

**VILLAGE OF OAK PARK  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2020 - 7:00 PM**

***SPECIAL NOTE*** - The Village President has determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation. It is not feasible to have a person present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation. A special meeting is being conducted remotely with live audio available and optional video. The meeting will be streamed live and archived online for on-demand viewing at [www.oak-park.us/commissiontv](http://www.oak-park.us/commissiontv) as well as cablecast on VOP-TV, which is available to Comcast subscribers on channel 6 and ATT Uverse subscribers on channel 99. Remote meetings of Oak Park Citizen Commissions are authorized pursuant to Section 6 of Governor J.B. Pritzker's Executive Order 2020-07, with limitations. Governor Pritzker's Executive Order allows for remote participation meetings by public bodies, but public bodies are "encouraged to postpone" meetings and should only hold meetings when "necessary." Executive Order No. 2020-07 (COVID-19 Executive Order No. 5) at Section 6. The Illinois Attorney General issued "Guidance to Public Bodies" regarding the Governor's Executive Order on April 9, 2020. In that guidance, the Attorney General states, "Where a public body does not have critical issues that must be addressed because time is of the essence, cancelling or postponing public meetings may be prudent during the COVID-19 outbreak, rather than holding meetings that could pose a risk of danger to the public." Thus, the test as to whether to hold a meeting is an issue to be discussed is "critical" that must be addressed immediately.

***PUBLIC COMMENT*** - Oak Park Citizen Commissions welcome your statement to be read into the public record at a meeting. Public statements of up to three minutes will be read into the record during Non-Agenda public comment or Agenda Item public comment, as an individual designates. Statements will be provided to the Commission members in their entirety as a single document. Please follow the instructions for submitting a statement provided below. Questions regarding public comment can be directed to (708) 358-5672 or email [clerk@oak-park.us](mailto:clerk@oak-park.us).

Non-Agenda public comment is a time set aside at the beginning of each Citizen Commission meeting for public statements about an issue or concern that is not on that meeting's agenda. Individuals are asked to email statements to [transportation@oak-park.us](mailto:transportation@oak-park.us) to be received no later than 60 minutes (6:00 PM) prior to the start of the meeting. If email is not an option, you can drop comments off in the Oak Park Payment Drop Box

---

Please call (708) 358-5724 if you are unable to attend

Get the latest Village news via e-mail. Just go to [www.oak-park.us](http://www.oak-park.us) and click on the e-news icon to sign up.

Also, follow us on *facebook*, *twitter* and *YouTube*.

If you require assistance to participate in any Village program or activity, contact the ADA Coordinator at (708) 358-5430 or e-mail [building@oak-park.us](mailto:building@oak-park.us) at least 48 hours before the scheduled activity.

across from the entrance to Village Hall, 123 Madison Street, to be received no later than 5 PM on the day of the Commission meeting. Agenda item public comment will be limited to 30 minutes with a limit of three minutes per statement. If comment requests exceed 30 minutes, public comment will resume after the items listed under the agenda are complete.

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Non-Agenda Public Comment - Up To 15 Minutes
3. Agenda Approval
4. Approval of Draft Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes
  - 4.1 October 13, 2020 draft Transportation Commission meeting minutes
5. STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING OVERNIGHT PARKING OPTIONS
  - 5.1 Staff Agenda Item Commentary
  - 5.2 Public Testimony
  - 5.3 Staff Recommendations
  - 5.4 Maps of Existing and Proposed Overnight Permit Parking Zones
6. OTHER ENCLOSURES
  - OE1 Progress Report of the Implementation of the Slow Streets Pilot Program
7. Adjourn

---

Please call (708) 358-5724 if you are unable to attend

Get the latest Village news via e-mail. Just go to [www.oak-park.us](http://www.oak-park.us) and click on the *e-news* icon to sign up.  
Also, follow us on *facebook*, *twitter* and *YouTube*.

If you require assistance to participate in any Village program or activity, contact the ADA Coordinator at (708) 358-5430 or e-mail [building@oak-park.us](mailto:building@oak-park.us) at least 48 hours before the scheduled activity.

DRAFT Meeting Minutes  
Transportation Commission  
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 - 7:00 PM  
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Staff Liaison Michael Koperniak called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:02 PM

Staff Liaison Koperniak read the following statement into the record:

"The Village President has determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation. It is not feasible to have a person present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation."

Roll Call

Present: Camille Fink, Garth Katner, Meghann Moses, Aaron Stigger, James Thompson, Chair Ron Burke

Absent: none

Staff: Development Customer Services Director Tammie Grossman, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Cinthya Calderon, Traffic/Transportation Engineer Jill Juliano, Staff Liaison Michael Koperniak

2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

3. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve tonight's agenda as presented.

