

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION  
Minutes**

April 26, 2017, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall  
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairwoman Dunne called to order the April 26, 2017 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairwoman Dunne; Commissioners Carter, Saricks, Wilkinson, Wrobel

Absent: Commissioner Schiller

Staff Present: Public Works Traffic Engineer Will Lorton

Others: Aaron AND Raegan Cates, 2531 Indianapolis Ave.; Lauren and Anders Singdahlnson, 2529 Indianapolis Ave.; Phil Albert, 4839 Cross St.; Sue Zid, 4528 Cross St.; Bill and Nalen Hollison, 4852 Fransisco Ave.; Tony and Irma Tran, 4708 Cross St.; Robert Bartos, 4750 Cross St.; Donna & Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel Rd.; Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Rd.; Judith Davenport, 4617 Cross St.; Scott Rogers, 4504 Drendel Rd.; Adam & Beth Curey, 4524 Cross St.; Michael Hendron, 4823 Cross St.; Jackie Olkiewicz, 4506 Drendel Rd.; Guy Thacher, 4521 Cross St.; Dan & Miriam Fife, 4516 Cross St.; David Growdy, 4801 Cross St.; Jeff Mont, 4605 Cross St.; Wayne Hoppendorf, 4512 Cross St.; Kurt Schaefer, 4510 Drendel Rd.; Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Rd.; Katie Novosel, 236 Indianapolis Ave.

Chairwoman Dunne explained the protocol for the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 8, 2017**

**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 8, 2017 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. SCHILLER, SECONDED BY MR. CARTER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 4-0-1 (MR. WROBEL ABSTAINS).**

**PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-Agenda items)** – None.

**File #6-17 Lester School – Indianapolis Ave. – Parking Revisions:** Traffic Engineer Will Lorton summarized that this matter was raised by Lester School which was experiencing circulation issues with a change in the dismissal bell. Apparently parking restrictions were in place along Lincoln to coincide with the dismissal of the school but the parking restrictions on Indianapolis were not changed. During an on-site visit, staff observed vehicles parking earlier (2:45 PM) which was prohibited. With vehicles parking on both sides of the street, it made it difficult for two-way traffic to travel and circulation issues existed.

Staff was proposing to revise the parking restriction to match the dismissal bell to provide better circulation for the school. A map reflecting same followed. Mr. Lorton summarized that the hours on Lincoln Avenue had been modified previously and the restriction was tied into a one-way operation, i.e., one direction from 2:30 PM to 3:30 PM, reflecting the dismissal of the 2:55 PM bell. Mr. Lorton could not provide an estimate of how many vehicles parked on the south side of the street but stated that 2 to 3 vehicles would impede traffic for about 10 minutes. Responding to the chairwoman's question of whether staff had a history of the No Parking Any Time restriction on the south side of Florence, Mr. Lorton said he did not have that information. He also added that there were no concerns of discrepancy along Indianapolis Avenue.

Asked if staff saw any benefit to revising the current afternoon restriction on Lincoln Avenue (2:00 PM to 3:00 PM) to the same restriction on Indianapolis Avenue (2:30 to 3:30 PM) for consistency purposes in the area, Mr. Lorton indicated he did not see a benefit because, based on his observation, there was no disruption on Lincoln during the PM peak time.

Hearing no further comments, the chairwoman invited the public to speak.

No public comment was received. Mr. Lorton added that he received an email from a resident requesting that all parking restrictions be removed.

Public comment was closed.

Chairwoman Dunne stated staff's recommendation was valid and was an improvement. Mr. Saricks also added that it was based on what the school had requested.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE #6-17, MR. WROBEL MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO REVISE THE ORDINANCE FOR INDIANAPOLIS AVENUE, ON THE SOUTH SIDE, BETWEEN FAIRVIEW AVENUE AND FLORENCE AVENUE, TO BE BETWEEN 7:00 AM AND 9:00 AM AND 2:30 PM AND 3:30 PM.**

**SECONDED BY MR. WILKINSON.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

Traffic Engr. Lorton premised the next three cases with the reminder that Neighborhood Study Nos. 5, 1, 2, and 4 were performed by KLOA Consultants, contracted by the village, for the studies. He reminded commissioners that this study was bounded by Ogden, Walnut, Burlington and Belmont and it included traffic counts, geometric review, safety review and the neighborhood as a whole.

