

Approved February 8, 2006

**PARKING & TRAFFIC COMMISSION**

Minutes of Public Hearing  
October 12, 2005

Downers Grove Public Works Facility  
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Johnson called the October 12, 2005 meeting of the Parking and Traffic Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Commissioners Kren, Stapleton, Thurston, Wendt, Chairman Johnson

Absent Commissioners Carlquist, Yeksigian

Staff Present: Mr. Dorin Fera, Traffic Manager; Mr. Mike Millette, Asst. Dir. Public Works/Engineering and Recording Secretary Megan Dugard

Visitors: Ms. Regina Demias, 1142 Mistwood Lane; Mr. Don Sulzer, 1052 Braemoor Dr.; Mr. Dan Romito, 1047 Braemoor Dr.; D. Masarik, 5605 Katrine; Mr. Peter With and Ms. Lisa Grant, 2745 College Rd.; J. Myczek, 5714 Chase; J. Agne, 5714 Chase; Kevin Luke, 5702 Katrine; David and Susan Schloch, 5805 Chase; Mr. Michael Morris, 2517 College Rd.; Pat Pitzbach, 5840 Katrine; Ms. Elaine Nepereny, 5615 Katrine; I. Nedas, 5875 Katrine; Mr. Roger Testi, 5641 Elinor; Dr. Richard Patelski, 5145 Washington; Mr. Tom Barrett, 5403 Washington; Mr. Daniel Bogue, 5418, Washington; Mr. Todd McDaniel, 2220 Haddow Ave.; Mr. Michael Michaud, 5844 Katrine; Ms. Lynn Goodsell, 2605 College Rd.; and Ms. Sandi Murray, 5258 Washington.

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

**APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2005 MINUTES**

**COMMISSIONER WENDT MOVED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2005 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER KREN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**File #24-05 College Avenue, Katrine Avenue to Walnut Avenue - Safety Investigations.** **Chairman Johnson** indicated the Village received two petitions on this matter regarding speeding traffic. Of particular note was the fact that part of the area was not in the Village's jurisdiction.

**Mr. Fera** confirmed that two requests were made. The first was a request for a safety-type intersection analysis for stop signs and the second request was for a traffic calming consideration. After visiting the site a number of times, **Mr. Fera** said the intersection did not qualify for a four-way stop sign due to insufficient vehicular volumes. However, the intersection was one of the first intersections that qualified for Phase I traffic calming interventions, which are interventions to change driver behavior. He agreed the area had no sidewalks and the route

was very popular for drivers. Because College Avenue east of Katrine was not in the village's jurisdiction, any intervention requested for that section would have to be coordinated with Lisle Township. **Mr. Fera** explained traffic calming interventions worked on a two-year cycle whereby a review followed after the first year. Should the area not improve after the first year, during the second year Phase II calming designs may be applied which include physical changes made to the roadway.

**Chairman Johnson** proceeded to explain the criteria that must be met to warrant stop signs, noting that the traffic volume and the nature of the subject intersection did not qualify for four-way stop signage. He clarified that stop signs were not to be used to control traffic speed but were used to determine who has the right of way.

**Chairman Johnson** opened up the meeting to the public:

**Mr. Kevin Luke**, 5702 Katrine, stated he was the person who submitted the two petitions. He expressed concerns about safety, speeding traffic, and children and pedestrian safety. The stop signs at Elinor were ignored. He recommended installing something to calm the traffic because what was currently posted was not working. He stated many of the traffic problems stemmed from the Bristol Club and the commuters. The road was a main thoroughfare for both. Per Chairman Johnson's question, the main issues were on College Avenue.

**Ms. Jane Myczek**, 5714 Chase, lives in the unincorporated area under discussion but confirmed that traffic begins to speed starting at 59<sup>th</sup> and Chase. DuPage County sheriffs have sat in her driveway to issue tickets which have been about three cars every 15 minutes.

**Mr. Jeff Agne**, 5714 Chase, believed the street was used as thoroughfare and cut-through area since he used to cut through the area too. Many speeding issues were on Walnut and many homeowners there parked their cars on their driveways to block their children from getting hit.

