decided that tennis doesn't really make sense in this location at all. That that should happen at a future High Pointe Park that would be a major recreational center and that should actually be a larger complex with tennis courts. In general for all of these parks the theory was explained that maybe rather than having little scattered tennis courts all over the Village it might be better to have a central tennis complex that's a more polished and much cooler facility that's easier to recognize when courts are open and so forth. Any other comments that you guys can think of?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess . . . splash park. I really like Concept A, but the problem I had with option A is that--let's see the sketch. This is the kind of area that the Village does not have at this time. And it would be down the road a few years before the Village does acquire it would be the shortest estimation. Then there's one more strip right in here on the north side that we do not own. We spent some time meeting with Kris Johnson, he's the Sports Director for Pleasant Prairie find out what is immediate programs needs and future program needs are, and he said he really needs two softball fields at Pleasant Prairie Park right now. There are six softball fields that we have at Prairie Springs Park, and they're pretty much maxed out at prime time. And he's also using two fields here. So we really can't eliminate one. If we did own this area out to the west this would be great.

So something we had looked at doing was we had a couple of ideas. Our first concept was having another park or another softball field that came around and went down, but it's a hazard for people that are doing the parking, parking here, walking all the way down to a home base to watch the game and then walking back. Then it kind of really flips it up. So what Jim had talked about is possibly putting the fields in where the soccer are, moving the soccer out to this area. Having a big field here and a smaller one here, and then having the playground which is now shown on the future site or kind of in this more centrally located area. And that was staff's recommendation to fit this in. I'm not sure if Mike has any other comments.

Mike Pollocoff:

We need to plan for acquiring this. If this is what we think it looks good as, if we like this plan, that should be our ultimate plan for how it lays out. But I agree with John, this is going to be the hard piece to acquire only because they're bigger properties and more substantial homes. One of my issues I guess is inserting the parking so deep into the park. I can see the concept of having a drop off, but I kind of wonder if by putting the ball fields here you're going to put lights here, and you've taken your nighttime activity which is away from these residents and it's right in their face. Unless you sign off on having no nighttime baseball. But maybe if we looked at to take care of the drop off thing that happens, if you were to leave these fields here or even just do a little rotation, bring a drop off or even just a road that came in and dropped off and they had parking to the sites, I think if we can keep the parking away from the interior of the site and then keep the fields open and the areas open so the only thing we have is a drive that comes around, when this gets acquired here then we can look at a way to interconnect to the other side if only for maintenance or to facilitate drop off.

I'd like to see the parking closer to the road as far as the cars making backup motions and turning movements, all that stuff where you get that away from where kids are running around where they're backing up and turning around and get that out by the street and work with the softball fields here to tweak them. Maybe that's crazy to bring a road around here, but I'd rather see the parking activity pushed out. I think that's a good buffer between the recreation activities and the residents. They'll see the cars there, but all the noise, the lights and everything will be away from the street where the residents are.

Rita Christiansen:

Of course I have a comment. The first one that you drew, option A, the one thing that I don't like, actually two things, I agree with Mike having those bright lights on the main road. The other thing is that one of the big concerns currently is that the playground area is a distance from the softball diamonds. Most people when they come to watch softball sit by home plate, so you now have the parents sitting at home plate and looking all the way across the field at their children playing. So some kind of adjustment would need to be made so one in the same are closer, whether you turn them or whatever you do, or place them like Mike said in a different area.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the things we were looking at with the orientation of the softball fields is do you have the batter batting into the sun, or do you have the outfielders fielding into the sun? And we felt it was safer to have the batter batting into the sun versus having the outfielders looking into the sun when a line drive is coming at them. So that's why we want to keep the orientation as we had them here. Maybe we can do something where we can shift these back.

Rita Christiansen:

Maybe where the soccer field is.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Have the softball field here, but have home base turned this way. Turn this way and have one field here and have another one here. That limits your space. I guess something else that Kris Johnson was looking for is these softball diamonds have a length of about 230 feet which is good for probably up to sixth grade softball. Anything over sixth grade softball you're hitting into the woods or hitting out. So we're really looking to try to expand the fields out to about 300 feet if we could and try to make that orientation. But it definitely makes sense about the lights that are shining onto the residents. Obviously there's more changes and we'll take whatever changes you guys and Mike recommend and try to tweak this. I really wish we had that land off to the west because I really do like how it is, two softball fields and a warmup field and a playground and everything really flows nice. Maybe this whole park is going to be at a two tiered stage where we do something right now that we need and then we do something later on once we acquire more land.

Rita Christiansen:

One of the other things, too, that we had talked about is the possibility of putting the skate park right on 104th. And maybe for future then if, say for instance, the soccer fields were on 104th or whatever the decision is, then at that time we could incorporate the skate park there and then move the softball fields or the baseball diamonds out accordingly. But I think it was important again because it was one of the considerations that people came to the meeting and voiced an opinion of. And I really do like the dog park. Thank

you for putting that in there.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the nice things about the dog park in that area is that it really is rolling and a wooded area so you really wouldn't have to clear a lot of trees or do a lot of impact to the ground like that. And another option, even though it's not my favorite option up front, like Mike had mentioned if we are doing this as a two tiered project, I guess your goal would be you don't want to spend a lot of money on your first year before you finish it at the end of the day. So if you can live with these two softball fields like you have here, add a soccer field on here and then eventually when we acquire the land kind of shift it from Plan B to Plan A at that time. Reorientate this field 90 degrees, add another one and so on. So maybe we could look at doing a two tiered program. We have acquired all the land up to this blue hashed area, so there is plenty of land here for a soccer field to add that on. Keeping the softball fields really keeps our costs low. And then down the road going with our dream park.

