

PARKING & TRAFFIC COMMISSION

Minutes of Public Hearing
July 14, 2004

Downers Grove Public Works Facility
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Johnson called the June 14, 2004 meeting of the Parking and Traffic Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. He then asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners: Messrs. Carlquist, Kren, Stapleton, Thurston, Wendt, Yeksigian and Chairman Johnson

Present: Staff: Mr. Dorin Fera, Mr. Dave Barber, Mr. Mike Millette, Mr. Tim Sembach, Ms. Chris Chalberg, Recording Secretary

Visitors: Marilynn Gerloff, 4211 Highland; Nancy McCoy, 6500 Terrace Dr.; Glenn Ludwig, 1307 Turvey Rd.; Joan Mills, 1421 Norfolk; Rachel Naderer, 4343 S. Elm; Lawrence Allen, 702 39th St.; Eileen Moroney, 6541 Hillcrest; Don Eckmann, 1244 Hawthorne Lane; Frank Braman, 6560 Hillcrest Rd.; Jean Braman, 6560 Hillcrest Rd.; Terry Kent, 1411 Palmer St.; Linda Maloney, 6531 Hillcrest Rd.; Thomas R. Kammer, 6540 Terrace Dr.; Sherrie Morrison, 6621 Terrace Dr.; Jay Norco, 6800 Fairview; Bill Kramer, 4705 Montgomery Ave.; Bernard McAndrew, 6550 Terrace; Pete Mensadis, 944 Curtiss; Anadanell Guy, 944 Curtiss; Bob Goste, 6631 Terrace; Jay McArdy, 6550 Dunham Rd.; Judy Sidrys, 5223 Lee Ave.; Dr. Richard Patelski, 5145 Washington; Linda McLaughlin, 2420 College Rd.; Diane L. Berry, 1008 Curtiss

Chairman Johnson informed the commissioners that the meeting was being recorded on Village owned equipment to aid in the preparation of the meeting minutes.

COMMISSIONER WENDT MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 9, 2004 PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION MEETING BE ACCEPTED AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER KREN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Motion carried by voice vote: 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS

File #09-04 North and South High Schools Parking Restriction Adjustments

Chairman Johnson read staff's report as follows:

**Public Works Staff Report
File # 09-04
North and South High Schools Parking Restriction Adjustments**

BACKGROUND

At the request of the Village Council, staff has initiated a survey study to determine the extent of current parking restrictions at both high schools, and to develop a uniform parking restriction for each school. The objective of making parking restrictions uniform is to limit student parking on Village streets, allow more resident use of the streets, and to make Police parking enforcement more efficient. Over the last several years, complaints were also received from residents at both High Schools toward reducing the parking restrictions, so guests and residents are not ticketed in front of their homes.

Historically, there used to be an open campus policy at the high schools, wherein expanded parking regulations were placed to limit excessive student parking on residential Village streets. In addition, parking issues around both high schools apparently were not evaluated as a whole; they appeared to be addressed on a block-by-block basis. That is why so many restrictions are currently in place. With the open campus policy terminated years ago, students are prohibited from leaving the campus, and are required to begin school at 8:00 AM. We are aware that there are less than a dozen late starts throughout the year, when students begin at 10:00 AM.

STUDY

In the vicinity of South High School, staff has conducted a field review and documented a total of 15 different parking restrictions. The streets extend for approximately a ¼ mile section in each direction around the school. In the vicinity of North High School, staff has documented a total of 22 different parking restrictions within the same parameters.

Staff has collected the individual addresses of all the affected residents on each block, where a parking restriction exists. Following that, a two-part resident post card survey was developed to be mailed out to each resident regarding the Village's intent to modify the current parking restrictions. Two choices were stated in an effort to limit the variety of possibilities, and to focus on the volume of students parking on-street, which begins typically before the general 8:00 AM school start. Open ended choices were also not offered, again to focus the parking restriction to a time when it is needed most, and to offer as much on-street parking to residents as possible.