**File #7-17 Neighborhood Study – Traffic Control Revisions:** In this study, it was pointed out there were a number of uncontrolled intersections within the neighborhood study area. Traffic counts were conducted in the fall of 2016. Review of all-way stop controls were reviewed based on the MUTCD warrants; two-way and one-way stops were based on the Illinois Vehicle Code; and the terminating leg required a stop similar to what was brought to the commission's attention previously. Per Mr. Lorton, there were recommended improvements near the Metra station that staff wanted to investigate in the future due to impacts on the overall parking.

Mr. Lorton noted there were 16 proposed changes to two-way and one-way stops and one location to become an all-way stop. A detailed map followed. Staff was asking to go forward with the recommendation from the neighborhood study and implement all of the stop control locations with the exception of the Metra station.

Chairwoman Dunne asked whether staff supported KLOA's recommendation on Cross Street regarding the S-curve because she believed it differed from the purpose of an uncontrolled intersection.

In response, Mr. Michael Worthman with KLOA, explained that with the S-curve the recommendation was to stop the traffic because it was a narrow section of road and it was difficult for two vehicles to pass each other. It also allowed a stopped vehicle to see the other vehicle and allow it to pass. Further explanation followed.

Mr. Saricks, calling attention to the intersection of Edward and Haddow, asked whether the recommendation for a four-way was based on traffic volumes on Edward approaching Haddow or as a way to stop traffic from speeding up going east and west on Haddow. Mr. Worthman explained it was a combination of the volume as well as a high pedestrian safety reason.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if there was consideration of parking off of Ogden and Drendel with the strip mall and Hertz, due to it being an avenue off of Ogden and the fact that parking takes place on both sides in that area. Mr. Worthman explained he did not review shopping centers nor did he receive any response from the neighborhood on the matter. He did not notice anything when traveling in the field but said it did not mean that it did not happen. Mr. Wilkinson recalled this matter was raised by the neighbors because again, when vehicles parked on both sides of the street, the street became narrower. Mr. Worthman offered to review it again and follow up with the commissioners.

In addition, Mr. Wilkinson inquired about the two streets that back up to the park and whether there was any activity in the park that would cause traffic to park in the neighborhood, i.e., development of a soccer field. Mr. Worthman stated he heard that the field was under consideration but that currently the park did have a parking lot that was sufficient, from his observation but, again, did not visit the site on the weekends when the fields were being used. He heard no neighbor complaints.

Per the chairwoman's question, Mr. Lorton stated there was minimal crash history for the S-curve of Cross Street, noting there were no crashes for the past five years.

Chairwoman Dunne invited public comment.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4750 Cross Street, stated there no crashes on the S-curve. However, his concerns included that traffic from both ends of the street was being stopped and a bus and/or truck could not make the turn while staying in its own lane when coming around the S curve and coming from the north, due to the telephone pole and the tree blocking the other stop sign. He discussed the difficulty of vehicles traveling during the winter months and trying to get traction. He did not support the stop signs for that location.

Mr. Wayne Anderson, 4805 Cross Street, asked for the cost of the traffic study (\$14,000). Regarding the S-curve, he raised the fact that sidewalks were not being addressed at this time and could change the things on the corner, i.e., trees and bushes may have to be cut down to improve visibility. However, when traveling north on Cross Street at the S-curve, he surmised a stop sign at that location would keep the vehicles from traveling into Mr. Bartos's yard.

Mr. Dave Grandi, 4801 Cross Street, supported Mr. Anderson's comments regarding the locations of sidewalks. He could not envision stop signs at the south end nor at the north end of the S-curve because it was a tight and pasture-like setting. He has not seen any accidents, believes drivers will see the S-curve and slow down naturally.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel, said she had never seen a crash at the S-curve and believed the stop sign would not improve anything. As far as the other two stop signs on Indianapolis, she stated not enough traffic warranted them. However, she did have parking concerns at the Hertz location because parking occurred on both sides and overnight parking took place. There was no enforcement. She distributed photos of the Hertz dealership reflecting how the road's shoulder had been expanded through illegal dumping of gravel to make a parking lot. The gravel now blocked drainage and the street flooded. She stated that emergency vehicles or a snow plow could not get through and safety was a concern. She wished the village could address the issue.

