

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall, Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
Wednesday, April 5, 2006  
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Wednesday, April 5, 2006, 6:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, William Mills and Kathleen Burns. Michael Russert 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. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 7, 2006 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

William Mills:

I just have one correction. I think my name is right in most places except page 19. I'm William Morris again. So somewhere there's a William Morris that's appalled that he's being quoted as my comments.

Michaeline Day:

Other than that change in page 19, could we have a motion to accept?

William Mills:

I make a motion to accept the minutes.

Glenn Christiansen:

I'll second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Michaeline Day:

Pete, would you like to come in and introduce yourself? What we need is your name and your address.

Pete DiBartolo:

Okay, Pete DiBartolo, 2318 16<sup>th</sup> Place, Kenosha. I'm here with my associate, Lisa. Actually we're in some negotiations with Ralph Gezwaldo in the Towne Club property. The reason we came today is just because we knew that the Parks Department had some interest in the property and we just came to see what you guys--we didn't know how far along you were with negotiations or purchases or what have you. So we just came to see what was going to be discussed tonight.

What we have is about a 13 acre parcel that we know is a majority of wetland with a pond back there and a lot of unbuildable land. But probably one of our--what we would like to see is five acres developed and the rest being designated at park or recreational, whatever would be available for the Unit W.

Michaeline Day:

Okay, I appreciate you coming. Thank you, Pete. Thanks, Lisa.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a. Discussion of Park and Open Space Plan, Unit W Park.**

Michaeline Day:

I see we've got a thing from Jean Werbie. I know that I asked John if he would put this on the agenda this evening that I think speaking personally I was kind of surprised about the park plan not getting accepted as a whole, that we kind of read it in the paper two weeks later that it wasn't accepted, or a week later or whatever. And I guess what we can do to get it back on. I personally felt that we had a strong showing of Carol Beach residents coming to the workshops and to the hearings, and we spent a lot of time discussing it. And I do not believe that the one gentleman that came in and opposed it never came to any of our meetings, and I just felt that it wasn't given due consideration by the Plan Commission about it. I don't think that one person or two persons should be able to influence what the whole neighborhood had actually requested and worked on. I don't know how anybody else feels about it, and I wanted it to be brought up to see what we could do if everybody else on the Commission felt the same way.

William Mills:

I agree with you, and I think we have representation on the Commission from Carol Beach as well. I do not remember of any comments that were brought up in terms of any issues with the project that we discussed, Unit W.

Rita Christiansen:

I would agree. I felt that as a courtesy at a minimum the Chair should have been notified that the Plan Commission had changed what we had worked on as a special courtesy that did not occur from my understanding. As far as Jean Werbie's memo very well written. Her suggestion number 3 that we should host information meetings, and also number 4 the Park Commission should hold public hearings, these are all items that we have already done. Opportunity was given to all the citizens to voice and I just think we're revisiting something that was already decided. For me the plan was comprehensive. We took great strides to make sure that that area was considered and included in the overall comprehensive plan. I would like to see it put back in.

Michaeline Day:

Kathy, did you have any comments?

Kathleen Burns:

I feel the same way. At that informational meeting that we had, although there wasn't a large turnout from the Village as a whole, there was a good turnout from Carol Beach. I happened to be sitting with some of the Carol Beach residents that were there as we were getting input, and I feel that everyone was invited, that we've done some of these things that are already listed. Again, I think that puts us back to square one of brainstorming, and we've gotten so far beyond that that it scares me to think that we could go back to again trying to garnish input and revise all of that work. It's just not something that is in the best interest.

Michaeline Day:

And to me to have someone be able to bypass the whole Park Commission, never attend a meeting, never attend a hearing, never attend a workshop and then be able to show up at the Plan Commission, object, and then have the park thrown out is just kind of ludicrous on my part. Glenn, did you have any comments?

Glen Christiansen:

I by and large agree with everything that was said. Obviously one member of the Commission does live in Carol Beach, and at that late of date to have people come in and object to it, simply it would be nice to find a way if possible to get this back into the plan. Or, if there really is substantial objections to it take it out and we'll spend the money elsewhere. I think it is kind of a shame after all the time we spent at the eleventh hour somebody decides they don't like it.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, is there any reason why we can't leave it in because it was my understanding from

our last meeting that even though the parks were said to designate certain say if it's tennis courts or soccer fields, etc., in the end they may be adjusted accordingly? So why wasn't this left in and then when it came to this development process then if people wanted to give input of what they may have wanted to see then at that time it could have been shrunk down or expanded depending on what funding we had available at the time?

Mike Pollocoff:

There's still a park at Unit W. The Plan Commission when they modified it they had had a hearing just like they're used to having hearings, and at that hearing there were a couple people that spoke. Again, none of those people had attended any of the other Plan Commission hearings. One of the members of the Park Commission was at the meeting who is also the President of the Unit W Homeowners Association and really didn't offer any objection. We were looking as a representative of the Park Commission to make a comment to say yes or no. So I think from the staff's standpoint we felt a little sandwiched that we had gotten X amount of input that had created the plan.

I think the park is still in there. The plan is adopted. We needed to move forward on the plan. The plan is adopted. What this would be is an amendment to get it back to either that's where you want it or, secondly, some variation on it. Some of the feedback that I heard that night, and it wasn't conclusive, was that some of the residents there seemed to oppose having a park be that close to their backyards. They were opposed to the acquisition of the Towne Club property in doing a swap for the Village property. That seemed to be a major policy question that had been arrived at by the Park Commission as well as the Plan Commission and the Board. To me that was an underpinning of how to make this whole thing work the way it wants.