Michaeline Day:

Mike, where would you have put on your scenario the playground? Again, I had a concern the way it's situated now it's close to the road away from where their parents are sitting watching the kids play softball. It's not a good spot. You've either got to play with your kids at the playground or you've got to watch your kids. You just can't let the little kids out by the playground because it's too close to the road and not supervised. So under your scenario where would you be moving the playground so it's not in the car traffic as well?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd say where the splash park is. And then I would jettison the tennis courts and basketball and get the parking closer to the road and get it away from the playground and the field.

Rita Christiansen:

If you did that, Mike, then you would not have to move the playground twice. It would be anchored where it's at and you'd switch the softball diamonds. You wouldn't have to worry about that expense of reinventing a playground.

Mike Pollocoff:

How many parking spaces do you think you'd have on something like that versus what we need?

Jim Schaefer:

You mean what's shown on these drawings?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Jim Schaefer:

I didn't actually tally it. I probably should have. It's just a visual thing, but I'm guessing that's probably 150. It's pretty many. Probably too many. But we were thinking of a lot of magnets here for visitors. So if the splash park goes away maybe it's not necessary.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know what we have when we're changing teams or when one team is getting off and one team is getting on. That's our peak.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

When we have both fields going, there is one time when you have almost eight teams in transition. When you have four teams that are actually playing and four teams that are coming on to warm up, you have eight teams times 15 and then grandma and grandpa come. We'll have to size up the area that we have now and make it accommodating. But I definitely think there is enough room to make those changes. So, Mike, you were looking at moving the parking closer to the road where it is now?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And orient any other recreation where the parking lot is?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Rita Christiansen:

Also, as a side comment, if the parking lot was moved down to that area, I think it would be easier for our police department to monitor.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, it just gives you a big look into what's going on.

Jim Schaefer:

The theory on having the parking extend in was just to get people closer to what was.

This looks like the center of activity right here. If we push it over a little bit that might help. So you don't mind walking 600 feet to a ball diamond? That's no big deal?

Mike Pollocoff:

I had to do it for years with my kids all over the place. You don't want the parking lot near the ball field when they're hitting balls. People usually find a way to get away from that.

Glen Christiansen:

The other one, too, is if you get the parking lot farther out to the edge then you eliminate the distance that people use the parking lot as a driveway for their racing, spinning their wheels.

Jim Schaefer:

I should also mention another strong comment from Village planning staff. I didn't mention this yet and was waiting. But there was a strong desire for them to see this connect across, that the circulation would actually connect right to 88th right through the site.

Mike Pollocoff:

I wasn't thinking running through the middle of the site, but I thought if you had that road coming in on the side and then come down, and then when the park gets completed then have it go over to 107th on the north side.

Jim Schaefer:

Do you want to try and draw that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

So come through here and around and down. You'd eliminate this.

Mike Pollocoff:

You could have a turnaround right there, John. If they want to drop somebody off there they can drop them off there, and then when we acquire the land have that road go all the way to 107th.

Jim Schaefer:

Are you suggesting it should hug the perimeter?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the concerns of doing this now is that there's barely enough room we're at right now to have two softball fields. You really can't orientate this one more back to the west. I know what you're saying about having a connection all the way through, but maybe do that as part of the second phase.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd like to see it connected, but if this thing goes there's going to be a lot of activity going on there, and then you're going to have a road going right through the middle of it that's a little counterintuitive in my eyes.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, if the parking was left where you currently desire, why not bring the road along that bottom edge and then back out?

Mike Pollocoff:

You could do the bottom, too. Bottom or top.

Rita Christiansen:

Yes, exactly, it doesn't have to be on top. And because you actually would probably have the room to do that, is that correct, John?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

I see us buying those properties on 104th just because they're smaller sooner than the other ones. In fact, we've even had a couple people that have said we're ready to sell and here's our price. One is \$100,000 and the other one probably isn't far behind. We might not have to buy that one at the far south end, that old rickety building. Buying that doesn't really get us anything.

Jim Schaefer:

I'll give you my professional opinion on the road connecting through. Generally, and it's not like I really have a strong preference personally, but an argument I hear from a lot of the park designers is that people don't want park roads connecting through park sites because it's not considered to be a good security thing. Most police enforcement people will tell you it's better to terminate circulation and force people with only once access

point to come in and come back out the way they came in. That's why you see so many parks with barricades around the parking lot. They don't want people to escape through a park site. People are attracted to parks because there's really not an owner present most of the time and they can do mischievous things. So I'm not saying you can't do it, but it's also the speed of people cutting through the center of a park would frighten me a little bit.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct. Also, too, we need to keep in mind that one of our goals is to connect the parks and to have a running trail through the Village. So if this is one of the areas that's intended for that, then maybe in future planning that's what we need to do.

Jim Schaefer:

Here's the direction I'm hearing and people tell me if I've got this right. We want parking out on the edge. We want to connect circulation across? I'm just making general comments.

Rita Christiansen:

I think for a future site, Mike, is that what you're talking about? I think for the future we should leave that open.

Jim Schaefer:

And it could either be the north or the south whichever works better?