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road, acknowledged the infringement of parking that Hertz was doing and, in previous years, called the village to see who was cleaning up the area due to litter,

lawn cutting, etc. Mr. Horak further explained that signs would get knocked over and not picked up. However, he did believe stop signs installed at the S-curve would prevent accidents. As for the topics of sidewalks, curbs, sewers, etc. he believed it was an agenda based around the recreation center that was being constructed. He believed none of the residents wanted the proposed changes and suggested they be surveyed first.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, reported that the Hertz company came in on a Saturday night, dumped gravel and made their own parking lot and no one followed up. (The chairwoman appreciated the comments and believed someone at the village should know about it.)

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road, returned and said there is no enforcement regarding the Hertz parking. Also, there was confusion as to who owned the nearby land which was supposed to be protected prairie. It was a traffic safety hazard since cars coming off of Ogden did not expect to see the Hertz parked cars.

Mr. Lorton offered to have staff find out who owned the parcel and follow up.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross St., voiced the challenges of traffic near Puffer School and the extensive vehicle line that extends into Belmont making it difficult to make a left turn off of Belmont coming northbound onto Haddow in one's own lane to go past the traffic. Today, he saw 10 cars parked by the soccer field which were commuters.

Chairwoman Dunne closed public comment and invited comments from the commissioners.

The chairwoman, again, voiced concern about the two-way stop for Cross Street.

Chairwoman Dunne re-opened the public comment.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, noted the village installed three stop signs in Klein Estates to slow down traffic but it just inconvenienced the residents there. No enforcement existed.

The chairwoman closed public comment and again stated the neighbors on Cross Street were not supportive of the stop signs and compliance would not be good. The safety issue, based on experience, either did not exist or would not be a problem fixed with the stop signs. She proposed to amend the recommendation to not include the two-way stops on Cross Street. Mr. Carter concurred, given the comments received from the Cross Street residents; other commissioners concurred.

Mr. Carter inquired of KLOA staff whether any widening of the S-curve could be done, wherein Mr. Lorton explained this particular location was one of the locations where a half right-of-way existed and the east/west portion across did not have 60 feet but, instead, had 35 feet of right-of-way so not enough room existed to widen the road significantly and there would be an impact to vegetation. As for the proposed stop sign (east ramp) for Warren Avenue, Mr. Lorton explained that particular location would have to be reviewed further, given there would be removal of additional parking spaces, a change in the curb line, and a future crosswalk. The chair concurred, asking the motion to reflect that Warren Avenue is open to further study. Regarding the Edward and Haddow location, Mr. Worthman confirmed for the chairwoman the reasoning for the control was to provide for safer pedestrian crossing. It was located mid-block and was the main entrance to the golf course.

Mr. Wilkinson asked whether the inclusion of the No Parking restrictions on Drendel, raised earlier, should be included in the motion, wherein the chair believed the focus should be on the traffic control revisions signs but to direct staff to consider the concerns raised by the residents.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE #7-17, MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO REVISE THE ORDINANCE FOR THE PROPOSED STOP SIGNS SHOWN IN FIGURE 9, WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS:**

- THE EASTBOUND WARREN AVENUE STOP SIGN AT THE METRA STATION; AND
- THE TWO NEW PROPOSED STOP SIGNS ON THE CROSS STREET/PRAIRIE AVENUE CURVE AREA

**SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

**File #8-17 Neighborhood Study – Pavement Marking and Sign Revisions:** Traffic Engr. Lorton reported that KLOA has also recommended in this study to revise all cross walks to include high visibility ladder-style cross walks to draw attention to drivers for safety and use of an S-11 with plaque on Haddow for eastbound traffic near the school, again, to catch drivers' attention and let them be aware of students crossing. Lastly, he said there was a recommendation to install sharrows to allow bike ride sharing at Cross Street, Burlington and Warren Streets. Staff preferred to defer that recommendation pending any demand with future improvements. Another recommendation was to include a crosswalk at the Metra station but due to impacts, staff would hold off to a later date for further investigation. Another recommendation was to install a pedestrian refuge island on Belmont Road to allow persons traveling east/west to Puffer School to cross half way and allow the cross time to be shortened but it required county coordination. Due to impacts and construction, staff believed it should be considered in the future during improvements. Map details followed.