I really think at the end of the day what seemed to get to the people the most was the fact that ball fields and soccer fields were going to be hitting away towards their backyards. That's pretty easily remedied. You have them hit in the other direction or you maybe make a decision that you're not going to have a softball field there. They're not league fields. They're just pickup game fields. So I think that from my standpoint from the staff there was someone from the Park Commission there as well as from the neighborhood and we thought that--

Michaeline Day:

I guess I would say this would be my fault. I was under the impression that it was going to be approved as written, and had I thought that there was any--if I needed to have been there as Chair of this Park Commission I would have been there. I was not under that impression that I needed to be there to speak up for the plan and that if there was going to be an issue I would have thought it would have gone back to us and say, hey, we've got a problem with W. We have one resident here standing up and complaining that the majority of what everybody else wants. Forgive me, I just thought majority kind of ruled.

Mike Pollocoff:

We sent the plan to the Plan Commission as recommended. We had no idea that it was going to be modified either. We were as surprised as everybody else because it has been through a lot of due diligence. But what I think is important is the Park Commission shouldn't get mired down in this for a couple reasons. One is the plan is in place and we need the plan in place to be able to make this year's cycle of grant applications. So the plan is in place. What isn't in place is what that Unit W park is going to look like. I'd hate to give away a year's worth of opportunity for grant applications because we were haggling over where the ball fields were or where the soccer field was. We can still do that. What it does mean is Unit W falls out of the funding cycle until we figure out what happens with this.

Michaeline Day:

So there's still five parks? I thought they totally took out by the way the paper read was that they totally took out Plan W.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's still a park there but we don't know what it is. The people at the meeting seem to object to the fact that the park was nestled up against their backyards. I think when we went through the planning process, the Park Commission and the people who were there liked the idea of getting the park off of 90<sup>th</sup> Street, getting it into the grove of woods and being able to do a land swap so we could get some money to be able to do this and make it work. I think once the people who attended the meeting heard that then they saw some sense into that, too. So what we were faced with was educating people who hadn't been through the process. They were talking against it and then hearing about it some warmed up to it, but they weren't happy about having an active park behind their house. There's still a park there. What we contracted with Vandewalle to do to generate that actual conceptual plan of how that park is going to function that's what's up in the air.

Rita Christiansen:

A couple of things, Mike, if I could. Back to Jean's Village staff memorandum, and I'm paraphrasing here, it's expressed by area residents who attended the Park Open Space Plan public hearing and they felt that greater input was needed directly—

Michaeline Day:

That's not true.

Rita Christiansen:

That's not a true statement. And also number 1, the Village should send direct mail notices. I'm not quite sure why we would treat specific residents of this Village any differently than we treat other residents in regards to notices, because people, if I'm not mistaken, were given notifications through the local way that we do it through the newspapers, etc., so that was available to everybody. Again, the Village hosting an informational meeting, if that's what you want to do to present alternate plans we did that

because we had the open forum. And we held our hearing, so I just think if we consider this or recommend this that we're setting a precedent for this to happen again and that's my concern. I don't think this is good business practice because opportunity was given to everybody to send their recommendations in, to attend various meetings. So I think there was ample opportunity for the Carol Beach residents. And, again, because we have a member on the Board he did not express anything against this. That's what I have to say.

Kathleen Burns:

Two things are going on for me. One I think is the protocol that something can be put forward and accepted by the Park Commission but then gets changed, and whether or not if that is something that can happen without our input. The individual that was there was he there as an individual or a member of the Park Commission should probably have expressed some sort of input but I can't say for that. In which case something like what Mickey said then maybe we should have gone there had we known that more input would have been needed from this group, but we didn't know that. So I'll just speak for myself. I thought our part of it was over, that we had approved it and now it went forward.

So I guess it's sort of one question as I work on this Commission longer is that always an option that can happen? And then, if it is, we do want to get that, and again I'm speaking for myself, I do want to get that grant cycle going. To lose a year after all this work, again, why would we wait another year if the only way we can move forward until we work out the other issue is to pull W out to let that go forward. I'm in favor of that, and then try to figure out how this happened and why we didn't get any input in it or why we weren't told ahead of time so it could be addressed more proactively instead of now it feels kind of contentious and I don't like that feeling.

Michaeline Day:

I don't like it either.

Mike Pollocoff:

Like I said the Park Plan had been through a fairly exhaustive process. You all know it because you've been involved in it and the staff felt relatively comfortable. I was more worried about some of the trail issues because you're kind of making a swath across the Village. I thought that was going to be an issue. I was surprised at Unit W. As I recall the Park Commission planning effort was a lot of deference was given to the Carol Beach representatives as to what they wanted and we worked through that and it was put in there. So I didn't anticipate, nobody on the staff anticipated there was going to be a blow out from Carol Beach.

