

**Burr Ridge Park District
Special Meeting
March 2, 2022**

SPECIAL MEETING

The special meeting of the Burr Ridge Park District was called to order at the Burr Ridge Community Center at 3:35 pm by Vice President Caplis.

Present:	Caplis, Lawrence, Malloy, Paulius,
Via Video Conference:	Quigley
Also present:	Jim Pacanowski, Director

Approve March 2, 2022 Agenda

No changes were made to the Agenda.

Approve February 14, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

Malloy moved, seconded by Lawrence and approved by roll call vote to table the Approval of the February 14, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes until the next Regular Meeting.

Ayes: Caplis, Lawrence, Malloy, Paulius Nays: None Abstain: Quigley

OPEN FORUM

No Open Forum

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discuss Harvester Park Tennis Court Resurfacing Project

Pacanowski provided an update on all available space within the park system for a 4 court pickle ball and approximate costs associated with each option.

Caplis asked if an option to place a lineal court near the batting cages would be an option.

Pacanowski responded that the batting cages are used and the area is too tight to place a lineal court in the area.

Caplis stated that the problem for a 4 court option is two fold:

- 1 – space constraints so as not to place the 4 courts in the tennis court area
- 2 – financial constraints

The remaining option then becomes whether or not to wait until finances become available in order to place a 4 court pickle ball element in an interior area of the park system or place a 2 court pickle ball option to reduce noise levels in one of the tennis courts.

Malloy stated that the park is for the entire village and not only for certain residents. Two pickle ball courts would be a reduction in noise and would benefit the entire community. There is a large support for pickle ball within the community.

Paulius agreed that 1 tennis court and 2 pickle ball courts would benefit the community as a whole. Four pickle ball courts within the tennis court area would be a noisier option for nearby residents in addition to a higher cost.

Lawrence stated that Chestnut Hill residents are not distinguishing between 2 courts and 4 courts of pickle ball and there is a disconnect between the Chestnut Hills residents and the pickle ball enthusiasts. If the discussion is not revolving around negative impacts on one group, then the discussion is really regarding finances.

Pacanowski stated that if a 2 court option on the tennis court is being considered, the Board indicated a desire to research noise mitigation options of which an option has been submitted to the Board.

Lawrence asked for details on what noise mitigation would be for a 2 court pickle ball option.

Pacanowski stated that for a 2 court option, the noise mitigation would be an attempt to control the sound within the court.

Caplis asked the Board if there is any member that would want to place 4 pickle ball courts on 1 tennis court space.

It was unanimously decided that a 4 pickle ball court option at the tennis court location is not an option.

Caplis asked if any Board Member would prefer to remain with 2 tennis courts only at this location.

It was unanimously decided that the Board should continue discussions for a 2 pickle ball and 1 tennis court option at this location.

Pacanowski stated that if the Board decides to move forward with a 2 pickle ball court option bid specs can move forward as the only difference will be down to striping which is the last item to be completed in the project. If that is the case, the bids would go out in April.

Pacanowski supplied information on a noise mitigation material that could be considered. The cost of this material, installation, and pickle required fencing would estimate out at \$30,000-\$40,000.

Paulius asked if there is a park in Illinois with this material that Board Members could go to visit.

Pacanowski stated that there is not to his knowledge.

There was some discussion as to whether or not the material surrounding the court would make the courts too hot in the summer and also whether or not the reduction in noise would be enough to satisfy nearby resident.

Pacanowski responded that there are no guarantees for decibel reduction as there are so many variables for each location, however, an additional mitigation option to bring the decibel level back into the 60db level could possibly be to place a cedar fence on top of the berm for additional noise mitigation.

Lawrence stated that he is pro pickle ball, and feels the sport will continue to grow. If an additional \$30,000-\$40,000 is required for noise abatement for a 2 court pickle ball at the tennis court location, then it is now a difference of only approximately \$210,000 - \$220,000 for a 4 court pickle ball element in a different location and then both differing groups would be happy with no noise issues to deal with.

Caplis stated that the problem is that there is currently no other location to put the 4 courts.

Pacanowski stated that the most likely location would be the area west of the west ballfield where the small sledding hill is located. The estimate at that location is \$250,000. The county wetland map would have to be looked at to ensure there are no critical wetland issues requiring wetland mitigation.

Malloy asked if lights would be installed.

Pacanowski replied no.

Caplis stated that a 2 pickle ball court would fit in with the type of park atmosphere that is currently at Harvester Park. A four court pickle ball element will encourage large non-resident groups of 40-50 people who may then initiate a number of issues that come along with consistent large groups of visiting players who may feel entitled to special privileges.

Lawrence stated that a 4 pickle ball court may be inclusive to village residents just as a 2 pickle ball court would be.

Pacanowski added that there would be a certain gamble and pressure involved and as witnessed throughout the meetings, Group A stated that 3 pickle ball courts are better than 2, 2 are better than 0, however, that then changed to if there are not 4 courts installed it is a waste of taxpayer money and none should be installed because the courts will not be used. Staff believes that a 2 court pickle ball element will be used by serious players, park district programs, day camp, and when other pickle ball facilities are too crowded, overflow would then trickle to this location. Two lit pickle ball courts would be appreciated by pickle ball groups. When compared with Group B who state the 2 pickle ball courts are no different than 4 courts, neither group is happy, and the Board has always had to weigh all differences and then decide on the best for all involved, including the park district.

Lawrence stated that Chestnut Hills will still be upset with the 2 pickle ball court.

Lawrence stated that everything at Harvester Park is a destination park, not a community park. People come from all over to utilize all of the elements of the park and plan to come here as a destination.

Pacanowski added that there are a few options for many elements in order to accommodate the needs of many. A 2 pickle ball court option would be consistent with that philosophy.

There was some discussion regarding looking at the Capital Budget in order to accommodate a 4 court pickle ball option in the future.

The Board unanimously decided to table resurfacing the tennis courts for one year in order to pursue researching the option of installing a 4 court pickle ball in a location other than the tennis courts.

The Board directed Pacanowski to locate the county map to determine if the area west of the west ballfield is within the critical wetland area of wetland mitigation. Pacanowski was directed to put together a communication recap to update the pickle ball group and Chestnut Hills that a 4 court pickle ball at the tennis location would not be considered.

This item will be placed on the March Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Malloy moved, seconded by Paulius, and unanimously approved to adjourn the Special Meeting at 4:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Stednitz
Recording Secretary