The focus of the parking modifications is upon the residential streets only. The existing parking restrictions on the collector- or arterial-type roadways, such as Dunham Road, Prairie Avenue, Main Street, etc. would not be affected.

Staff mailed out the postcards to affected residents on June 21-23, 2004. The requested return date was June 30, 2004. A total of 2,467 postcards were prepared and mailed out to affected residents. As of July 6, 2004 a total of 836 postcards were returned, for a 36% response rate. The general responses were:

For Alternate A: 8:00 AM to 10:00 AM is 54%, or 454 responses
For Alternate B: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM is 45%, or 382 responses

Staff has had discussions with both South and North High officials regarding the proposed parking modifications. The North High School principal stated that he had no objection to either restriction Alternate A or B being placed. District 99's Superintendent stated that he would also support either option for South High School parking, even though he suggested a different option in his letter to the Village. Staff's focus is to control on-street student parking during the typical (180) days within a school year.

As stated previously, there are late start days at both high schools scheduled throughout the school year. For the 2004-05 year, there are seven (7) such late days, where students begin at 10:00 AM. The District 99 Superintendent also stated that the late arrival program, which started as a pilot program, would likely continue as a permanent program in the future. Staff is also cognizant that during these late start days, neither Alternate A or B would control the on-street student parking.

The study began with the intent of collecting data, processing the information, presenting the findings to the Parking and Traffic Commission, and then to the Village Council, for implementation to coincide with the start of the 2004-05 school year.

During the course of this study, staff has received numerous phone calls, e-mails, and petition letters from residents in response to the proposed parking modifications. These residents generally indicated that either there should be other choices from which to select, or they felt no changes at all should be made to the current restrictions.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not have a specific recommendation at this presentation to the Parking and Traffic Commission. Based on the responses received so far, it appears that further discussion is still needed. Based on tonight's meeting, it is likely that a third alternate may be discussed and be considered by the Commission.

The chairman reminded the public that Parking and Traffic Commission was an advisory body and to receive public input. Copies of the received surveys, petitions and emails, many of which indicated requests for no changes to the present policy, would become part of the public record. **Chairman Johnson** opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Terry Kent, 1411 Palmer, stated the postcards sent out did not reflect the views of his area residents, which was directly south of the high school. His petition pointed out that 98% of the residents did not want to the current restriction to change.

Mr. Frank Braman, 6560 Hillcrest Rd., spoke of his interaction with the students at South High School, his concerns about the safety of children in the area, and explained that the restriction would have many students driving in and out of the area. Should the 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. restriction not pass, Mr. Braman expected to return to the commission and request the commission to mark his streets.

Ms. Marilyn Gerloff, 4241 Highland, said she was before the commission in 1999 due to the increasing vehicles parking in her area. They created a safety hazard and could not allow emergency vehicles down her street. Ms. Gerloff discussed how the Village was very accommodating at that time. She asked to keep the current 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. restriction.

Ms. Rachael Naderer, 4345 Elm was satisfied with the current restrictions.

Ms. Nancy McCoy, 6500 Terrace, a 28-year resident, was happy with the current restriction, but suggested it may be time for students to use the bus. While the residents wanted the congestion to decrease, other means of transportation were not being discussed.

Mr. Gordon McAndrew, 6550 Terrace, mentioned there may have been some confusion regarding the letter he sent to the mayor which was forwarded to this commission. Back in 1999 he and his neighbors were discussing the same issue. After that meeting, a point was made that the residents on Hillcrest, Palmer and Terrace, adjacent to the high school, did not want any change to the ordinance which stated "No Parking 7:00 to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday." He reiterated he and the residents wanted the restriction to remain the same. Should other residents feel the need for a change, he suggested they put a petition through the process. Mr. McAndrew suggested making a recommendation to the Village Council and to staff to stop wasting time on the issue and simply enforce the current ordinance. Additionally, the flow of traffic on Dunham and Norfolk, prior to and after school hours, was very congested and he suggested having an officer direct traffic to be more efficient.