But that aside the statutes require that the Plan Commission is the ultimate authority on the master plan of the Village, and they have the responsibility to conduct a public hearing to get input. They can't duck that one. Now, at the meeting we didn't want to table the whole thing to send it back. They wanted the Unit W issue resolved, so the only way to take care of that was to pull Unit W, not the park but—

Michaeline Day:

Well, why couldn't they tell those three people that stood up--that one person that stood up and the couple other ones I'm sorry, we went through a hearing, we went through public workshops, we went through everything and it was approved. We understand you don't like it, but however the majority of Carol Beach wanted it, they put their input in, so thank you for your comments, W approved.

Mike Pollocoff:

You'd have to ask them. We did say--

Michaeline Day:

I feel that the Park Commission, and I think that I speak for everyone feels a little bit like we just wasted not a whole year but a portion of it. They didn't come to--one person that I know of that's on the Planning Commission came to our hearings. Nobody else did so they didn't understand how much work we put in. They didn't know, however, they felt they were capable to judge this because three people stood up. So, yeah, we feel a little bit put out. And I know you can't answer for them and I'm not asking you to make excuses or answer for them because you're not on there and you are staff and you are surprised about the whole thing, too. So I'm venting and I don't mean to vent it out onto you or blame you or John or Judy or anybody else in this room. It's just that--I agree with Rita in the fact that while I think Jean tried to appease everybody here with this one through six steps we already went through that. I agree with Rita saying that to revisit it later I think it's a step backwards.

Mike Pollocoff:

I understand your frustration and I honestly don't know what to do about it. But I think that if the Park Commission wants to say we gave you the plan we recommended and we're not going to change it, then we'll need to docket that for consideration, have you approve the amendment because the plan has been adopted, this will be an amendment to the plan. The plan as amended didn't include that conceptual design of that plan, adopt an amendment to the plan that says here's what we recommend. Send it back to the Plan Commission for a consideration and attend the Plan Commission and say why you think it should be there.

The issue is, though, at some point someone is going to have to address the issues that the citizen raised. I think if we just say you weren't there so you missed your shot at it, it's going to make people uncomfortable that we're not wanting to hear what it is that people wanted to say because we've done that through the whole process. It's unfortunate--

Michaeline Day:

But we listened to 100 of them that wanted it. So why are we telling the 100 that want it to the one who doesn't that guy counts more than the 100 that wanted it?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I think what policy question you want the Plan Commission to address is what you're saying is we've already gone through a lot of input and process. We, the Park Commission, we don't feel that should be negated because there's a couple people who came in at the last. They need to hear that.

Rita Christiansen:

That would be fine with me, Mike, if that's how it was presented. I feel very strongly that we produced the best product that we could give this Village and everybody, including staff, worked hard to consider everything that was in that plan. And to just let it go I don't agree with that. So I would be comfortable with telling the Plan Commission this is what we have and this is what we want.

Glenn Christiansen:

I have a question. I agree with what Rita just said. As a staff everybody here and a few other people besides worked very hard on this and I think we all pretty much came to the consensus of what we want. But we also approved this as a conceptual plan which obviously meant that some things could be amended, re-arranged, omitted and so forth. So would it not be possible to leave the plan as is, adopt it as is with the provision that when we get around to actually doing something down there based on all the variables, including acquisition of additional land to do, that park could end up looking nothing like what the conceptual plan was. A few times when we looked at some of these plans we all agreed that what was being put on paper was purely conceptual, that it could change substantially by the time we get around to finishing it. So does it really make sense to go overboard altering it at this point and just move on with it?

Rita Christiansen:

The decision has already been made by the Plan Commission that an amendment has to happen. So with that decision being made why was it even brought back here to ask us to approve that when it's already done.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Park Commission would have to generate an amendment to the plan.

Rita Christiansen:

And if we don't what's our option?

Mike Pollocoff:

Then there's no conceptual park there. Once the Plan Commission--



Rita Christiansen:

It amazes me how one person in the Village or two people could hold the whole plan hostage. I hear what you're saying and I know our hands are tied and it's a very frustrating experience but we've all learned something very valuable here tonight. So other than stopping everything which, of course, we don't want to do because that's not progressive, we don't have an option but to move forward for the better of the Village.

Mike Pollocoff:

Just in response to what Glenn was saying, my take of what came out of the Plan Commission meeting was that even the citizens that were objecting to it after they understood what the Village was trying to accomplish with the park there were okay with the park there. They weren't happy with the conceptual layout of the play fields that were there. As Glenn said, once we get to the point of refining the plan that maybe it looks different, the park is there, how that park layout ends up occurring, where the softball field is, where the playground is might look different. Maybe that's the issue.

But I think the important, the planning or element of park that the Park Commission was looking for that survived the hearing process that you guys went through was to move that park from 3<sup>rd</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> back into where the Morrow property is and put the park that's on 3<sup>rd</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> into the wetland, just to be able to facilitate a swap. I think that's the important thing. I think the Plan Commission needs to hear from you guys because they didn't hear from the one that was there. They need to hear that this is what the Park Commission recommends and this is why. We've gone through that to some extent at the Plan Commission meeting, but I've been at a lot of public hearings and sometimes the dynamics get to be a little strange and they take off on their own.

But I think if you guys all seem to be of one voice or one mind at least of what you wanted to have happen, and the amendment that you would be recommending is going right back to what you had. I think we need to go to the Plan Commission and say this is what we want and this is why we wanted it and then we can describe the Park Commission's view of how we got to that point and why it's a good plan. But that being said I don't think we ought to mire ourselves to where the softball is exactly.

Rita Christiansen:

That's not the issue.

