



Carroll Center Public Meeting #2

Date of Public Meeting: 11/2/2005

Location of meeting: Carroll Center

Notes taken at meeting of comments made by attendees

Gary Balling opened the meeting and explained the process
The majority of the attendees had not attended the first public meeting
others had read of the meeting in the paper that day
Therefore John Mac Manus of Altamanu gave a brief overview of the first public meeting
and comments made by the attendees
Concerns and opportunities brought up at the first public meetings were listed briefly
There was general discussion about the first public meeting
Then the historic significance of the Center was discussed

Historic significance of Carroll Center

Information on the historic assessment of the Carroll Center building was listed briefly
The findings of the committee that assessed the park building were quoted
The Center had historic significance but had been altered significantly
The Center and park reflected the aims of the social/park movement of the 20's
At the first public meeting there was no support for restoring or keeping the Center
The Center was described as "tired" and was too small for multiple uses
Mike Grandy spoke about how the building had changed over time and the difficulties
and potential expense of restoration
3 residents spoke about the changes made to the building
One resident spoke in favor of restoration
One resident, who informed the meeting that he was a contractor who worked in
restoration stated that he believed it would be extremely expensive to restore
The location of the building and how it divided the park was discussed
The possibility of a new Center was discussed
The benefits of connecting it to the school were discussed
Due to changes and condition the existing building most likely would not get landmark
status
Public sentiment is involved and therefore it would be good to incorporate existing
building elements into the new building
Removal of the building would open up park

Do we need a new Center?

Survey said that adult population was underserved.
Park is overused, kids use every inch
Survey talked about running, jogging, walking paths.
What about a space for Yoga and exercise during the winter
School needs space as well
Gym overbooked, clubs and groups looking for space
Middle school, High school, and adults--survey shows unmet needs (staff)



What age groups use Carroll Center?

- Preschool
- K-3 classes
- La escuela
- Leagues (fields or gym) 3rd through 8th grades
- Tues-Thur exercise adult group

The 6 concept drawings were presented and each concept was discussed in detail
Comments were made by public regarding the 6 concepts
Existing building was not shown on the concepts keeping the building was not recommended at the first public meeting

Issues with Center attached to school
Would like not to share new center during school day
Would security issues will be increased for the neighborhood?
Concern that school would take over Center

Positive feedback about Center attached to school
Resident who called himself the neighborhood guardian stated that there were very good relations between the school and residents and he was not worried about sharing
Park District and School District could provide more for the community if they work together

The drop off and turn around
9am drop off of kindergarten and daycare use turn around at Kenilworth ave.
Question was asked as to the actual need of a turnaround
Village engineer told Altamanu that it was necessary for emergency vehicles/access
Emergency vehicles do not use it but residents do
Distance from current drop off to center and school is close enough for parents especially when many children are dropped off -parent does not have to get out of car
The majority of the schemes showed the turnaround moved but still close to the school

Landscape
One resident was concerned that the plans showed too many trees
Josephine Bellalta stated that the trees could be limbed up to provide visibility
John Mac Manus reminded the resident that the tree trunks would be 5 inches or less
Resident liked identity of green space separate from school with trees and landscape
Liked some plans with activities on south end or middle of site.

General Discussion of Alternatives
It is important to have ventilation in new building
Public sentiment involved--incorporate existing building elements into new structure
Ball field and Car conflict, Belfield attracts lots of outsiders
Parking and drop off takes place behind the existing Center at alley
If Center moved, then alley drop off resolved
Love having running track around park/we do not need running track
Gary Balling reminded the group that it would not be a running track. It would be a circulation path
Issues to be resolved are fundamental difference between Park District and school
i.e. School does not want bikes and roller blades because of small kids
One resident in particular wanted the Center at the south so that it could be separate and so bikes would be allowed



How will school feel about adults running next to playground?
 Some residents liked baseball at south end/but do not take houses
 Concept #1-New building--takes up space of wheelies and skateboarders
 Have we taken too much hard top? We can add some at the south end
 When it rains/snows--ice on play equipment, so only have blacktop (kids)
 The smaller green space is used all the time. In concept #6 it is useless
 Baseball in middle--cause car congestion
 No the opposite is true as cars will use Harvard and Fillmore
 If center placed north would be nice to have a nice entrance at south as well
 Parking lot was to be turned over to school --Project team to check
 Nicer to have playgrounds in green space for multiple uses
 Likes Concept #3 but put playground further west
 Likes Concept #1 but blacktop is reduced
 Two Play areas limited
 Soccer fields overlap softball in scheme #1
 A resident was said he was a neighborhood guardian stated that no houses should be eliminated--eyes won't be there to oversee the park security
 Gary Balling and John Mac Manus assured the residents that no house would be taken.
 Residents could give the PD the option to purchase the houses - the right of first refusal.

Residents were then asked to offer their votes on the alternates.
 A series of votes were made and each time the alternate with the least votes was eliminated
 Eventually two alternates were selected.
 Scheme I was the preferred alternate if the phasing allowed, as the residents at the first public meeting had requested that the Center not be removed until the new multi use Center was built
 Scheme 3 was selected as the back up as the phasing would be easier

FIRST VOTE

<u>Concept</u>	<u># of Votes</u>
#1	16
#2	12
#3	3
#4	6
#5	1
#6	0

Concept #3--like flow of diamond at north;
 slide playground west; add hard top
 flip round about in opposite direction
 Baseball on north or center
 safer with softball in center



Concept #4

With right side cull-d-sac (east of Kenilworth) adjustment
more independent of school
Location of playground good
Hardtop stays--center to north
Sight line issue with building

Changes suggested by attendees

- Concept #1 with restroom in middle of site
- Concept #3 playgrounds far from center and restrooms
- Concept #1 likes two different soccer field areas
- Concept #4 redesign for soccer in south

Mike Grandy spoke to group about how trends in recreation change so build flexibility into the plan

The resident who was the only one to want the Center at the south end stated that

- Concept #1 and #3 sight lines to fields does not work
- Concept #4 sight lines are better

SECOND VOTE The attendees were asked to consider phasing
Phasing of remaining plans was discussed

<u>Concept</u>	<u># of Votes</u>	
#1	7	
#3	8	easiest phasing
#4	1	

THIRD VOTE--REGARDLESS OF PHASING DIFFICULTIES

<u>Concept</u>	<u># of Votes</u>
#1	10
#3	5
#4	1
#4B	0

Number one received the majority of votes and number three was selected as back up

Gary Balling informed the meeting of the next stages and of the presentation of the Master Plan on Thursday December 1st. The team would try to make Scheme 1 work but if phasing did not work we would use scheme 3.

Mr. Balling invited the public to attend the meeting on December 1st
3 residents praised the PD form a very democratic process.