Dialog followed on whether the village intended to install a crosswalk in the concrete sidewalks at the one-way drop-off for Puffer School as well as at the entrance to the golf club, seeing there were crosswalks going through private driveways. Mr. Worthman explained there would be no need for pavement markings across the driveways. In response, the chairwoman recommended modifying Figure 10 noting the proposed crosswalks on the north leg of the parking lots are currently private driveways with sidewalks through them and would not need an additional crosswalk marking.

In addition, she raised dialog about the distance of the crosswalk and stop sign to the intersection of **Rose and Western ??** and if there were concerns about it, wherein Mr. Lorton stated that they would meet the minimum requirements of the MUTCD and if there was need for realignment, he would "work through that."

Chairwoman Dunne opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Wayne Anderson, 4805 Cross Street, inquired about calming striping near the golf course and why the bike route did not continue on Burlington to Walnut, thereby removing the bikes from Cross Street, and then route them onto Walnut to Ogden to view the parks there. He suggested spending more money on marking the lanes in the village and skipping the bike lines. Lastly, he asked staff for clarification of how the holding island in the middle of the street (for Puffer School students) would work, to which Mr. Lorton explained but said it would not be implemented at this time due to county coordination and costs. Mr. Anderson expressed safety concerns and did not support it.

Ms. Lauren Singdahlon, 2529 Indianapolis Ave., supported the village moving pedestrians and anything that was not vehicle traffic off of the Cross S-curve and onto Franciso, which was a dead-end street.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, referring to the above comment, indicated that there was an 8 to 10 foot elevation difference between Cross and Franciso and it would get slippery when it was icy and there were many coyotes in the area.

Regarding the above comments about the bike route, Mr. Lorton stated the area was identified previously but not updated in the plan. It was not being proposed at this time.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, referring to the intersection of Haddow and Belmont, discussed the visibility challenges of marking a right turn off of Haddow onto Belmont due to landscaping in front of the school. Adding any traffic control to push a driver back further from the street would create difficulty.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross St., asked if this meeting would cover any road resurfacing in the area of Puffer School or would it be discussed at a different meeting to which Mr. Worthman, of KLOA, responded it was a different subject and related to an overall look at the next agenda item.

The chairwoman closed public comment and invited commissioner discussion.

Overall, the commissioners supported the recommendations with Mr. Saricks pointing out that the changes being made basically followed the "Safe Routes to Schools" program.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE #8-17, MR. CARTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL IMPLEMENT THE FOLLOWING:**

- **IMPLEMENT PROPOSED CROSSWALKS WITH EXCEPTION TO THE PROPOSED CROSSWALK THAT CROSSES WARREN AVENUE.**
- **IMPLEMENT PROPOSED S1-1 SIGN ON HADDOW AVENUE.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SARICKS**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

**File #9-17 Neighborhood Study – Sidewalk Installation:** Traffic Engr. Lorton reviewed a history of the former sidewalk matrix program. He explained the new sidewalk study recommended a sidewalk on at least one side of the roadways within the neighborhood with improvement on pedestrian safety and improving separation of pedestrians and vehicles. Mr. Lorton shared the discussion from the neighborhood meeting in February 2017. Details followed regarding the physical installation of the sidewalks and the fact that a tree survey would be completed prior to installation of a sidewalk. Installation would cut through driveways with temporary access provided and the parkway would be restored when completed.

Mr. Lorton emphasized the design was not finalized and tonight's discussion would only focus on whether sidewalks should be implemented and to receive feedback from the neighborhood. Further details followed on the steps that would be taken if sidewalks were desired and the fact that more discussion would take place. Mr. Lorton explained that the location of the sidewalks will be based on the least impact of the trees, drainage, overall costs, driveways, and neighborhood feedback.

Chairwoman Dunne invited public comment.

Ms. Karen Semiec, 4613 Drendel Road, stated there were much more severe problems than kids walking to the bus stop since the area was served by school buses. No children were walking from her area to the school so there was no need for sidewalks. However, she proposed that the location of the sidewalk be on the opposite side of where the children lived and direct the walkway to the bus stop. She stated the drainage in her area was made "awful" by the village by it allowing high density housing. The roads were in terrible shape and proposed sidewalks would sink due to the area's drainage issues. She suggested spending money on other improvements. (Ms. Semiec provided photos to Mr. Lorton.)