Mike Pollocoff:

But the concept is that we should do that swap, we should get that parkland acquired.

Rita Christiansen:

I have no problem changing football or baseball or whatever fields around. That isn't an

issue a all.

Mike Pollocoff:

With the citizens, to be honest with you, that was the issue. I think they got uncomfortable with what was right in their backyards.

Rita Christiansen:

I think what else I find disturbing is that a member of this Board chose not to represent us. Perhaps he wasn't there in that capacity as you stated. But if he was and voted no objection at all to when we approved this conceptual plan—

Michaeline Day:

Unfortunately, he's not here tonight and it would have been nice if we had heard from him.

Kathleen Burns:

If you agree to something as a Commission, my understanding would be when I leave here—

Michaeline Day:

You agree.

Kathleen Burns:

--I don't go out there and say they're a bunch of idiots and I really don't agree with what I just signed off on. And I don't mean to say that. That came out wrong. I beg your pardon. I take that back. But I think that as a group the point I'm trying to make is if we vote for it or that's the plan we're putting forward universally we agree to something with consensus and that appears to be the way that we agreed.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Glenn Christiansen:

Let me ask a couple of questions. Maybe this will clarify things. Then essentially what you're saying, Mike, is we still want a plan on there being a park there, and the general plan itself may not be in question. The basic features may not be in question, and the exact location of things, or pardon me, the actual arrangement and where the features are placed is probably the only real question. So really it's just the conceptual drawing that has made people uncomfortable. Is that your understanding?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. They didn't articulate that very well, but I really think that's the source of consternation.

Glenn Christiansen:

That's what I've been reading into it.

Mike Pollocoff:

And what's happening where in the park. At first they objected to it because they felt if there was no park there then they didn't have to worry about anything. Once staff explained the rationale for what the Park Commission had determined as far as doing that swap of land, and you don't get this in the minutes, but there's a lot of nodding heads in the audience like, oh, okay, so they weren't so bad with that. But then they were kind of back to the use or what was being shown where in the park because as we all know is right now superficial.

Glen Christiansen:

I think it's a shame to lose the park down there because I can't believe that most of those residents down there would not want to have that park. So if it's just the exact list of features and how they're arranged in the park being the question, then perhaps the amendment should just be exactly what's put into that park and how they're located within that park is to be determine later on and otherwise leave the rest of the conceptual plan alone. Maybe that's the best way to approach it so we can just move on.

Mike Pollocoff:

The only down side is we've used our money to create the conceptual park and we don't have any money.

Michaeline Day:

It's done.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's gone. So if we want to redo another conceptual plan we've got to scrap around and fine—

Michaeline Day:

No.

Mike Pollocoff:

So I think is where we are is I think the Park Commission and the citizens who spoke before us want that park situated where it is and we know that and we want that change in use over there with the old park. And I guess what we decide to do internally John and our Engineer and Jean we'll in-house create that conceptual as we beef that up and figure out what we want do the conceptual plan. Because we don't want to go back and have Vandewalle--that's why we did those iterations that we did so we could come up with what we really wanted in the end.

Michaeline Day:

So what do you need from this Commission tonight?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd need a recommendation or adopt a motion based on what I hear to recommend to the Park Commission that the Park and Open Space Plan be amended to reflect the document that was presented and go back and put that park back on the table as you have it and then send that back for consideration. If you want to have an opportunity to meet with the residents in the neighborhood to deal with it before the meeting, because I'll come back. If you want to do that before the meeting of the Plan Commission it might be a good thing to do it because I think that we're not that far apart from what they're thinking and that might just forestall it. But then have that meeting and go to the Plan Commission and say, okay, we're sending it back to you and we want what we wanted the first time and we really meant it and this is why. Let me them hear it.

Staff got a little sandwiched at that meeting because we were hearing the comments from the citizens. We didn't think that was really going to weight in that much. But then it started weighing in that much and then our Supervisor is also a Trustee and I was waiting for that to be the next step and then, boom, it didn't happen. Nothing happened. So then they voted and they were off to the races.

Rita Christiansen:

I would just wonder if these people that represented Carol Beach, the whole neighborhood, would be willing to take their specific tax dollars to pay to have this renooded.

Michaeline Day:

I guess what Michael has suggested is that we ask that the Planning Commission revisit this and adopt it like we had it, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

You'd be requesting the Plan Commission to amend the Open Space Land Use Plan as originally submitted so that Carol Beach Park would come back the way it was.

Kathleen Burns:

Along with that would it be appropriate to address—

Michaeline Day:

That would be the first one. They would be two different issues. Then if we want to meet with them beforehand we would do that, but we're working on doing the amendment first and then we can meet with them before or after but that would not be part of the motion.

Glen Christiansen:

In other words we first have to ask for it to be put back in and then my suggestion about—

Michaeline Day:

Meeting with everybody.

Glen Christiansen:

--rearranging it would then have to be asked for.

Mike Pollocoff:

You could put it altogether. If your motion for amendment is based on another meeting with the citizens or some other planning that you want to take place that's fine. We can put it together.

William Mills:

As frustrated as I am in terms of how the process worked, I guess part of it I would agree that just learning part of the process, I guess in the future I'll make sure I'm at the Plan Commission meeting when those things come up. But at the same time I and I think the Commission is frustrated. Right now I'm speaking from a standpoint of not even knowing what issues were brought up by the citizens at the meeting. So I would definitely recommend at least talking to those citizens. It seems like maybe there was some ignorance in terms of what we were doing as a Commission, but then there's some ignorance in terms of from a Commission standpoint in terms of what the issues were that were brought up even at the Plan Commission.