Rita Christiansen:

I thought the preference would be south.

Jim Schaefer:

So basically just hug the south edge?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Jim Schaefer:

There might be wetland issues, but you're just be diagrammatic. So is the idea of connecting--I just want to be sure I'm clear. You mentioned several times a road and you made a motion. That's not what you were getting at. What you really meant was just to be able to get across?

Mike Pollocoff:

I was thinking top because we have parking up there but the top. To be honest with you I wouldn't have a problem if we jettisoned that parking on the top end.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Maybe green space.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because that's a parking lot for the neighborhood. That's not recreation parking.

Jim Schaefer:

I didn't even realize. I just thought it was for the fields now. It's not?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. Well, it could be but nobody uses it.

Jim Schaefer:

Oh, great. Wow, we just got more park area. When you have more fields it actually does sort of start to look like it makes sense with the soccer fields if this was soccer field. Once we have more use that actually--one theory behind park design is that you do have a lot of little satellite parking areas rather than one ginormous parking area in the center. I could go either way. But if you want it to be green that would be fine.

William Mills:

I do like the idea of maybe a drop off point. So if we do have the road extend through the whole park area maybe in the middle instead of everyone haul their equipment, balls, bats, dropping off. If the parents are just going to drop off the kids to play, maybe at the center have a turnaround or circle that you can drop off the kids so they don't have to walk.

Jim Schaefer:

That's a good point. I had the same thought. If we do make a road we should have a drop off and maybe that's a traffic control point as well instead of a cut through.

Mike Pollocoff:

Round about.

Jim Schaefer:

I wasn't going to say it because I'm from Madison and we get in trouble when we say round about in Milwaukee.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think the thing that we have in this park that we're really not identifying right now is a restroom area or a pavilion area. It's shown right now right off in the privately owned area now. Is this just something we'd move by the playground area? I guess it's something that we should address or identify where we are going to have it. So I'd assume we'd have it somewhere in here maybe. Restroom, pavilion, very small concession stand.

Jim Schaefer:

Central is obviously where that needs to occur. I think we've beat you guys up enough on this one. This is clearly going to need a lot of work. This is by far the most difficult one. I think we should move on. I'll continue to interact with staff directly on this one quite a bit.

We can talk about Unit W. We did two of these because this is another one that had more uses than there was space for. Sort of two different themes really. The uses that were kind of a scatter plot of pavilion for open air for picnics, soccer, play field, trails, small playground, dog park, basketball and tennis. So it seemed like there clearly was two different themes. One seemed more recreational and one seemed to be more sort of passive open space. The first one I drew was the more passive one. I think most of you know the site, but there's sort of a wet feature, sort of an intermittent stream. Is that the right term you'd use to describe this? I have to be honest I've never actually been able to find this piece of land. I get lost every time I try to go near it.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's a ditch.

Jim Schaefer:

So there's a ditch right in the middle and I assume in the spring there's flooding?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think when they filled it they just kind of left it and there's no place for the water to drain.

Jim Schaefer:

So it was a farm field that this was the drainage?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it was a wetland they filled.

Jim Schaefer:

So you all know there's that stream feature which sort of bisects the site into two halves. This felt like the neighborhood half to me, so we showed a picnic shelter with picnic tables, a tot lot and maybe pull a few parking stalls right off of the road. I don't think we want to construct a big parking lot just for this small park if there were any parking at all. If it weren't parallel, maybe we could pull some perpendicular stalls off the road. That's sort of a we'll see. You tell me if you think that neighborhood can handle that kind of parking arrangement. We also thought that this made more sense of a more passive dog park use. Really just sort of a brainstorm idea. Some of the vision input was that this might be a good dog park site, and it made sense to think about pulling in parking stalls off of the road to the south as well. If you're going to have a dog park, people need to drive the dog right up to the dog park. That made sense to connect things up with trails. I don't know if anybody really knows what the long-term future of what the DNR land is going to be other than just remaining open space. But some day who knows, there could be a trail network in which case maybe we could tie into some sort of trail system as well connecting to the north at these two points and to the south right near the drop off point.

The other concept I tried to show what it would look like with more athletic uses, so we started with a tennis court and a basketball court. The best you could do is maybe a U10 soccer field. The same parking arrangements and picnic and trail features. That really sums up Unit W so far if anybody has any feel for what's the right approach and what's the right direction we should take.

William Mills:

To me it seems to make more sense to make that a dog park just due to the fact that a lot of times when you see something like soccer that's an active program where you've signed up for soccer teams, etc. And if you only have enough room for one field here it just doesn't seem to be a very good use of that open space. The dog park seems to make a lot of sense to me. The only thing is I'm just wondering whether or not to give it that feel of both sort of activities if that's going to be open dog park whether or not you will be able to use the open space in the northeast corner for maybe what you have on the other drawing here with basketball courts or tennis courts or whatever.

Michael Russert:

A dog park is just basically open land for people to bring their dogs and let them run?

Jim Schaefer:

Yes. I'm actually not a dog owner, but my mother-in-law has three big dogs, and sometimes when we go visit we take the dogs and put them in the car and drive to a site on the north side of Milwaukee up past Brown Deer Road on I-45 where those two square cube buildings are if you have any idea what I'm talking about. There's a wonderful dog park that's a natural area. There might be a fence but you don't notice it because it's dedicated the entire park as a dog park. It's amazing actually. And it's kind of a surreal experience having these dogs walking on a mile long trail with the water and the stream. The dogs just sort of meet each other along the route with picnic tables and

it's kind of neat.