Mr. Jack McArdle, 6550 Dunham Road, agreed enforcement was necessary but other alternatives needed to be discussed than just the two listed on the postcard. He suggested creating a permit system for residents, as used in other suburbs. He briefly commented on the small inconvenience of parking with the current restriction.

Ms. Eileen Moroney, 6541 Hillcrest, agrees with Mr. Kent. The current restrictions were important to have in place and remain.

Mr. Tom Kammer, 6540 Terrace Dr., a 30-year resident has seen everything and believed the streets were not built to handle the congestion and traffic occurring. Putting the restriction in will move the problem to another area. Mr. Kammer and his neighbors were proposing "Option C" on the survey -- to keep the restriction the same.

Ms. Marilyn Gerloff, 4241 Highland, stated that in February 2000 she appeared before the Village Council and read a note to the council regarding the lack of interest by the school district as to where students park and was causing issues with the residents. She believed the school district should meet their parking responsibility just like any other business in the Village. In response, **Chairman Johnson** believed the schools were cooperative but did not have the means to provide the additional parking.

Chairman Johnson explained the initial concern on this matter was the fact there was so many different restrictions in the area. Those restrictions closest to the high school would most likely remain, as well as those special restrictions put in place to accommodate certain situations. He noted the issue of creating a standard restriction for north and south high schools was ongoing over the course of many years. Looking to the map, the chairman noted that the one or two restrictions depicted, represented approximately 85% to 90% of the parking restrictions in the area. Only recently, had the commission begun recommending specific restrictions as a response to the school campuses.

From the input tonight, the phone calls, and the emails received, **Chairman Johnson** believed that most residents did not want a change in the restriction and suggested not to recommend a blanket change at this time. Additional signage costs, manpower and ordinances would have to move forward. **Commissioner Thurston** agreed no change was necessary at either high school but the commission should take into account the local streets in the neighborhood as they relate to the hours being restricted. Resident support evidenced that no change in the restrictions was necessary.

Asked whether the police department had any issues with the enforcement of the restrictions, **Mr. Sembach** stated the police department did not have any issues with the current restrictions and regularly patrolled the area. Restrictions on Havens Court and Birch would be enforced when residents called to complain. For the record, **Chairman Johnson** stated that when residents need to have additional parking for guests, etc. a Village provision exists for those residents to contact the police department to inform them of the function or special parking needs.

Ms. Nancy McCoy inquired if staff visited the South High area, wherein, **Mr. Fera**, who conveyed he lived in the area, said yes, and a traffic flow adjustment was made for southbound Dunham to drop off students on school grounds rather than on the street.

As to the permit system for Springside Ave., **Chairman Johnson** said the system was tried as an attempt to eliminate a specific problem in the area, but to date, all the permits had not been sold. Additionally, the Village Council was not eager to use the permitting system again due to administration issues, counterfeiting, etc.

Mr. Bernard McAndrew believed the decrease in parked cars on Springside was due to the church at 63rd and Dunham selling parking permits to students. The lot was consistently filled. As to what the permits cost, **Mr. Fera** believed the church was charging a similar rate as the Village but the general location of the lot was much closer to the school. **Mr. McAndrew** asked that this commission vote favorably on the current ordinances and move it to the Village Council.

Mr. Terry Kent clarified that it was the residents that should be allowed the permits to park on the street and not the students.

Commissioner Stapleton voiced some of the issues the school district ran into years ago, including when the subdivision was initially being built. South High requested that Norfolk connect to Springside but the Village turned it down. The district also requested to purchase land where the existing park was, but it was also turned down. Another time, the residents requested an exit off of the property onto 63rd Street, but the County turned the request down.

Mr. Jack McArdle asked when the above requests were made and at what point do the residents bring their petitions in. He agreed the traffic issue had to be resolved.

Discussion followed that the request was made back in 1969-1970 to have Norfolk extend but was turned down. Somewhere from 1972 to 1974, the high school request was made to move out onto 63rd. **Chairman Johnson** recalled that the request may have been brought up again due to the recent Village construction. As to extending Norfolk, the issue was brought up about 10 years to 15 years ago when there was general discussion of restrictions around the high school, but the school did not want it.