**Mr. Mike Morris**, 2517 College has videotaped the intersection of Elinor and College and no one stops. He confirmed that the corner was not under Village jurisdiction but it was typical of the problem. He expressed concern that if an intervention was installed, who was responsible for the enforcement -- the village or the county? He believed the coordination of sidewalk installation for both the county and village would probably not occur. He believed many of the Phase I interventions would be ineffective unless there was enforcement. He believed drivers wanted to avoid the stop lights in the area. He believed that the problem would cease if the drivers from the Bristol Club would use Walnut as opposed to College, and, waiting to see the results of the Phase I intervention after one year was too long.

**Chairman Johnson** explained that the one-year waiting period had to do with engineering studies that needed to take place. Getting enforcement to the area was difficult due to the two jurisdictions. He agreed the matter would be difficult.

As a heads up, **Mr. Morris** stated he would be speaking to the village and township on this matter.

**Ms. Susan Schock**, 5805 Chase, expressed concern about the additional traffic that would result from the Woodridge's completion of 59<sup>th</sup> Street from Elinor to Walnut as well as a housing development south of that area. Interventions had to be in place prior to those projects.

Per Chairman Johnson's question, **Mr. Millette** recalled the housing project would begin in the spring.

**Mr. Roger Teste**, 5641 Elinor, noted that 56 townhomes were under construction on Elinor which would result in those residents using the same traffic routes and creating more traffic.

**Mr. Mike Morris**, 2517 College, stated that when 59<sup>th</sup> Street is completed, it will not deter drivers from driving down College.

**Mr. Kevin Luke**, 5702 Katrine, suggested installing a speed hump just past his driveway and one where the old section of College met the new section of College to slow down traffic.

**Mr. Fera** proceeded to discuss how the Village's traffic intervention program initially began back in 2002, with many refinements until it was adopted in 2005, and was based on what other cities and communities were doing over the past 20 to 30 years. He emphasized that whatever traffic intervention was proposed, it should be the least disruptive for everyone involved and could be used as a model for future intervention requests.

At this point Chairman Johnson recommended that staff work on the ideas suggested and provide additional field work and then revisit the matter on a future agenda.

**Mr. Jeff Agne**, 5714 Chase, discussed his understanding of speed humps and the advances of them to date, noting they were less intrusive and provided better effectiveness.

**Mr. Kren** raised conversation about no sidewalks in the area and did not know whether the area would fall under the Village's sidewalk matrix.

**Ms. Jane Myczek**, 5714 Chase, asked if there would be a real effort to work together between the township and the Village, wherein Chairman Johnson surmised it would be difficult between the two agencies. He suggested that she wait to see what the village does.

In closing, Chairman Johnson thanked the residents for their input, believing it was a step in the right direction and asked for their patience.

**File #26-05 Mistwood Association - Proposed Posting 20 MPH Speed Limit.** Chairman Johnson stated his only concern on this matter was whether the 20 MPH speed limit would set a precedent, wherein **Mr. Fera** clarified that there were other streets in the village already with 20 MPH limits.

**Mr. Donald Sulzer**, 1052 Braemoor Drive, representing the Mistwood Condominium Association, stated his request was to actually recommend 15 MPH posted at the entrance of the subdivision and not 20 MPH due to the increase in volume of outside traffic which included delivery trucks, visitors, etc. that were speeding through the area.

**Chairman Johnson** proceed to explain to the residents how the 85% percentile figures worked for calculating speed. He reiterated his concerns about the 15 MPH being artificially low and possibly causing other traffic problems.

**Mr. Fera** explained there was no 15 MPH category except for alley ways. However, to install 20 MPH signage would provide motorists with an expected speed limit. He believed it was a good starting point. While no traffic studies were done in the area, **Mr. Fera** said his staff could provide traffic counts once the signage was installed and report back to this commission.

**Ms. Regina Demias**, 1142 Mistwood Lane, discussed how the sloping terrain of her subdivision affected a vehicle's speed and the fact that visitors were not aware of it and ended up speeding. Having a 15 MPH speed limit would bring an awareness to visitors in the area.

**Mr. Dan Romito**, 1047 Braemoor Drive, believed a key factor was that drivers tended to keep a higher than average speed going through the subdivision when they came off of Highland. The signage would act as a reminder for the area.

**Chairman Johnson** supported the 20 MPH limit versus a 15 MPH limit and agreed Mistwood was a unique subdivision due to the curvature of its streets and its terrain.

A Mistwood board member discussed the increased traffic coming to the area and agreed that some sort of signage would act as a reminder for the drivers. He referred to the Commission's judgment as to the specific speed limit but was open to the 20 MPH signage.