But when you have a small enclosed site like this, I think the theory is that you need a fence and it has an enclosed security gate with two gates so no dogs escape. It's just a place for dogs to burn off energy basically and greet each other and throw the ball. It's nothing fancy.

Michaeline Day:

Are there any issues with dog fights?

Jim Schaefer:

That's the second time I've heard that today.

Michaeline Day:

I'm not a dog person either so I'm just curious about if you've got 50 dogs in there and some of them are not very friendly to the other ones.

Jim Schaefer:

I don't know about any sort of legal ramifications or who is responsible for who bites who, but from personal experience I can say I think dog owners generally know their dogs and know whether they're going to be hostile or not. If they are, they're very careful. I think people who go to dog parks with their dogs are looking for a fight. If you're someone who is scared that some other dog is going to hurt your dog then you don't take your dog to the dog park. But it might be new territory where there's not good legal precedent. I'm not even sure. We'd have to investigate that.

William Mills:

I'm not a dog owner. But I have friends in northern Illinois and these dog parks are huge. I've driven by the one near Libertyville and in that parking lot on the weekends, which is fairly large. If I had any comment it would be probably in terms of whether or not you've got enough parking. That parking lot is huge and it is full every time I've ever driven by that dog park. There are several. I know that's not the only one that they have

Jim Schaefer:

I think part of the theory behind a dog park here was that it's so much further east than the Pleasant Prairie park site. That if you're going to do it on one side of the Village it makes sense here. Some other comments from the Village are this is actually a wetland so it wouldn't work anyway. I'm not sure if we know that or not. Is anybody familiar with the site enough to know?

William Mills:

The one in Libertyville, to be honest, I've been there once with friends that have dogs, and that actually is a wetland. You see a lot of the labrador retrievers at that park.

Jim Schaefer:

Another Village comment or staff comment was parking here is a bad idea because this is a busy road on the south edge. And this is too remote to really be a logical place for a dog park because people would never be able to find the site which I'd have to vouch for.

Mike Pollocoff:

This is a difficult park. What makes it difficult is people in Carol Beach and Unit W and the unit south . . . for a dog park most of these people just turn their dog loose in the wetlands. All it's going to be is a dog park for somebody else which is going to irritate them. There's a part of me, and this is beyond the scope of the consultant's study, but one of the things we may want to try to do is take a look at option B. That gives that neighborhood it's traditional urban park, and then try and do a swap with the State and have them--if we could buy the Town Club property, show them where that is John, right there, because that's been all filled. It's not wetlands. There's some wood around it and you could get a little bit more intimate access from the neighborhood, and then get this property back in the wetland condition as part of the wetland restoration. It would make that corridor more complete. I think it would be more usable space for what those people are looking for.

The DNR is not a very creative group of people when it comes to doing this stuff. But maybe if we could do some horse trading with them with some other land we have. I think that's really what the people on that side of the Village or in that area are looking for. We want what Becker Park is, we want what Pleasant Prairie Park is, we want all that stuff. If we give them another open space with a dog run they'll go snapping nuts. They're not going to like that at all.

Michaeline Day:

I would agree with you with Plan B also. I think that there is not a whole lot down in Carol Beach area for the residents. They do have a lot of open space.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We have two options here. When we asked Vandewalle, they kind of come up with some concept plans where money is no object, and obviously land contours and land really is no object. Just by looking at this Plan B that we have it looks really nice. You have basketball and soccer and tennis, but I guess two things come into play. One is the land that Mike talked about, how it is with a lot of wetlands and floodplain and it's just a really wet and bad area.

I guess the way that these parks are going to be funded are either through impact fees or through the general tax levy. With the times that we're in right now, we're really not going to have a lot of money out of the tax levy. And the amount of impact that would be collected for Unit W . . . 95 percent of this Unit W area is already developed so there's

only 5 percent. So maybe \$5,000 or \$6,000 would be going from impact fees into this park. So just trying to be realistic at this time, what would you like to see in the short term or knowing what we have for land restrictions and money restrictions? It makes sense just to do something small. I don't want to point to B, but if you just do a small picnic area and a tot lot and then maybe down the road a second phase, whether it's 5 years, 10 years, 20 years. If we could do something where acquiring the old Town Club land makes sense to me.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the areas aren't too dissimilar. I think if people like option B then we say that's the option we want. Then before we pour money down the rat hole, see what we can do to do a land swap and get some assistance to put that park in. It might not happen. John's right, this one here is going right on the back of the taxpayers. There's nobody we could put the arm out for this one because we already gave up all our parkland for wetlands that's down there. We have a lot of parkland down in Carol Beach but it's all just crap. I mean it's good wetlands but bad parkland.

So I think the concept plan is good. I think it's a good plan to sign off on. I just think we need to move it away from where it doesn't work and get it where that area is already filled that we can put the park in, and then put this one back in to do some wetland restoration on it and take the fill out of there and working the way we want. DNR might be happy about that. What do you think, Glen?

Glen Christiansen:

I know there's a few people up at SEWRPC I talked to years ago that thought it was a shame that that spot was filled in and would have preferred to see it scraped out back to its original contour and restored. If people at SEWRPC felt that way you would think that there would possibly be somebody in the DNR who would probably agree with that. So, to be honest with you, I would have suggested it but I didn't think anybody was interested in the idea.