Mr. McArdle asked what the position was of the Parking and Traffic Commission on this matter and whether the commission had discussed relief for the high school areas. **Chairman Johnson** stated the commission had not formally reviewed the matter other than when staff suggested introducing permit parking on Springside. There had been discussion with the school district and park district about using some of their land for some parking relief, since some of the park land was not being used. To date, the commission was not looking at any particular relief scenarios.

Mr. Frank Braman, 6560 Hillcrest, recalled that a pool was proposed at Powers Park but the residents opposed it. He believed the same would occur if the Village tried to expand parking in Powers Park due to the activities that go on there. He believed the problem was a school problem and not a resident problem. **Chairman Johnson** agreed but also stated the school was an intricate part of the community.

COMMISSIONER WENDT MOVED THAT THE NORTH AND SOUTH HIGH PARKING RESTRICTIONS BE RECOMMENDED TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL AND TO LEAVE THE CURRENT RESTRICTIONS IN PLACE.

COMMISSIONER KREN SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Roll call: AYE: Carlquist, Kren, Stapleton, Thurston, Wendt, Yeksigian,
Chairman Johnson
NAY: None**

Motion carried: Vote: 7-0

File #10-04 Re-Striping of Washington Street and Curtiss Street for Parking Deck
Chairman Johnson read staff's report.

**Public Works Staff Report
File # 10-04
Re-Striping of Washington and Curtiss Streets for Parking Deck**

BACKGROUND

Staff has initiated this geometric and operational change on both of these roadways, in accordance with the plans prepared for the Parking Deck (Deck). The Deck will have two primary vehicular entrances; one on Washington Street just south of Curtiss Street, and the second on Curtiss Street about halfway between Curtiss Street and Main Street. Each of the entrances is proposed to be two-lane, two-way, with one lane inbound and one lane outbound from the Deck.

STUDY

Staff has conducted a field review of the proposed locations for these exclusive turn lanes, to determine operational and other associated impacts.

The Deck is proposed to contain 762 parking spaces. With only two main entrances the peak hours of operation are likely to cause added traffic flow to the area. It is anticipated that with the provision of exclusive turn lanes into the Deck, the on-street congestion can be minimized. It is difficult to say what the overall traffic impacts will be, but staff will be monitoring ingress/egress activity at the Deck on a periodic basis.

Washington Street Deck Entrance

Washington Street is 40 feet wide curb-to-curb, with on-street parallel parking along both sides. With a proposed exclusive northbound left turn lane into the Deck, the on-street parking will be removed from the Deck driveway south to Maple Avenue. The on-street parking spaces north of the Deck driveway would remain. The resulting street cross-section would consist of one through lane, one northbound left turn lane, and one northbound through lane, to make up the 40 feet width.

A total of 18 on-street designated parking spaces would be lost with the installation of this northbound exclusive left turn lane into the Deck. Of that total, 14 of those are 9-hour meter spaces, which are commuter spaces that will be transferred to the Deck. The remaining 4 spaces are 2-Hr. spaces.

Curtiss Street Deck Entrance

Curtiss Street is also 40 feet wide curb-to-curb, with on-street diagonal parking on the north side, and parallel parking on the south side. This section of Curtiss Street is within a 2-Hour parking restriction. With a proposed exclusive eastbound right turn lane into the Deck, on-street parking on the south side will be removed, from the alley to the Deck entrance. All the 16 diagonal on-street parking spaces along the north side of Curtiss Street would remain. The resulting street cross-section would consist of one diagonal parking lane, one eastbound through lane, and one eastbound right turn lane, to make up the 40 feet width. The 4-inch white stripe adjacent to the diagonal parking spaces will be removed, to make room for the two eastbound driving lanes.