Glen Christiansen:

I guess it bears to be said that sometimes it's interesting to be a public servant even at

this capacity.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's pretty rare, and I could probably count in 20 years on one hand, how many times one Commission has done this to another one.

Michaeline Day:

Well, that's what they did. They didn't respect what we had done.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't think it was that. It wasn't deliberate. Sometimes they get taken up in the moment and they were trying to respond to peoples' needs and they might have forgot the big picture. We just didn't anticipate it happening and I don't think you guys did either but here we are.

Glen Christiansen:

I guess then the thing to do is why don't we make the recommendation that--

Michaeline Day:

We want to meet with the Planning Commission to put it back on the calendar, I mean put it back in the plan.

Glen Christiansen:

And if we feel that we need to meet with citizens, if that's what we have to do, I mean I don't know, but if we have to alter the language of the conceptual plan to make a few people happy it's as simple as that.

Mike Pollocoff:

If it's easier the staff can meet with them, too, and anybody who wants to attend is more than welcome to come.

Michaeline Day:

What I would like to see is a recommendation or a motion that we would like to amend the open plan to put W back in.

Rita Christiansen:

It is in, just readjusted.

Michaeline Day:

I mean as it was originally put in, to meet with them, and then vote on that. And then schedule and then decide if we want to have staff meet with the people that opposed to it to explain it to them, if we want to meet with them and make a meeting before the Planning Commission, the Parks to talk to these people, how we want to meet with Carol Beach. Have two separate issues, not combine them both together. It gets too cumbersome and too complicated. So if we feel we would like to have the plan put in, the W plan as presented the first time, I'd like to have someone make a motion that we suggest that we do that and then vote on that, and then discuss how we're going to deal with a few of the residents in Carol Beach.

Kathleen Burns:

Could I ask a clarification on the motion. If we ask that this go back in, your motion is it goes back in the way we originally presented it. Do I understand that correctly?

Michaeline Day:

Correct.

Kathleen Burns:

When that goes back to the Plan Commission, are we able to include documentation or some sort of information from us saying that we understand that it was removed based on information that Jean shared with us retrospectively? By address I don't mean meeting with the Plan but to say the kinds of things we all brought up that we did this, we did this, we had the open meeting, so although we got this document we felt that we addressed these issues that are here and based on that we, therefore, recommend that it be put back in—

Michaeline Day:

We would have to go before the Planning Commission. We would go as the Park Commission before the Plan Commission and say we're asking you to put this back in as it was and here's the reasons why, and we would argue. Just like he argued against it, we would argue for it, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Staff can prepare a staff report that reflects what Kathy was talking about. Here's the things we did to arrive at what our decision is.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, in all respect I think Kathy's input is critical because she was at the table with these people when we had the open meeting so she would be the best representative to say this is what was suggested, this is what they wanted, and this is what we've produced based on that feedback. And also our consultant firm should have that data based on

what was written up on the board, is that correct? So we should have some hard facts and data available to also present to look at why we've made this type of decision.

Kathleen Burns:

What I'm trying to get across is if we say, okay, we have this document with concerns in it, is there justification for it being removed, then I would like it the same type of document with our recommendation to say we want it back in and here's our respectful articulated document.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Kathleen Burns:

--saying the same thing from this Commission so that there's an understanding that the issues were considered very strongly here, that the issues were discussed and that we still feel that they were addressed. It's not that we're ignoring them. We feel we did this. And that's why we are countering that recommendation is what I'm trying to say.

Rita Christiansen:

It was a consensus from the people at the table you sat at that represented Carol Beach that these are the things that they wanted. Based on that that's why we came to that conclusion.

Kathleen Burns:

And I think I just muddled up your motion.

Michaeline Day:

I can't entertain a motion as Chair. That's why I'm asking if someone here will make a motion to represent it to the Planning Commission.

William Mills:

I guess I'm a little confused, too. In terms of because we're talking about potentially getting input in terms of the exact comments that were made at the meeting because I'm not sure what issues were brought up to be honest. Maybe I'm just confused on this, but it seems like we're just voting to basically send back to the Plan Commission what we've already sent to them once before. I'm wondering whether or not we shouldn't do a little work up front.

Michaeline Day:

We will before we meet before the Plan Commission and get documents ready.



William Mills:

But shouldn't we vote on it after we do that?

Michaeline Day:

No. We have to put it up there and then we have to do our homework. They actually didn't get our homework. They didn't get our worksheets. They got the plan. So now we have to, just like they argued, the Planning Commission because they did not hear from us personally probably was not aware that we had a significant representation. And so staff will make those reports available. So when we do re-present it to the Planning Commission all of that data that we had presented will be part of our argument of why we are requesting them to reinstate the plan as written, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Michaeline Day:

And part of the process could be what we're doing right now is asking them to put it back in. Part of the process before that meeting might be, and that would be the next thing we would want to discuss with staff, might be just giving them our information. It might be meeting more with the people that were in opposition, seeing what their opposition is talking to them either as a Commission or as staff, but that would be our step to prepare ourselves to go to the Planning Commission and say here is their objections and we agree or disagree and here's the reasons why. So that would be our preparation before we get to the meeting, correct?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I have a question and maybe this is a question for Mr. Pollocoff. What is our timing to bring this to the Plan Commission? Is this something where we would have an opportunity where maybe at our main meeting have the public input available for Unit W during our meeting and then maybe on the second Plan Commission meeting in May bring it to the Plan Commission, or are we looking to bring it to the Plan Commission ASAP at the next meeting?