Mr. Garry Horack, 4507 Drendel, asked for an explanation of staff's comment about a 50/50 chance of not running into infrastructure and how staff proposed to do that.

To the chairwoman's question about funding sources to pay for the sidewalks, Mr. Lorton was not sure about the funding sources, but offered to say that costs would probably be broken into a two or three-year phase. Mr. Worthman stated that would be a village council discussion/decision.

Mr. Dan Fife, 4516 Cross St., expressed concern about the logic of the entire study, commenting that it was basically delaying the resurfacing/refinishing of a road that the village neglected.

A resident returned, recalling he saw a sidewalk study that was done last year reflecting the estimated costs broken down by block. He estimated it was about \$200,000 for sidewalks and suggested reviewing the Public Works records.

To Mr. Saricks' question regarding the installation of the sidewalks where drainage was an issue, Mr. Lorton explained an ongoing engineering study was taking place where drainage and topography were being reviewed for possible solutions. Should sidewalks be installed, the drainage would be designed to handle the additional impervious area. Should they not be installed, an issue could arise in the future. Mr. Worthman added that was the reason why they were looking at the neighborhood holistically, commenting that the village did not want to resurface streets only to have to rip them up a few years later to install storm sewers to improve drainage.

Mr. Robert Bartos, 4715 Cross Street, shared concerns about a water main existing under Cross Street on his side of the street and how it would affect the appearance and condition of the sidewalk when the village had to access the older water main. He did support sidewalks.

Ms. Mary Fife, 4516 Cross, supported sidewalks if the road was not going to be widened. She expressed that there were safety concerns for her children when walking on the current narrow roads, especially when it snowed. If the roads were going to be widened she would not support sidewalks. She discussed the amount of vehicle and pedestrian traffic she sees going to the train station and supported sidewalks. Recalling last year's petition she spoke with many of the neighbors and recalled many of the neighbors on the west side of Cross Street supported sidewalks. Per a question, she stated that the right-of-way along the rear of the golf course was used by the residents/students walking to the school. And in the winter, it could get icy.

Ms. Donna Samiec, 4615 Drendel Road, reiterated that the village cannot install sidewalks on her road because it is a dead-end street due to the slope and drainage. She discussed the amount of water that accumulated during a past storm. She noted no sidewalks should be installed unless the drainage issue was addressed first. Lastly, she said if sidewalks were installed they were the responsibility of the residents to shovel them which she stated she could not do at this time. She

discussed the issues she and her husband have faced when the village snow plows during the winter. She did not support sidewalks currently.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Road reminded commissioners this area was covered by bus service for the school. Sidewalks were “a luxury” and drainage had to be addressed which caused flooding due to high density housing.

Chairwoman Dunne reminded the public to keep their comments to the sidewalks.

Ms. Judy Davenport, 4617 Cross Street, attended all of these meetings and recalled that only 19 families signed the petition for sidewalks in the area under discussion. She did not want sidewalks and did not want 19 households controlling the entire area. She asked if there was a process to vote on the matter.

Ms. Raegan Cates, 2537 Indianapolis, recalled there were 19 families that signed the petition for sidewalks but she started the petition. The roads were narrow and not improved properly. She noted that students were bused and she lived .55 miles from Puffer school, which she found unacceptable. Students could not walk because they could not do it safely. Money could be saved by not having to bus children when they could walk to school. She believed that if the drainage issues were addressed it could change her neighbors’ opinions. Regarding the shoveling, she agreed it was a safety concern for those shoveling as well as the students trying to get to school. She asked staff whether there was an ordinance requiring that residents have to shovel their snow. (Staff could not confirm.) She supported sidewalks due to their positive health and social benefits.