Approximately 2 to 3 on-street parking spaces along the south side of Curtiss Street would be lost, with the installation of the eastbound right turn lane.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Parking and Traffic Commission forward a positive recommendation to Village Council, subject to field verification of engineering measurements, and adherence to MUTCD standards, to implement the following:

INSTALL ONE EXCLUSIVE NORTHBOUND LEFT TURN LANE ON WASHINGTON STREET, BETWEEN CURTISS STREET AND MAPLE AVENUE, TO SERVE THE EAST ENTRANCE TO THE PARKING DECK;

INSTALL ONE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TURN LANE ON CURTISS STREET, BETWEEN WASHINGTON STREET AND MAIN STREET, TO SERVE THE NORTH ENTRANCE TO THE PARKING DECK.

Chairman Johnson asked whether it would be necessary to remove the parking on the east side of Washington when nearing Maple to accommodate the 40 feet width, wherein **Mr. Fera** indicated a couple of the spaces may be saved but not until a full engineering plan was developed. For informational purposes, the turn lanes on both Curtiss Street and Washington Avenue were proposed by deck consultant Desmond Associates, and staff was trying to accommodate that plan. As to creating a turn lane on Curtiss, staff would need to determine whether it is necessary after monitoring any backup traffic but also believed a turn lane of some sort would be necessary in the future.

Chairman Johnson discussed that the entrance area to the deck could become very congested but staff and the commission would not know until the deck was built.

Staff could not estimate the number of stacked cars in the turn lanes but did estimate that typically a car takes up to 20 to 25 feet. In the straight portion of the turn lane, staff estimated 6 to 8 cars could stack up. **Mr. Fera** reminded commissioners that the car movement would be monitored and re-striping refinements if needed could be done later.

Mr. Stapleton expressed concern about the Curtiss Street turn lane and the location of the mailboxes, wherein **Mr. Fera** indicated the matter will be reviewed again.

Chairman Johnson opened the meeting to the public.

Dr. Richard Patelski, 5145 Washington, is located across from the Washington Street egress/egress and foresees that people will be parking in the Curtiss turn lane to pick up pizzas from Angelo's Pizza. He agreed the mail boxes should be relocated. He has been in his building for 13 years and suggested installing a right-turn only exit onto Washington due to the difficulty of maneuvering left during the rush hour. **Chairman Johnson** agreed, stating the matter may be self-correcting.

Ms. Linda McLaughlin works in an office on Curtiss Street and asked the commission to consider the heavy use of the loading zone in front of the Chamber of Commerce office by the large trucks. As to making a left turn onto Washington Street at 3:00 p.m., she agreed with Dr. Patelski's suggestion of a right-turn only out of the deck. **Mr. Millette** responded that there was a loading zone behind Joyce Aller's building which would serve the businesses located at that corner and would accommodate the larger delivery trucks, even if the parking on Curtiss returned.

Asked whether there was consideration for restricting left turns onto Washington, **Mr. Millette** believed it was a common sense approach and drivers would not want to fight traffic during peak hours but offered to review the matter with peak hours in mind.

Again, **Mr. Fera** confirmed that parking on the east side of Washington, from the deck entrance to the south would be removed. From the deck entrance to the north, preserving parking on both sides of Washington Street would be attempted. **Mr.**

Millette indicated that within the Deck grounds, diagonal parking spaces with 4-hour restrictions were proposed. These spaces which would be facing the bank's drive-through.

Mr. Carlquist inquired as to why the turn lanes, etc were not in the initial plans, wherein **Mr. Millette** indicated they were in the concept plan but were not included in the bid for the construction. Additionally, Washington was the last phase of the project and offered physical barrier opportunities if warranted. **Mr. Fera** suggested that staff return with a more detailed plan of the deck with turn lanes, etc.

Mr. Wendt asked whether staff could take immediate action if a correction was necessary; staff concurred. He also asked to discuss the no left turn onto Washington issue. Mr. Barber agreed it was a suggestion but preferred to return with better drawings and review the matter more, possibly having a time restriction for it versus adding a concrete island. **Mr. Barber** offered to bring back the information next month, possibly with a recommendation.