Mike Pollocoff:

My recommendation would be to bring it at the second meeting of the Plan Commission in May for a couple reasons. One is there's going to be Commission reappointments at the first meeting in May and I don't know who's coming or going. And, secondly, I think it would probably be as troublesome as it is to have to deal with the fact that a few

people hijack the process. Some of you guys want to amend the plan and we might as well get that addressed and get it out of the way so that when it does go to the Plan Commission if after you've heard the citizens and you still don't agree with them, you can say this is why we don't agree with them and here's what they said and this is why we think it's good. Or, if there's something in there we decide we agree with them we can deal with it.

Or, as Glenn suggests and I think it's probably the case, it's a lot more superficial than anybody suspects and maybe it just goes away and it's not a big issue. But I think that group of citizens aren't going to go away so we might as well deal with them before we deal with it at the Plan Commission. But if we get them in here at your next meeting, find out about it, have time to get a staff report prepared for the Plan Commission and listing out the things that Kathy showed so they could understand what we've done, plus any other information that comes out of that citizen meeting would be the best if that's okay, if that time frame is okay. Again, the open space plan is on its way. We're doing grant applications now so we're not holding anything up. All we have is just the Unit W issue.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, could you rephrase what you said in regards to the motion that we need to entertain?

Mike Pollocoff:

A recommended motion from me would be to conduct a or meet with interested neighbors at the first meeting in May concerning a proposed Unit W Carol Beach Park and submit an amendment of the open space and land use plan that reflects the original submission with comments and make for any adjustments made before the meeting. And my recommended motion is we just kind of move the process like we're going to do it. Have the meeting, get the input and make the plan recommendation. I think the first thing we should do is probably just have a motion to meet with the citizens at our next meeting. Based on that what you guys feel after hearing that, send the plan amendment like you had it before because you still like it, or if there's any changes you want to make you can make them then.

Rita Christiansen:

So the next meeting being the next Park Commission meeting?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Rita Christiansen:

So you need a motion that we meet with any citizens that have concerns and want to have discussion about the Carol Beach Unit W's Concept Park Plan at the next Park Commission meeting. That's the motion.

Michaeline Day:

I have a motion on the table. Anyone second that motion?

William Mills:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

William Mills seconds.

Mike Pollocoff:

And if you want I'll invite some Plan Commissioners to attend.

Michaeline Day:

Yes, please. We have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

And then the second motion would be then to?

Rita Christiansen:

Make the motion that after the meeting of the Park Commission the first week in May that we take the results of our discussions and findings and present them to the Plan Commission the second week of May. And based on those discussions and conclusions that we formally recommend keeping the plan as is or, based on citizen comments, making the adjustments accordingly.

Michaeline Day:

We have a motion on the floor. Do we have a second?

Kathleen Burns:

I second it.

Michaeline Day:

Kathy seconds. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Any other comments about the W park?

Mike Pollocoff:

Not that I can tolerate right now.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you for listening to our frustration.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I have one more question or at least a clarification. Is this an appropriate time to respond to the citizens under discussion of Unit W to respond to his question about where we are in the process?

Michaeline Day:

Yes, please.

Rita Christiansen:

Oh, absolutely. I agree.

Mike Pollocoff:

If I could get you back to the podium because I need to ask you a couple questions I had. You indicated your proposal was to develop part of the property?

Pete DiBartolo:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

And what do you mean by developing it?

Pete DiBartolo:

Residential.

Mike Pollocoff:

Are you aware that's not in the sanitary sewer service area?

Pete DiBartolo:

Yes, I am. There's water to the south end of the property. And the sewer, I've done some studies and gotten some estimates as far as putting a lift station in and possibly–

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not in the sewer service area.

Pete DiBartolo:

The sewer is about 400 feet away.

Mike Pollocoff:

No. In Wisconsin for the municipality to be able to extend sanitary sewer into an area it has to be in an area that's been established by the EPA and the Clean Water Act under Regulation 208 which means you have to physically identify areas where sanitary sewer can be extended. Even though you might have sanitary sewer right next to an area, unless the DNR and the EPA and the Kenosha Water Utility and the Village have agreed that an area is in an approved sanitary sewer service area we can't extend sanitary sewer into that area.

Pete DiBartolo:

And you're saying it's not approved?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not. It's part of the Chiwaukee Prairie Comprehensive Land Use Plan compromise where it was agreed that certain areas were not going to have sanitary sewer extended to those areas. It's really been kind of the rub with this piece of land all along is that right now it can't be developed without sanitary sewer and it can't be platted without sanitary sewer. The most that could go in there is one house so it would be treated just like any other lot in Carol Beach. If someone wanted to put one home in there they could check for a mound system or a holding tank but they can't put sanitary sewers into that area.

Pete DiBartolo:

I don't know. I never got that information. The last time I spoke with some of the people at the Village here, even the Village I think looked at one time at putting a lift station in there when they had plans on developing it.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, we did at one point, because I think the original owners of the Towne Club were looking at doing that. But subsequently with the adoption of the land use plan it's not in a sewer service area.