--:

I think it's an excellent idea.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't think we should jettison the work they did her. I think it's a good plan. We just need to stick it on another piece of property right next to it.

Rita Christiansen:

I have some input I'd like to say. John, you say just as a guesstimate, if you will, if it's say \$6,000 to build this park and we built a fourth of it which we would restore the other back half of it, how extensive would it be to put this park in at the future side? Are we looking at \$6,000 possibly, or are we looking at more? We have to look at costs and how

it's going to impact.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'm not sure exactly what the estimations are, but for \$6,000 you'll have a hard time even just getting a tot lot and some grass planted. Actually all you can probably do with \$6,000 is plant some grass and have an open spot and maybe throw a couple of picnic tables in and a cheap garbage can, if anything.

Michaeline Day:

What Mike was saying, while we wouldn't get impact fees on this, Carol Beach for a very long time has been ignored and we do have a lot of public opinion that they have been ignored. You might just end up having to bit the bullet and realize you're not going to get the money on impact fees, but you'll have to be fair and service all the Village residents . . . out of general funds

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Something else that I might want to add that we really haven't covered yet. When you do a park master plan, the plan is something that it's your plan for about the next five years and then you make another plan. So I guess when I'm going through with saying just have a tot lot or some grass and a picnic area, that's kind of what I see happening in the next five years. And down the road if we do some more land acquisitions we can always revise that park plan. Otherwise, why really spend the time working on it now if you're not going to do it for the next 20 years? Kind of address what you'd like to see right now and then in five years readdress it based on what you've done.

Rita Christiansen:

I guess my concern, John, would be to spend the money currently and then if we know that we can swap and that's an object of where we want to build this for the residents down by the lake, then I think that should be our first choice to try and do instead of spending the money and then finding out we can acquire the new site tearing it all up and moving it. Now we've doubled what it cost everybody to build what they might want.

Mike Pollocoff:

My concept is say that we can get DNR to--tell them we'll give you this piece, you buy the Town Club piece, and then even take what you would have paid us for this piece assuming that it was okay, get them to buy that piece, and then get that graded out. The guy that owns it is nuts. He thinks it's worth way more than it really is and we'd have to true him up. I think there's a reasonable possibility if we got somebody willing to say okay we'll trade dollars with you and we'll trade land with you that you might be able to get it done. I agree with John. While this is happening, because it won't happen quick, we can go out there and even if we just do some light grading and seed it and mow it, they've got something there so we're not saying, yeah, you'll get it whenever we get this deal done, but I'd be hesitant to plow any money into it because I think every dollar we

could spend, because it's so hard to come by, every dollar we could spend to get it ultimately where they want to be would be better. Just take that plan and move it up, move it to the right.

Michaeline Day:

So it's the consensus that I like the more active than passive option, but I guess how does the rest of the commission feel? Do they like the passive or the active? Mike, I'll start with you.

Michael Russert:

I'm all for Plan B.

Michaeline Day:

The active?

Michael Russert:

Yes, active.

Rita Christiansen:

I'd rather go more passive, because if we're looking towards the future—

Michaeline Day:

No, moving it. If we had that land, we're just saying . . . doing nothing right now but flopping it here to here . . . not doing anything here right now, but just say if we flop it would you want to see more active or passive?

Rita Christiansen:

Definitely active.

William Mills:

It seems like for the area it makes more sense to go active. I do think, though, in terms of the overall park plan, and I'm not even a dog owner, but it does seem like based off of the citizen comments at the planning session it seems like if you do a dog park in the right way it would be a fairly cheap thing to do. I actually think we could get a lot of people that would utilize something like that. But based off comments this is probably not the right location for it.

Glen Christiansen:

Active.

Michaeline Day:

Does that help you, Jim?

Jim Schaefer:

Let me just make sure I understand. When you say active, do you want to see a concept that looks like B on this site? I know about the land site, but I was charged with the task of designing a park for this piece of land.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think we just accept that design as it is on that piece of land.

Jim Schaefer:

So don't even spend any more time on it because we're not going to do it anyway.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, we'll just take that and move it up.

Michaeline Day:

Just basically that concept.

Jim Schaefer:

Maybe dog park instead of soccer?

Michaeline Day:

No.

Jim Schaefer:

Dog park is out. Got it.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think a dog park is a kiss of death. The people that live around there they just charge the dogs out into the wetlands and the dogs love it.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Like Mike had said there is so much green and open space available.

Mike Pollocoff:

We need a dog park but not here.

William Mills:

That's where my comments are. Not knowing the area as well it doesn't make sense here but I do think it makes sense somewhere.

Jim Schaefer:

That's everything I have on park designs. I guess I should mention that I did do cost estimates on these, another first pass through based on what we drew. I'm not really ready to share yet. But I think if you saw those numbers you probably would all have heart attacks on the spot. Tell me if I'm wrong, but I'm thinking of this as really long term. Maybe it is a 20 year master plan for these projects. Obviously this stuff isn't going to happen with money you have now or can even see or visualize or imagine having right now. I'm thinking of this more of how do you spend the money you have now so that you're not making a mistake that stops you from developing the parks properly into the future. So I'm thinking of it as a master plan approach. That's how I would sum up. If that doesn't seem right I guess I would need to know that. If you're looking for something that looks like something you can build next year I guess I would need to hear that. I understand we need to address for the Pleasant Prairie Park more immediate--we need to make a master plan that addresses the immediate needs for that site in particular. I just realized we skipped a park. Does that make sense what I just said, this master plan, the right thinking? These aren't going to be plans they can build next year.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess the first park that would probably start moving ahead is Creekside Park because they're already moving dirt and they have the gravel roads. It probably wouldn't be long before that park . . . I would assume you won't see anything before 2007 or 2008 at the earliest by the time we can collect our impact fee money, have our design made, have a plan and put it out to bid. So everything is still two years out I guess.