Chairman Johnson inquired whether two exit lanes onto Washington Street could be provided, i.e., one left and one right. **Mr. Barber** stated it was set up that way, but again, he asked to return next month with the entire packet of information.

Per **Mr. Carlquist's** question regarding sufficient striping on eastbound Curtiss, staff felt the striping was sufficient versus a separate median and the police department could offer some observations. **Mr. Barber** explained that at some point the Village may want to change the striping on Curtiss, but only after traffic counts were done and after the deck was done. He pointed out how traffic flow could be altered just with the new development occurring in the area.

Regarding Washington Street, **Mr. Yeksigian** asked staff to mention in its report that the off-street parking along the deck would replace the on-street parking, with the 4-hour restriction, as discussed.

The discussion then turned to the issue of parking on Montgomery near Chicago Avenue. **Chairman Johnson** indicated his concern of the residents not being notified.

Mr. Bill Kramer, 4705 Montgomery, said he was seeing students parking on Montgomery and many other streets, and it was a nuisance. Trash was around, emergency vehicles had difficulty maneuvering and small children lived in the area. It was the reason why he was seeking a parking restriction in the first place and believed few residences would be affected by it. Only one resident did not sign the petition and that same resident appeared at last month's meeting. Mr. Kramer explained that resident's concern was to make the restriction as minimal as possible, i.e., 1 or 2 hours, in order not to inconvenience anyone. **Mr. Kramer** suggested trying a small restriction first initially to see what occurs, but to have the restriction in place by the start of the new school year.

Discussion followed on what other restrictions existed in the area and the fact that the affected residents were not invited. **Chairman Johnson** suggested inviting residents from the Chicago and Montgomery Avenues area and to place this item on the August agenda. **Mr. Fera** stated Commission meeting agendas are not official until the agenda is printed in the paper and residents receive a letter inviting them to the meeting. He agreed to send out the mailings for next month's meeting and explained what other topics will be on next month's agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

File #08-04 Review of Sidewalk Program (continued - time permitting)

Chairman Johnson indicated the sidewalk program was not going to be discussed in detail tonight. Instead, **Mr. Barber** provided an update. To date, very good bids were received on the sidewalk program. Eleven of the 12 projects were awarded. Six segments on the matrix would be completed for this year with construction to begin in the fall. Recalling an earlier issue with the rebuild projects, where the developer has contributed no costs to the matrix, under the current program when the sidewalk is rebuilt, there is no obligation to pay a sidewalk fee. Commissioner Tully and several other commissioners have asked that staff bring forward the change to the code and therefore, **Mr. Barber** was working on that revision in order to close the gap and not lose any more money.

While he is only responsible to bring forward the matrix priority list under the code once a year, **Mr. Barber** explained he would like build more items into the matrix. He suggested postponing the matrix discussion until the September meeting in order for the commissioners to catch up with their regular agenda. However, he asked commissioners to provide any input before the next meeting. Commissioners agreed to discuss the matrix topic in September.

Per **Mr. Yeksigian's** question regarding a bond issue and the elimination of the matrix, **Mr. Barber** stated there was no further discussion on that matter. As to those areas that did not want a sidewalk and whether it could be a factor in the matrix, **Mr. Barber** explained it could not for the current time but that other alternatives could be looked at, such as gravel paths.

Mr. Gary Walgren, 5235 Brookbank, President of the Dunburn Woods Homeowner's Association, stated there was mention of an appeals process in initial documents. **Mr. Barber** indicated that currently the appeals process was to go before the Planning Commission; however, the appeal may want to return to the Parking and Transportation Commission.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Johnson announced the Village's new formation of the Transportation Advisory Commission. At the request of **Chairman Johnson**, **Commissioner Yeksigian** has agreed and will be representing this commission by attending the Transportation Advisory Commission to keep this commission informed. Lastly, **Mr. Barber** asked for clarification on where to send specific issues so that the correct committee reviews the issues.

ADJOURN

COMMISSIONER KREN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. COMMISSIONER YEKSIGIAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Motion carried. 7-0

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
(as transcribed by tape)

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt, Recording Secretary