Ms. Lauren Singdahlnson, 2529 Indianapolis Ave., explained it was not a matter of 19 families wanting sidewalks. She supported the sidewalks and described how she and others obtained the signatures required for the petition. She shared the importance of walking and stated that kids are bussed because it is considered “hazardous” for them to walk less than a half mile to school. She noted the sidewalk map located a variety of locations that the residents could walk to besides the school and link them together. As to the comment that sidewalks are “a luxury”, Ms. Singdahlnson stated they were a luxury and as a resident she should have that luxury and have them at least on one side of the road and to be able to walk safely. Regarding costs, she understood the village was researching the costs and that some of the sidewalk costs could be covered by a “Safe Routes to School” grant. She supported sidewalks.

Mr. Scott Rogers, 4504 Drendel, supported sidewalks and was concerned about safety, as he did have small children. He shared the challenges students have to face walking to the bus stops during the winter. He shared the safety concerns for those commuters who walk home in the evening during the winter months.

Mr. Jeff Mahn, 4605 Cross Street, asked if the commissioners have physically seen the area under discussion. He suggested tabling the motion until the other studies arrived and then return to the sidewalk topic after that.

In response, Mr. Worthman explained that sidewalks were important to address now because ditch drainage currently existed along with a need for some storm pipes. Design details with, and without sidewalks, were explained.

Mr. Richard Mackie, 4613 Cross Street, did not support sidewalks and noted that generations of kids had grown up in the area without sidewalks. While he knew of the drainage issues, he was not affected by them. He supported widening the streets.

Mr. Garry Horak, 4507 Drendel Road suggested holding off on improvements and was against the sidewalks.

Mr. Wayne Hoppenrath, 4512 Cross Street, stated he was told the only reason there were school buses was because there were no sidewalks. In later years, he noticed the amount of coyotes in the area and expressed concerns about the safety of children. He did not support sidewalks.

Mr. Dan Fife, 4516 Cross Street walks to/from the train station and when he arrives home it is dark. He said there has been one or more occasions where he has almost been hit by a driver. He supported sidewalks.

Mr. Anderson Dalson, 2529 Indianapolis, discussing the line of cars picking up/dropping off students, explained that having sidewalks would help alleviate that problem. He discussed the positives of walking and currently walked in the street. He supported sidewalks.

Mr. Aaron Cates, 2537 Indianapolis Ave., discussed the increase in children over the past 10 years and the fact that there was the possibility of accidents increasing with them. It was beneficial to have a safe passage to the school. He supported sidewalks and appreciated discussing the drainage issues in the area.

Mr. Adam Kerry, 4524 Cross St., supported sidewalks. Buses dropped off students but they also walked three-quarters of a block, in the street. A sidewalk for that short distance would be a positive.

Ms. Marianne Fife, 4516 Cross Street, referring to those residents who lived in the neighborhood for many years and did not support sidewalks, recalled hearing that in the last 15 years the golf course has become more popular and a number of locations have increased in population, making it an entirely different neighborhood than 30 to 40 years ago. She agreed the neighborhood is turning over with more small children than there were 10 years ago.

Ms. Beth Kerry, 4524 Cross St., agreed with many of the comments being made, commenting she and her husband have a young son and want to ensure he has a safe place to play and walk to school.

Mr. Dimitri Goloff, 4904 Western, supported sidewalks and was not even aware there was a petition and he did not sign it. He believed if it went door to door, it probably would have received more signatures. Currently, he and his wife walk much. He agreed there were drainage issues but said even if the sidewalks were not installed now, they should be planned for the future.

Ms. Jackie Okowitz, 4506 Drendel, supported sidewalks since she has small children and it was a safety issue. She wanted to be connected to her neighborhood. She currently walks with her dog. She believed the village had to look at the issues holistically, especially concerning the drainage issues. Her backyard also flooded.

Ms. Raegan Cates, 2537 Indianapolis Ave., acknowledged the overall increase in pedestrian traffic over the years and stated when she moved into her home initially, it was not incorporated, as were her neighbors' homes. However, without her knowledge, she became incorporated and was fine with it. However, she felt if 95% of the village had sidewalks and amenities that she paid high taxes for, then the residents should receive the benefits of sidewalks.

Ms. Amanda Vernderholm, 4505 Drendel, has resided in the village less than year but she would like sidewalks since she has young children. Connection was important, as was walking in the community, and getting the children to move outside.