Mike Pollocoff:

Or, one thing is we'll end up going out to referendum. Like we say, we'll show this park plan and what we want to do and put it out to referendum and see if people want to put it on the tax roll to fund whatever isn't being funded by impact fees. We have the plan. At least we have something to show the people and vote on.

Jim Schaefer:

I completely forgot we need to talk about Village Green. I think everybody knows the history of this. This is sort of evolving. The edges have been moving around and negotiations with the developer for a final plat for this development to the north. I'm not sure if this is a separate party. I think this is settled. I don't know how to do this except

to point at this. The open space sort of to the west end, plus we just learned today that there's going to be an additional certain number of feet to secure an easement to maintain the condition of the tree line in this location. Is it an easement or an ownership line?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It was an easement property.

Jim Schaefer:

So there would be an easement, but basically that would extend the ownership of the park across the tree line so neighbors wouldn't start showing up with chainsaws and taking trees down when they move into these home lots. This property line goes around a cul-de-sac that's proposed and around basically the existing wood lot. The big theory here is to try and use this parcel to connect the main east/west spine connecting the bike path to the lakefront trail. So this is the main east/west bike path. It will run right through the center of these woods. I understand there's already an existing path that's in pretty nice condition running through the woods. This is schematic but we've tried to locate the trail to take advantage of the existing pathway. Then this would be new trail extending either direction.

This is really a storm water area. It's my understand that even though I'm showing it as-- my theory was that what would make most sense would be a natural area or a prairie with some sort of interpretive exhibit around the pond that it could be sort of hairy. But that sounds like what's really desired by the neighborhood, and for the neighborhood plan this is actually a mowed grass with maybe some aquatic plant materials in the pond or on the edge. But really this is mowed by the neighborhood association and is just regular grass. Depending how close this pond edge is to this trail here, there may actually be a need for some sort of a fence barrier to keep people from falling into the pond.

Michaeline Day:

. . . on the opposite side of those tree lines our schematic shows that there's a

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think we actually have multiple areas on the GIS that are coming through is what it is so it's really not shown. I think there was one concept plan way back when where it actually showed a soccer field there.

Jim Schaefer:

That's a remnant. That's a ghost from one of the developer's schemes. That's been tabled. Soccer field would now occur in this location as well as what we're showing is a softball field, a pavilion, pretty sizeable parking lot, basketball, tennis, connection to the east/west trail and a tot lot. I can't remember if we said there should be a restroom? We did. We said there should be a restroom.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

. . . High Pointe Community Park we're going to have a large complex.

Jim Schaefer:

The other comments from staff was about the ownership lines. As John just drew, it sounds like there's also a chance that the Village could obtain this piece of land and have the density of these three units made up in other areas of the plan, and this is just open space so the best use of this would be as possibly a small open air picnic pavilion and then open space just for kids on this side of the neighborhood to use for frisbee or playing ball, just a ball field.

Michaeline Day:

I like the tennis courts there, because now you're talking about you could have teenagers either using the tennis courts or the basketball courts or adults. Like my husband and I could play tennis while the grandkids are on the playground. It's nice to be able to have. This type of arrangement is conducive to all age people where you're just not dealing with the young kids and playground. You've got the tennis courts and basketball courts. There's older people that still play tennis, so you're actually being able to--there's no . . . for people. Whereas if you have just a playground, all of our areas here are all just playgrounds. We have nothing for senior citizens or middle aged people to go do anything other than sit at a picnic table.

Jim Schaefer:

Is that true just for this site or is that generally true for all the parks that you're thinking tennis is good?

Michaeline Day:

Well, in all the ones you've done, in all the five parks we've looked at, have we done anything for a middle aged woman?

Jim Schaefer:

We were asked to remove tennis from Pleasant Prairie Park.

Michaeline Day:

But I'm just saying really in all the things we've looked at so far and what we've done, there's nothing here that a woman my age would do in any of those parks other than if you want to sit down or you want to walk.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of our thoughts on why we had talked about taking tennis out, Micky, is that our community park is going to be in this general area right about here. And the Village

Green Park is right here.

Michaeline Day:

There's a lot of homes around there, though.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, there's a lot of homes. So I guess that's something that's really been bouncing around. Do we have a cluster of them? Do we have them indoor, outdoor, two here or two there or a complex? So I think at this stage of the game we're definitely still open to anything based on whatever the Park Commission wants. But we've heard everything from every range that you can imagine on it so far.

Michaeline Day:

I just think that a whole family is able to use this.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's like a true neighborhood park where you can do everything that you want right here.

Michaeline Day:

Right, you've got older families. You've got older people there that are going to be in some of these town homes or condo areas without any children. They're going to be able to use that are all around, all age, versus just little kids. It's just my opinion that we haven't really addressed anything for a woman my age to do.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Does anyone else have any comments on the tennis options?