**COMMISSIONER WENDT MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL TO POST A "SPEED LIMIT SIGN OF 20 MPH" ON MISTWOOD LANE, MISTWOOD COURT AND BRAEMOOR DRIVE, PER STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER THURSTON. ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: STAPLETON, THURSTON, WENDT, KREN, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON**  
**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0**

**File #27-05 Haddow Avenue (Puffer School), Belmont Road to Chase Avenue - Proposed Parking Modifications.** **Chairman Johnson** expressed concern about staff's proposed parking modification request on Haddow adjacent to Puffer School property, specifically having a No Parking between 8AM and 9AM and 2PM and 3PM sign with additional signage that states Drop-Off/Pick-up Zone and whether it would have a desired effect. He also asked as to what constitutes parking in the zone. **Mr. Fera** explained that staff was trying to duplicate what was being done at Hillcrest School. He agreed there was confusion among the parents as to what constitutes "parking" versus just dropping off kids. **Mr. Fera** stated that at some point he and the police department would have to refine the ordinance to reflect and state what parents could and could not do during a suggested time span.

**Mr. Todd McDaniel**, Principal of Puffer School, 2220 Haddow, stated that if it was not possible to make the north side of Haddow a Pick-up/Drop-off zone, he was fine with it. However, he was hoping that the Village would allow parking at that location at the end of the day since it was needed. Otherwise, parents were parking in areas where they were not supposed to and creating blind spots for the children. Having the parking spaces on the north side of Haddow would alleviate some of those blind spots by having those parents park on Haddow.

**Mr. Fera** indicated that the request being asked was not in the ordinance. However, if the parking restrictions were removed but the Drop-off/Pick-up Zone was created, he asked **Mr. McDaniel** whether the parents would comply.

**Mr. McDaniel** stated that he liked parents to actually drop their children off in the parking lot on school property rather than drop them at the street. A drop off zone there would probably create a more dangerous zone for the students. **Mr. McDaniel** then proceeded to explain the current drop off/pickup procedures.

Discussion followed on whether these issues were taken up by the school's parent/teacher association, wherein **Mr. McDaniel** indicated the PTA parents were not causing the problem. **Mr. McDaniel** indicated he has tried to talk to the parents when outside. **Mr. Fera** confirmed with **Mr. McDaniel** that the issue then was with the afternoon pick-ups. **Mr. Fera** suggested that the Village remove the existing No Parking, Stopping or Standing sign and let the area be unsigned and that the section between the circular drive be kept No Parking, Stopping or Standing due to the existing crosswalk. Conversation was raised on whether the commission was opening up the opportunity for commuters or staff to park there all day. Other ideas were discussed, such as having four-hour parking restrictions to keep the commuters out. Adjoining streets on Chase and Puffer were also posted with 4-hour restrictions and the restrictions would be consistent. The commissioners agreed to use the 4-hour parking restriction.

**COMMISSIONER STAPLETON MADE A MOTION TO INSTALL 4-HOUR PARKING SIGNAGE BETWEEN THE HOURS 6:00 AM TO 6:00 PM FROM BELMONT ROAD TO THE EAST ENTRANCE OF CIRCLE DRIVE AND TO PUFFER SCHOOL ON THE NORTH SIDE OF HADDOW STREET. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WENDT. ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: STAPLETON, THURSTON, WENDT, KREN, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON**  
**NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0**

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**File #03-04 Washington Street Striping, Maple Avenue to 55<sup>th</sup> Street (Update).** **Mr. Fera** recalled that this item was discussed at the February 2004 Parking and Traffic Commission meeting. To date, some of the residents questioned the validity of the striping. New data was collected on Maple with **Mr. Fera** explaining that Washington Street was not a local street but was a collector street with 2,000 to 3,000 vehicles per day in a 24-hour period. According to the rules of the MUTCD, he stated the village is required to install pavement markings for traffic control. Per staff, nothing was wrong with its application. He further stated that under the Illinois Vehicle Code and the MUTCD, drivers can cross over the yellow double-center line to avoid an object. Because of the narrowness of Washington, the fact that Washington has four-hour parking restrictions, vehicles have difficulty driving down the street. Staff indicated the street was working fine and staff was not recommending any changes. **Mr. Fera** recalled that one of the staff's prior proposals was to change one side of the street to restricted parking. However, the Commission did not support that action.

