

Elsen, Nikki

From: Mar <theomar68@centurytel.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 2, 2024 6:49 PM
To: Elsen, Nikki
Subject: Rivercrest Drive North Property Dispute
Attachments: Ideas and Questions that have come forth in the Resident Group meetings and conversations re.docx

You don't often get email from theomar68@centurytel.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

***** CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. *******

Hello. I was told that I can make a request to you as the City Clerk about a couple of matters.

Re: Resolution 24-0701

Could you please make sure the attached document is put on "Legistar" as it is related to two meetings this upcoming week and one the following week. The meetings are City Planning Commission on June 3 and Finance and Personnel on June 6 and the Common Council meeting on June 13. Thank you.

My husband, Pastor Ted Dewald, and I both plan to attend the meetings.

We also plan to speak at both public meetings. Possibly you are able to register us; otherwise we will be there early enough to do that.

Thank you very much.

Marlene L Dewald
608.780.0429

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Ideas and Questions that have come forth in the “Resident Group” meetings and conversations re: the land dispute on Rivercrest Drive North:

The residents are PEOPLE...realistically, what are they supposed to do if the lease ends? A SOLUTION needs to happen.

The focus needs to be on the residents. This rift between the City of La Crosse and the owners of Rivercrest Village has to be set aside. Responsibility needs to be assumed by both sides. If a compromise cannot be reached, there is need for a mediator.

The residents are in an impossible situation, vulnerable “sitting ducks” between two large organizations...and they are the ones that could lose everything.

The residents would like to meet personally with the Mayor, have him know who lives there and walk through the property in question with them. There should also be opportunity to talk with Council members personally. It would be of great benefit for the City leaders and the Real Estate Owners to meet the residents, hear and try to understand their stories.

There needs to be more study on the actual danger of Pammel Creek at this site. There does not seem to be any imminent danger and no studies to support that. Logically aren't the residents of Rivercrest Drive North in a safer situation because of the walls containing Pammel Creek than many other areas affected by water concerns? Many people in our area seem to have to deal with the possibility of flooding; they don't have to give up their homes because of it. It seems that this one tract of land has been singled out for some unknown reason.

Why is there not consistency in the rules/guidelines with other homes along Pammel Creek?

Does there need to be a “Buffer Zone” at all? If necessary, why 100 feet? Why would this area need more of a setback zone than a navigable waterway? What is this based on?

Could the land in this neighborhood be contoured differently?

Could the 4 mobile homes closest to the creek (4803, 4804, 4805, 4806) be professionally raised in place somehow at no cost to them? Since they are older mobile homes they probably would not withstand an actual move to another location and the cost would be prohibitive. There are no suitable lots available now in Rivercrest Village.

Why can't the land be sold to the real estate partners with just the typical easement(?) allowed as for all water property? (Owned by the Army Corp of Engineers??) It seems to make no sense that this little strip at the very back edge of a family mobile home park is owned by the City instead.

Why can't access to most inspection/repair/maintenance of Pammel Creek at this site be done from the other side of the Creek? There would be road access there, the park is not used much according to the neighbors. Access from that West side seems like it would make much more sense than going through an entire mobile home park.

Why was this tract of land leased by the City in the first place? If the concern was flooding danger, why would you lease it to a mobile home park where you knew mobile homes would be placed? The City needs to acknowledge some responsibility for this even though it happened many years ago (1997) with different City personnel.

Why weren't people advised of this unique situation when they bought their mobile homes on Rivercrest Drive North? Probably no one would have bought a mobile home there. Disclosure should have happened.

Why displace 6 family systems from their homes, decrease affordable housing further and add to the homeless situation in the La Crosse area? These residents are living happily in their homes, want to stay there, have been paying significant lot rent monthly and look upon their homes as "forever homes" and "sanctuaries." This is not a transient population; they are residents/owners not temporary tenants. These people are contributing to the community of La Crosse in their work and otherwise. They are lower income people who are doing the very best they can to provide for themselves.

This situation is causing people great stress and distress...illness, problems with sleep, despair, confusion, anxiety. There is emotional damage happening to everyone involved in the resident group. One person says she feels overwhelmed and terrified. Another person says she "feels robbed... robbed of her peace, her life, her time, her joy in Spring." This has to stop.

The goal of the people is to stay in their homes. They are all very happy there. Hopefully the powers that be can look at and be open to new and different ways to resolve this problem for the good of the residents and for our community. Even though individuals, this resident group is acting as a group and is of similar mind in how this is best handled. If for some reason no solution can be found, someone must compensate them for the damage to their lives, their losses of home and equity and provide them with an equitable or better home situation that is suitable and approved by them as well as getting them moved. This is absolutely no fault of the residents. This has disrupted their lives enough. Both the City and the Real Estate Owners need to share in this responsibility..."joint ownership of the situation." To date, no one has even mentioned compensation as a possibility.

The community of greater La Crosse needs to know what is happening here. Media, legislators and other community services and agencies need to be made aware and involved.