Michael Russert:

Back in September the Commission had recommended option 1. I just want to know what changed from the drawings on option 1 to what we're looking at now. Back in option 1 we had three soccer fields, two softball fields.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think one of the changes we had made, and we kind of looked at it from a size standpoint, is that once you start having three soccer fields, two softball fields and all the other amenities that we're talking about, there's really a need for a lot of parking. And so now all of a sudden you either make this huge asphalt parking lot or have a lot of parking on the streets and cul-de-sacs. When we went down and re-evaluated all the parks as a whole, we saw a great opportunity with the High Pointe Community Park to make them more of a community park and utilize all the parking that the school would have to offer

already on there without having a large community park right here and another community park only a mile down the road. If you need to make a lot of extra parking and a lot of extra features at the community park at High Pointe, High Pointe already has parking lots. It's already going to have the lighted fields, larger fields and more concessions, so we toned down the Village Green Park. It's more of a true neighborhood park and toned up the High Pointe area park.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know if we talked about it at our last meeting, but we really kind of created a barbell between High Pointe and the Stahl property connected by a trail and, of course, streets. So both those parks in size, to give you a feel for it, are like Lance Park, the park around Lance Junior High School. That's about the size of the field we're talking about. And the more we started jamming into the Village Green all of a sudden it wasn't a great neighborhood park anymore, and we were trying to squeeze a community park into a neighborhood. What we wanted as far as bigger fields, more fields, and butting up and doing a deal with the schools, that kind of seemed to whip the parking structure problem, and then having the lighted fields being away from the neighborhoods. So the Stahl property we already have an agreement with the unified district that when they get ready to put the middle school there that they'll give us half that or they'll sell us half that thing at \$5,000 an acre, because we're the ones that got that set up for them to pick that up anyway. So that would be one. And you'd just be going up the bike path and then going over to the north/south Kenosha County Bike Path, get over to the Village Green Bike Path and you can go from one to the other. It's right down there. Maybe it's not a barbell. It's more like a boomerang.

Michaeline Day:

Mike, does the path on the far end, is there a path on the far end going through?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

A path between the Village Green Park and the--let me show it on this. You mean the path between the Village Green Park and the High Pointe Park?

Michaeline Day:

Yes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We're actually having a park corridor that's probably about 200 or 300 feet wide all the way through.

Michaeline Day:

So on this little piece on the end it's actually a--

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right. So what's going to happen from here, if you can show it off the map, this is the end of the Village Green neighborhood, and then the High Pointe neighborhood goes on. You'll extend this out and up a corridor maybe another quarter mile to where the High Pointe Community Park is going to be in this area. So there is going to be a large green open. Not just a trail, but a whole corridor that's a couple hundred feet wide.

Rita Christiansen:

So is there any parking down at that end?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Parking down in this area?

Rita Christiansen:

So people have to hike from the right side to the left side, is that correct?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

This is just a trail, so all the recreation activities are going on in this area. Then if you would want to walk down to the school you would just take the trail. We never really considered having multiple parking lots along the trail area.

Rita Christiansen:

How big is that area there with the pond?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's about 250 feet wide by about 1,000 feet long or maybe 800 feet long. So it is a large area. I walked it two weeks ago, and if you see this entire area as a park it's massive.

Michael Russert:

How many acres is that park?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I don't remember exactly how many acres this revision is. I'd just be guessing. I don't want to guess. It's larger than Pleasant Prairie Park, like maybe 16 or 20 acres. At one point it was 43 acres where it actually came up. It came up a little bit higher and then cross and down. I'm guessing at least 25 or 30 acres maybe, which is still a large park. It's really deceiving when you see something on a map and then you walk out in the field and say the park goes from here to way of the other end of that cornfield. It's a really huge area. So you really don't get a good perspective of the magnitude and the size of this unless you're out there. I was really surprised at how large an area this is.

Rita Christiansen:

I was wondering if that would be a place to consider a dog park on that far end.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You mean this area right here to be a dog park?

Rita Christiansen:

Yes. The whole piece other than the trail part that will go through to be considered for part of the dog park. It's centrally located.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

There's a retention pond right there so you can't have it there.

Rita Christiansen:

But dogs like water so that would be a good thing.

--:

You mean enclose the whole site.

Rita Christiansen:

Except for the part that you would use to bike through or walk through.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The only concern about having that is you're really abutting right up to all these neighbors. So you're going to have a dozen neighbors that there's going to be dogs barking right at their property line. That's the only concern I would have.

Rita Christiansen:

And in all fairness I'm sure there's more than a dozen neighbors that have dogs barking all the time anyway.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's something we can evaluate.

Mike Pollocoff:

I pulled out the Village Green map. I didn't get to High Pointe. But this is the earlier

iteration that doesn't have the more detailed neighborhood planning, but the park goes through here. This is 200 feet wide right there. This comes into High Pointe then you open up into a 40 acre park school site. Since we started planning on this we've opened this area up to get across here. Again, this is following that same WEPCo 200 foot easement to get to the bike path.

Rita Christiansen:

Also, too, if you did enclose that and enclose the pond portion in and being in close proximity to a school it might be a good thing to do. Just a thought.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Rita was talking about the possibility of enclosing this entire area as a dog park.

Mike Pollocoff:

A dog park makes more sense here.

Rita Christiansen:

It's centrally located.

--:

The other comment was there's a lot of backyards.