**Chairman Johnson** opened the meeting to the public:

**Mr. Tom Barrett**, 5423 Washington Street, in viewing the Rules of the Road booklet, stated that solid double-yellow lines were used "where there are four or more lanes of traffic moving in opposite lanes of direction" which was the thought-process of many drivers. The double-line was confusing and he wanted it changed because it caused most drivers to feel they did not have to make room for opposite traffic because no obstacle existed on their side of the street.

**Mr. Dan Bogue**, 5418 Washington, has resided in the area for 20 years and discussed that drivers are very territorial during rush hour due to the double-line and defend their side. The street has room for only three cars across and not four. He said just this past summer his car was rear-ended due to the yellow line. He stated the residents opted for not having parking restrictions on the street because it was a residential area and the parked cars controlled the speed of the traffic to the residents' satisfaction. In years prior there was no issue.

**Ms. Sandi Murray**, 5258 Washington, lives in the section where parking is only on one side of the street, near the church. She said she and her neighbors were upset that a double-yellow line suddenly appeared on the street. She explained what she and her neighbors were told at that meeting, i.e., it was a traffic calming measure for traffic. Those residents that did attend the February 2004 meeting were told that they could cross the double-yellow line but she believed that the residents who did not attend the meeting were not aware of that. She stated that because the residents did not want the double line, they were told it would be considered for removal. However, it was not removed and now she and her fellow residents were called for this meeting. **Chairman Johnson** stated the engineers saw the double-yellow line as causing people to think and become more aware that something different was going on and believed the street was safer because of the striping.

**Mr. Dan Bogue** disagreed and believed that when no cars were parked, cars drove like they were on 55<sup>th</sup> Street. When cars were parked, the traffic slowed down, but yet drivers were territorial about the line.

**Dr. Richard Patelski**, 5145 Washington, also resides at 5909 Langham. He stated that he drives the street numerous time and the first time he saw the yellow lines he thought it made no sense. There was no affect on the traffic.

**Mr. Tom Barrett**, 5423 Washington Street, asked if the Rules of the Road discussed whether a vehicle could cross a double line, wherein **Chairman Johnson** indicated it did.

**Mr. Wendt** inquired about the costs associated with removing the striping. He suggested to consider the residents' suggestions of removing it and monitoring the area for accidents.

**Ms. Sandi Murray** emphasized that just because her neighbors were not attending, did not mean they did not care. She discussed that the communication was poor and the neighbors were not given a chance to state their opinion initially.

**Chairman Johnson** indicated the matter came up because some residents requested the matter to be discussed. However, the striping of collector streets arose approximately three years ago from the Public Works Department. **Mr. Fera** indicated that the interventions came as a result of traffic control that are not provided in the ordinance. Staff focused on getting the striping issue in front of the commission and to allow the public to hear what was coming. **Mr. Fera** could not support the removal of a yellow double-line due to the fact that staff carefully reviewed the issue and he did not want to begin precedent-setting among the public because they did not have the information and data. He further reviewed upcoming interventions planned for Maple and Washington Streets, noting that if the interventions did not take place according to State statute, the Village would expose itself to liability issues. He understood that the traffic interventions would not be accepted by everyone entirely.

**Mr. Thurston** asked whether the line could be a dotted white line, wherein **Mr. Fera** explained the double-yellow line was a Village policy and was installed to discourage passing due to other roadway issues which exist. **Mr. Stapleton** suggested removing the parking in the area since it was a short distance. However, the residents indicated it was for two long blocks.

**Ms. Sandi Murray** recalled at the last meeting the car count on Washington was 3,000 and the issue was with the narrowness of the street, whereas, Prairie Avenue was four vehicles wide. She also raised discussion about a signalized light at 55<sup>th</sup> Street and a parking structure.

**Mr. Dan Bogue**, explained the different traffic patterns for the area, including commuters in the morning and evening; Friday night traffic in the summer; and the heavier traffic for special events. The traffic was no different one block over. The residents understood the traffic. He believed if the parking was removed, the residents would raise issues with the commission.

**Mr. Tom Barrett**, 5423 Washington, believed the lines on the street gave traffic the license to travel faster, which was not the case. The road became a collector by the way of how it gets used. By having the double-yellow line, he has not seen or heard how it has improved the situation. He believed the residents wanted it removed and he asked it to be considered.