Michaeline Day:

When was the land use plan adopted, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

1985 I think.

Glen Christiansen:

I thought it was a little later.

Mike Pollocoff:

The compromise land use plan. Then there's been successive adoptions of the Federal 208 plan for sanitary sewer service. We've probably had five since then. So it is really close to sewer and water is there, but in the Village our land division ordinance we won't permit a subdivision to be created without sanitary sewer and in this area you can't get sanitary sewer service. So the property is still developable in the sense you could put one house in there but that's it. That's why our recommendation was given that the land was constrained that we look at a method whereby the Village could acquire the property and put into a park. I haven't seen a plan that's been forwarded that would just show one house going on the Towne Club property. So when you say developed, I didn't know what you meant by development, but if development is a subdivision that would take some significant hurdles to jump.

Pete DiBartolo:

That property has been--I think the . . . acquired it in the late '80s or early '90s--

Mike Pollocoff:

Who acquired it from Mr. Oatsville who acquired it from the court who acquired it from--

Pete DiBartolo:

. . . tear down the property and now you've just got the blacktop there from the tennis courts.

Michaeline Day:

So before Pete gets into further negotiations with the present owner he should maybe come in and talk to Jean Werbie or somebody to see what his options are or see what is available to develop there, how he can?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. You can develop it today for one single family house.

Pete DiBartolo:

So there's no variance or ordinance change that would—

Mike Pollocoff:

No. Well, the ordinance change that would be required is if the Village decided to say we'll allow subdivisions to be created without sanitary sewer.

Pete DiBartolo:

So you'd have to change it for the whole Village.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'd have to change it for the whole Village. And a variance it would be a hardship is what you'd have to be petitioning for, and if it's a hardship it can't be economic under State law.

Pete DiBartolo:

When was that taken into place? It's been around?

Mike Pollocoff:

What's that.

Pete DiBartolo:

The ordinance where you have to have the sanitary.

Mike Pollocoff:

1989.

Pete DiBartolo:

Because I've got documentation that shows the Village I think actually bid out to have sanitary.

Mike Pollocoff:

That area was in the sanitary sewer service area at one point but has changed. You could use some other type of sanitary storage, such as septic system.

Pete DiBartolo:

I'm just wondering why they would have estimates coming in after that date.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because at one point the residents of Carol Beach were having sanitary sewer problems in Unit W and we were looking at doing that and overwhelmingly they didn't want it. It's one of the few areas in Pleasant Prairie where you can perk for a mound system pretty easily or a conventional system. So the soils are somewhat suitable. I don't think I buy that where the Towne Club property is. You're on the low side of the dunes, but that's where we're at now. It's not in a sewer service area.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, as far as documentation for Mr. DiBartolo is there something that he should access showing when this was done, some type of documentation that you're talking about that occurred in 1985, or was there any public hearings or meetings with the President . . . well, I don't know. Down in Carol Beach then they said they don't want this. Is there some formal meetings where he can go back and look into meeting minutes so you can see this was actually an occurrence. I'm not familiar with the process, but he's obviously done some research or he wouldn't be coming here.

Mike Pollocoff:

For what they're looking to do the park and open space plan is probably their best bet if you're looking to sell the property. You're representing someone who wants to sell it and we're looking to buy it. We're going to buy it at fair market price.

Pete DiBartolo:

I must have misinterpreted. I met with Jean Werbie about six months ago on a project and I spoke with her a couple months ago also. She didn't lead me to believe that this could not be done. I know there was a lot of hoops.

Mike Pollocoff:

You're talking years worth of hoops. It has to be unwound locally at the State and



federal government to make that work. That's not to say people can't do it, but it would take many years.

Michaeline Day:

So he'd have to go beyond the Village of Pleasant Prairie?

Pete DiBartolo:

I was aware I would have to have contact with the DNR as far as delineating wetlands.

Mike Pollocoff:

You'd need approvals from Pleasant Prairie, Southeast Wisconsin Regional Plan Commission, the Department of DNR, the Department of Interior and the EPA.

Glen Christiansen:

Army Corps of Engineers.

Pete DiBartolo:

That one I knew.

Mike Pollocoff:

The DNR will usually sign off for the Army Corps. But if DNR gets a little edgy about it they'll say you have to have the Army Corps look at it, too. So it can be done but I've been here 20 years and I haven't seen anybody go all the way through the hoops to make that change, but that's not to say it can't be done.

Pete DiBartolo:

Very helpful.

**b. Consideration of Survey Approval for Summer Rentals of Lake Andrea.**

Michaeline Day:

In your packet there was a survey that was produced by the staff. Does anyone have any comments concerning this survey?

Rita Christiansen:

John, I do actually. This survey was done in 20 days because you had to compile your results. In 30 days? How long was the survey out there.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The survey is not even out there yet. I guess I'm looking for approval that this survey is good to have out for the public. So if there's any additional information that the Park Commission would like to have on the survey that it's put on there before it goes out to the public.

Michaeline Day:

We're looking at a '07, correct?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct, because those '06 are pretty much all set. And we kind of run the survey at a couple months through the summer we really start doing our planning for next year in the August or September time frame for the '07 summer. So just to make sure that this survey goes out as the Park Commission would like to see it go out. It was one of my goals to make the survey very, very short and easy for the user to put together and have something that's very quantitative, or have something you could easily say X amount of people surveyed and 80 percent of them like to fish or so many people would like to see this. I can be very easily broken down into percentages and numbers.