Mike Pollocoff:

My thought is we should try and get those houses there . . .

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right up here.

Rita Christiansen:

But on the other hand, too, in regards to your comment regarding neighbors, a lot of people have dogs anyway so barking is-

Mike Pollocoff:

And we go to a lot of barking neighbors dog complaints.

Rita Christiansen:

But at least at a dog park you're controlling it because you're saying this time in and this time out, where in a neighborhood you can't control that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Maybe this is something we can put out on the internet. The only thing is that this is something that is not developed yet, it's not graded yet, there's no properties in there, so it's kind of hard to tell what the people are going to want. But definitely at the time when it does get developed it will probably get developed originally as some green space. And down the road once it's all developed maybe we talk about some of the neighbors in the Village Green area and say we're thinking of putting a dog park and what do you guys think? Any concerns about it? We can address it and keep it open on the table until then.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think what we ought to do is if we think we want a dog park there we ought to identify it to get it noted on the plat, so those lots that are going to be on the north side when they buy those lots they know they're abutting a dog park.

--:

That's going to directly affect the value.

Rita Christiansen:

But with a buffer, is that correct? Isn't there a buffer between the houses and the dog park?

Mike Pollocoff:

There's a buffer. This way if they like dogs and they don't mind dogs that are going to be barking at certain times they know it when they buy the lot. If we have to go back later on and say we want to put a dog park here we'll be fighting with all those people. It's better to get it out there and on the plat now.

Jim Schaefer:

So raise your hand if you want a dog park in that location.

Rita Christiansen:

I do. I think it's something we were asked to provide for the residents of the Village. We keep saying no, no, no everywhere. Someplace we have to fit it in because our job is to try and encompass what everybody wants. We can't make everybody happy obviously, but would this be a possible location considering everything else . . . but again I think the consideration . . . neighbors should know.

Mike Pollocoff:

You're not really affecting any existing people. Everybody that's going into this knows

and has their eyes open that that's what it is.

Jim Schaefer:

I wanted to mention one more thing. It's actually very important. I should have led off with this. I neglected to draw a very important wetland right here. That's a delineated DNR wetland so this soccer field isn't going to work so we are going to be reconfiguring this. But just so you're aware that's a change we're going to have to make. So we're going to be juggling these functions around a little bit. Did we have an answer on tennis? I loved your speech and I agree with you, but could I have a show of hands yes or no? Tennis yes? Okay, tennis yes.

Michaeline Day:

Us poor middle aged white women have to fight for our own--

Jim Schaefer:

Use your power that you have while you have it on the Parks Commission.

(Inaudible)

Glen Christiansen:

So is that a wetland or isn't that a wetland?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'm not sure how old this map is. Some of the delineations aren't very accurate on these older neighborhood plans.

Jim Schaefer:

The plan that was sent to me by the Village which was sort of the evolving neighborhood document pretty clearly, at least it looked pretty official, like there was a wetland.

(Inaudible)

Michaeline Day:

We have to use the microphones.

Jim Schaefer:

That's everything I have. I appreciate all your comments.

Mike Pollocoff:

I have one more thing that will maybe add to your vision on this. President Steinbrink asked me to contact Kenosha County. They've talked to us before about this to turn control of the bike path over to the Village from the County.

Rita Christiansen:

What is that impact? What does that look like financially?

Mike Pollocoff:

About a couple thousand a year.

Rita Christiansen:

Is that in the budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

It is in this new one. The reason we're doing it, and all things being equal we would have just told the County to keep it, but now that we have this 9-1-1 problem, 9-1-1 is trying to figure out when you call there are you on the bike path or are you off the bike path? What squads go? Now we have this source of confusion going on. He said we'll take over the bike path and if a call comes in there then we'll continue to take the call rather than have two agencies go there and see whether the crime was committed on the bike path or off the bike path or whatever. But it kind of slides it into our master park plan planning. If down the road we're making any changes to it or whatever we can do that.

Michaeline Day:

Does anyone have any other questions or comments for Megan or Jim? I want to thank you again for coming the long distance and sharing with us your vision. We had some comments but I think you did a wonderful job doing it. Did anyone else have any other comments?

Rita Christiansen:

Good job.

Megan MacGlashan:

Thank you. I guess I just want to close by updating you where we are in terms of our time line here. As I said in the beginning, we've done a lot of work in the last month on actually writing the plan. I didn't want to bring the whole thing tonight because I didn't want to overwhelm you all with the concept plans and then the background chapters of the plan and so forth. But the goal at this point is to have a completed draft to you by next Commission meeting, December 6th, which is kind of expediting this whole process here. So there's a potential in that case that we could go to a public hearing in January

instead of February. So the goal is to get that to John at least a week ahead of time so that you all will have some extra time to review the draft.

As far as the concept plans go, Jim is going to work on those as soon as we get back to the office and he'll be sending them off to John as they come. He's not going to wait until the next Commission meeting in that case. So you all can have the opportunity to put them on your website if that's something you choose to do and the staff can have repeated attempts to look at them and say we don't really like this. So that's where we are. I just want to thank you all again for all of your wonderful comments. They were very, very helpful. We will see you next month.

Michaeline Day:

We appreciate you and thank you.

6. ADJOURNMENT

William Mills:

I'll make a motion we adjourn.

Glen Christiansen:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you all for coming and your comments.

ADJOURNED: 7:50 P.M.