



Letters to the Editor

Harried against cemetery on Schuetz land

At a recent village board meeting, President Klar proposed looking at locating a cemetery within the Schuetz property.

A five to six acre cemetery located on this property, would reduce the 18.8 acres Schuetz property for park purposes by about one-third.

Within the entire eastside growth area, the Schuetz property ranks as one of the highest valued properties that should be preserved for conservancy parkland. It offers a very scenic overlook of Mud Lake and desirable passive usage in a natural state.

In my opinion, locating a cemetery within the Schuetz property as recommended by Klar and supported by Trustee Wernet is a poor use of a great potential one of a kind village asset.

Locating a cemetery on the Schuetz property would negatively impact parkland usage of this land. I feel more suitable land for a cemetery is located within the east side growth area.

Wernet states in his Oct. 19 letter a cemetery "will promote the use of the park by more than just a few." Other than counting park usage by the dead, does he think it will promote more family picnic

lunches, children playing, winter sledding, and trail usage within the cemetery?

Why take prime land and strip it of trees for cemetery lots versus using existing agriculture land without trees? Why physically or artificially limit public access to scenic overviews and trails with cemetery placement on prime parkland, when other land could be used?

Park fees in lieu of land received from developers should not be used to help acquire land for a cemetery. Those fees should only be used for new parkland acquisition and development per Village Ordinance.

In Wernet's same letter, he states once 'fees in lieu' funds are gone, taxpayers will have to pay for park improvements. His support of diverting and spending this money for cemetery land acquisition is doing exactly what he says he is concerned about.

Why doesn't Klar recommend private fund raising for cemetery land acquisition as he did for the Schuetz property, along with contributions from local religious organizations?

This seems to be another roadblock proposed to delay or stop the entire Schuetz property acquisition for parkland purposes.

Nov. 2, 06 **Mike Harried**
McFarland