**Chairman Johnson** did not personally support the double-yellow line, yet believed it made Washington Street safer in the sense that drivers were more cautious. He recommended staff getting more information on how and when the policy was implemented and get some additional engineering opinions. Dialog continued on whether any liability issues would exist if the striping was removed after having it installed. The commissioners agreed to postpone this matter. **Chairman Johnson** left it up to staff to report back on a date certain and thanked the residents for their input and indicated they would receive notification on this matter again.

**File #02-05 CBD Parking Re-Assignments - Overnight Parking (Update).** **Chairman Johnson** briefly reminded the commissioners on the background of this matter and whether the Village was to continue to be in the business of providing overnight parking for its residents. **Mr. Fera** reminded that staff was directed to differentiate between commuter overnight parking and resident overnight parking, understanding that overnight parking for residents was to be done temporarily until the end of the year. Commuter overnight parking would be available in Lot G with 12 overnight free parking spaces available. Per staff, the Central Downtown Business District, which does not address overnight parking, may need to be addressed in the future. Currently, staff's focus was to provide as much information about the availability of other parking lots and to forward it to the Downtown Management Association and the Chamber of Commerce. Those two agencies would communicate the information to new residents.

**Mr. Fera** reported that the prior list of private entities who expressed interest in providing parking spaces ended up not being able to provide them except for the First Presbyterian Church on Fairview. The only other available lot was the SBC lot off Forest Avenue.

**Dr. Patelski**, 5145 Washington, said he found out two days ago that the parking spaces north of the entrance to the parking deck were not 4-hour parking spaces but were instead the new Lot R spaces which required permits. He agreed the spaces were being under utilized. However, in constructing the parking lot, he estimated about 12 spaces were removed from Washington Street. He believed some of those spaces should have been 4-hour parking with the rest being Lot R. He explained the difficulty that some of his senior patients experience in parking in his lot. **Chairman Johnson** indicated the spaces would be temporary and would end at the end of December 2005.

**Mr. Fera** clarified that 17 spaces currently existed but were not always full at the same time. He also called attention to the fact that the parking deck had 4-hour parking and could be converted, if desired by the commission.

**Dr. Richard Patelski** suggested making 2 of the 17 spaces to 4-hour parking right up against Washington and that in the future the commission would eventually have to make the temporary parking into permanent parking. **Chairman Johnson** suggested that staff follow-up with the permits and to see if two spaces could be reserved temporarily for 4-hour parking in Lot R for

daytime use. Staff recalled that Washington was converted to 3-hour parking and thought it was enough spaces for the doctor. Wherein, **Dr. Patelski** said the spaces on Washington were always full. Staff would follow up with the permit issuance matter.

**Mr. Kren** expressed concern as to where the new apartment dwellers and businesses would park once the Curtiss block was under development, wherein it was explained that they would be parking underneath their building. **Mr. Kren** believed better communication was in order.

**File #25-05 Lee Avenue, South of Ogden Avenue - Proposed Parking Modifications.** The matter was straight-forward. Staff noted a typographical error in the recommendation.

**COMMISSIONER THURSTON MOVED TO INSTALL A NO PARKING RESTRICTION FROM 7AM TO 4PM EXCEPT SUNDAYS AND HOLIDAYS ON THE EAST SIDE OF LEE AVENUE FROM A POINT 210 FEET SOUTH OF OGDEN AVENUE TO GLEN AVENUE AND REMOVE THE NO PARKING SIGN FROM THE WEST SIDE FROM OGDEN TO WHERE THE ROAD NARROWS TO 24 FEET. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WENDT. ROLL CALL:**

**AYES: STAPLETON, THURSTON, WENDT, KREN, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON  
NAYS: NONE**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0**

**File #19-05 Paving Village Right-of-Way for Institutional/Recreational Use Discussion (Update).** Due to the late hour, **Mr. Fera** asked the commissioners to review the report. **Mr. Millette** asked the commissioners to contact him with their input. Some added language was suggested as it relates to "federal" and "state" references.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Mr. Millette** provided a status on the parking design for Doerhoefer Park, noting the park district will provide the internal improvements to the park. However, the park district has asked the Village to consider resurfacing options. On another matter, sidewalks were being installed on Gilbert Avenue.

#### **ADJOURN**

**COMMISSIONER KREN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. COMMISSIONER WENDT SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
(as transcribed by tape)

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