Michaeline Day:

The only thing that I thought would be an optional box for comments if somebody wanted to voice their opinion, I like the short and sweet, yes or no and easy to survey, but sometimes it's nice to get little comments. Somebody might have something kind of appropriate to say that might be nice if they want to take the time to comment on Lake Andrea or, for instance, would you like to see more special events at Lake Andrea? Yes. Well, maybe they have one in mind so they might want to put it in.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

What type of special event like a sub question.

Rita Christiansen:

It could be an opportunity for us.

Michaeline Day:

Just under comments anything you would like to see or have done at Lake Andrea. Most people won't answer it, but it does give someone the opportunity to make a comment.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Okay.

William Mills:

My only comment is just the reverse thought process in the last question. The way it's asked now is how many weekends would you like Lake Andrea to be open? And when I went home last month and talked to my wife about this, it was it should always be open very strongly to be honest. I'm wondering more along the lines of if you're going with that question that way if you're not going to get an automatic that the public should always be able to. Should you reword that question more to the point of how many weekend is it appropriate to limit Lake Andrea to host events such as Pleasant Prairie Family Days, the triathlon, all the events you already have listed on here. Just a suggestion. You could probably look at it either way.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We can definitely make as many changes as the Park Commission feels appropriate, sure.

William Mills:

I'm just afraid you'll get the automatic comment that the public owns that facility and it should be always open without thinking about you don't get the good, the benefit, from the events.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We'll make that change.

Michaeline Day:

Any other comments?

Rita Christiansen:

No, I think you did a great job. And I would agree with rewording question number 6.

Michaeline Day:

Terrific.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We will make those changes and then have them available on the internet, at the RecPlex, Village office, Prange Center, Fire Stations, wherever we can have them out.

Michaeline Day:

Would you send it in the next newsletter?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'm not sure when the next newsletter will be out but it would definitely be something that would be appropriate to have in it.

Rita Christiansen:

Can we have this put in the RecPlex newsletter?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes.

Rita Christiansen:

So, Judy, I see that it's linking to her so let me ask one more question here, John. So if I go into the web page or am I going to go into Judy's e-mail address in Pleasant Prairie and I'm going to click on a link? How is that going to work?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You'll be able to go to the pleasantprairieonline website and if somebody chooses they can either submit it electronically right off the website. If somebody picks up a copy and just wants to e-mail some comments back we have an e-mail address and we have a fax number if somebody wants to fax it. The drop box is a good idea and we can make sure locations for the drop box is on there.

Rita Christiansen:

And perhaps if we can submit electronically, because that would be my preference, where is the address that I need to go to? I'm going to go to her address and I'm not going to get there. So if I'm doing it electronically and submitting it, it will automatically go to her, correct?

Michaeline Day:

I guess Rita is saying you should have [www.pleasantprairieonline](http://www.pleasantprairieonline).

Rita Christiansen:

So instead of Judy . . . .

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I was just giving the residents another outlet for information.

Rita Christiansen:

You'll be in trouble, John, if she shows up and she's got 200 e-mails in her in box.

Thank you.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Thank you for all your comments.

Michaeline Day:

I want to thank everyone for participating and giving your views. I want to thank Mike and John and Judy for letting us vent and make our comments. With saying that, I would like to have someone propose an adjournment.

Kathleen Burns:

I have a question before we adjourn. I'm listed as my tenure on this Commission as May '06. So what exactly does that mean? Do I come to a meeting in May? Is this my last meeting? That's what it shows on the website.

Mike Pollocoff:

At the Board's first meeting in May, May 1<sup>st</sup>, they'll do Commission reappointments. So I'll be giving you a call or you can come in now and say get me out of here.

Kathleen Burns:

I just didn't know how it works.

Mike Pollocoff:

No, they call everybody.

Kathleen Burns:

I just didn't know what the protocol was.

Michaeline Day:

Either they'll call you or you can tell him after the meeting that you would like to stay on.

Rita Christiansen:

Is anybody else on there due?

Kathleen Burns:

Yes, there is somebody else on there but I just don't remember. Being as egocentric as I

am I just looked at mine. But there is somebody on this Commission in '06. I can't remember. It might be Mike.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll work on that. I start that here in a couple weeks.

Glen Christiansen:

Before we adjourn there's something I wanted to bring up. This is something that we've talked about a couple of times. I don't know if it ever came up before the Park Commission but we've talked, but in part I guess it did. We talked once about a veteran's memorial, and another time perhaps we talked about, and maybe it never came up before the Parks Commission, about putting up some kind of a memorial sign to Phil Sanders along 165. In light of the fact that Phil passed away a few weeks ago, I think it would be kind of nice if we could have a discussion on it if we could put this on the agenda. So I'm asking if we can put that topic on the agenda, both of them, really. I think there should be--I think the community needs to memorialize certain things. Both are appropriate so perhaps having a discussion on that in general would be a good way to start addressing it.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay. I'm more than glad to do that.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT.**

Rita Christiansen:

I'd like to make a motion that we adjourn.

William Mills:

I second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Any opposed?

**ADJOURNED 7:10 p.m.**