Mr. Mark Samiec, 4615 Drendel, did not support sidewalks since he lived on the southern end of Drendel, which was a dead-end street with very little foot traffic. He did not know if there was any pedestrian study on who uses the street but it sounded like Cross Street received more pedestrian traffic versus Drendel.

Per Mr. Sarick's question on the actual location of the sidewalk, Mr. Lorton explained that typically installation takes place near the right of way line but he would have to review the area to determine where exactly the sidewalk would be installed.

Another resident returned and asked whether the dead-end of Drendel would be considered under the Safe Routes to School grant program since it did not connect anywhere and the fact that the residents in that location indicated there was low pedestrian traffic in that location. Wherein Mr. Lorton believed that issue would have to be up for discussion in design because it could tie into Indianapolis. Details followed.

Susan \_\_\_\_, 4528 Cross Street, supported sidewalks. She asked who decides what infrastructure gets installed at Indianapolis Avenue between Cross and Drendel due to the drainage issues there.

Another resident returned and inquired as to who would be responsible for installing the sidewalks on Ogden Avenue, off of Drendel, to the recreational center, or those areas where the car dealerships were located. This resident voiced concern that if sidewalks were installed for the residents, where would they lead to and would there be pathways leading to empty lots? He voiced concern that the plan did not include everything – streets, sidewalks, sewers, etc.

A resident recalled that the village was going to come up with a comprehensive plan that addressed traffic, street repair, widening, sidewalks, drainage, and safety but that it was "back to piecemeal again." He voiced his frustrations.

Another resident spoke and acknowledged that there were residents who supported sidewalks and those that did not and the neighborhood continued to change. People who were moving into the neighborhood were younger with children of their own. This resident believed the trend would continue to grow and if changes were going to be made it would be a disservice to not include sidewalks from the master plan.

Chairwoman Dunne closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Lorton shared that prior to tonight's meeting there was one phone call against sidewalks; three emails received by staff with two against sidewalks and one against sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Ms. Karen Samiec, 4613 Drendel Rd., stated she tried to send an email to the village but the letter that was sent out had the wrong email address so staff did not receive comments that it would have.

The chairwoman closed the public comment portion again.

Chairwoman Dunne pointed out from the testimony that this was a safety issue, demographics were changing, pedestrian traffic had increased, and the area was incorporated. There were young children in the area and it was a disgrace that children living close to the school had to be bussed. Main reasons against sidewalks appeared to be construction or drainage which would be addressed as the design moved forward. Installing sidewalks, to her, was not making conditions worse. She supported sidewalks in this neighborhood.

Mr. Saricks asked for clarification of what it was approving tonight, understanding that it was basically to approve a comprehensive design and not necessarily the exact location of where sidewalks would be placed, wherein Mr. Lorton stated the recommendation was to include sidewalks with the design. Mr. Carter supported sidewalks, seeing the village was going through an expansion with the schools, etc. and bussing within a half mile of a school was an issue. Mr. Wrobel asked if there was a construction ordinance requiring sidewalks to be added to new construction wherein Mr. Lorton stated there was not. Dialog followed that the Nelson Meadow development was having sidewalks installed because it was part of the agreement with the developer.

Asked who else would be involved in the design of the master plan for the area, Mr. Lorton stated the Public Works engineering department would be involved. Tonight's vote would influence their plan and overall assessment of the area. Further discussion followed on how the process would move forward once approved by the village council, noting that additional neighborhood input would be received.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if it was feasible to have at the next neighborhood meeting a plan with sidewalks and a plan without sidewalks with minimal cost? However the chairwoman disagreed to move in that direction due to the excellent reasons for or against sidewalks as voiced by the residents. Mr. Wrobel pointed out that the village's master plan discussed having sidewalks on at least one side of the roadway throughout the entire village. He shared his observations at prior meetings on this topic. He agreed there were changes in demographics, there was connectivity with sidewalks and people were moving more.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE #9-17, MR. WILKINSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO IMPLEMENT SIDEWALKS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PROPOSED DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AS PROPOSED BY STAFF.**

**SECONDED BY MR. CARTER.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

**OLD BUSINESS: None.**

**COMMUNICATIONS – Refer to commissioners' packets.**

**ADJOURN**

**HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, THE CHAIRWOMAN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 9:15 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt  
Recording Secretary  
(transcribed from MP3 recording)