Commissioner Stigger seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes - Thompson, Stigger, Fink, Katner, Moses, Burke  
Nays - None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

4. Approval of the draft August 11, 2020 Transportation Commission meeting minutes

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve the draft August 11, 2020 Transportation Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes - Katner, Thompson, Fink, Moses, Stigger, Burke  
Nays - None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

5. DEVELOP A DRAFT 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WORK PLAN

Staff Liaison Koperniak gave a brief presentation about this item. The bulk of the draft work plan was developed at the Commission's August 11, 2020 meeting. The purpose of tonight's agenda item is to decide on the completion time frame for each work plan item and then to vote to submit the draft 2021 work plan to the Village Board of Trustees for review and approval.

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- The completion time frame for each work plan item.
- Whether to retain or delete the 'Review why Divvy Bike Program failed' outcome from the Neighborhood Greenways Plan review work plan item. The Commission ultimately decided to delete this outcome.
- Whether to retain or revise the 'Develop a mission statement and guiding principles' outcome from the Develop mission statement and guiding principles work plan item. The Commission ultimately decided to revise the outcome to

read 'Develop principles and goals for the Village's transportation system network'.

- Whether to retain or delete the 'Determine if the Transportation Commission's policies align with the core values of Oak Park' outcome from the Develop mission statement and guiding principles work plan item. The Commission ultimately decided to delete this outcome.

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to submit the draft 2021 Transportation Commission Work Plan, as revised tonight, to the Village Board of Trustees for its review and approval.

Commissioner Moses seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes - Stigger, Moses, Fink, Katner, Thompson, Burke  
Nays - None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

## 6. OVERVIEW OF OVERNIGHT PARKING REFERRAL

Development Customer Services Director Grossman gave a brief presentation. She indicated:

- That tonight's agenda item is intended to be an introduction to the topic and that the Commission will discuss this topic in detail and depth at its October 28, 2020 meeting.
- This item was referred to the Transportation Commission by the Village Board of Trustees.
- One item to be discussed on October 28th is to possibly increase the size of the overnight on-street permit parking zones.
- The Chief of Police and Public Works Director have been invited to participate in the October 28th meeting.
- Staff has developed some proposals.

- That one outcome of the October 28th meeting is for the Commission to tell Staff if it's on the right track or to recommend something else.
- That Staff has been receiving public comment regarding the easing of parking restrictions caused by the ongoing CODIV-19 health pandemic.
- That the Transportation Commission was not being asked to make any recommendations at tonight's meeting.

7. PETITION FOR EVENING PARKING RESTRICTIONS ON THE 1150 S CUYLER AVENUE BLOCK

8. PETITION FOR EVENING PARKING RESTRICTIONS ON THE 1150 WISCONSIN AVENUE BLOCK

This started out as a review of only the 1150 S. Cuyler Avenue petition. However, during the public testimony portion of the review the Commission folded the 1150 Wisconsin Avenue petition into this review since both petitions were asking for similar parking restrictions due to similar parking problems caused by two Berwyn bar/night-club type business establishments.

PRC Calderon gave a presentation on the 1150 S. Cuyler Avenue petition agenda item which included going through each exhibit.

After the presentation, the Commission asked questions about the presentation and Staff replied. Items discussed included the following.

- Two Commission member's personal experience that this block is regularly filled with parked cars and that this particular block is being used as a bypass to avoid the traffic signals on Ridgeland Avenue.
- Under what conditions, parking passes would or would not be required by the residents of the block and their guests.
- If parking is restricted on this block would the parking problem move to adjacent blocks.
- The possible benefits of developing a standard parking restrictions template for streets adjacent to business corridors.

Twenty-eight pages of written public testimony that were received for all items on this agenda are attached.

The floor was opened to live public testimony.

Margaret O'Neill of the 1100 S Cuyler Avenue block was a live participant in this remote participation meeting and indicated the following. She has been a resident of the block for twenty-eight years. This is a quality of life issue due to noise and public disturbances every night of the week. Mike's Place Sports Bar & Grill is a Berwyn based business that requires Oak Park Police resources to deal with the disturbances. The streets of Oak Park are a free parking lot for this Berwyn business. She prefers that the restriction starts at 8 PM.

The Commission engaged in a discussion with Staff and Ms. O'Neill about:

- Starting the parking restrictions at 8 PM versus 10 PM.
- The lack of available parking spaces for residents.
- What else can be done besides parking restrictions.
- The fact that Oak Park Police influence is limited due to the fact that the business is located in Berwyn.
- Implementing a consistent parking policy for streets adjacent to business streets.
- Staff using this as a pilot program to see if it will work under similar situations in other parts of the Village and the possible effects and consequences
- Available parking in Berwyn between Roosevelt Road and the alley to the south.

It was at this point that the Commission invited Paul Moore of the 1150 Wisconsin Avenue block to give his public testimony regarding the 1150 Wisconsin Avenue petition.

Mr. Moore indicated the following. His block has a similar problem to that on Cuyler. The proximity of Scoreboard Sports Bar & Grill in Berwyn is relevant. Residents won't park on Fillmore Avenue or on the 1100 block. Spoke about the idea of a pilot program.

He asked questions about the parking pass requirements. He also spoke about debris and litter being thrown out of cars by patrons of the business.

The floor was closed to public testimony.

The Commission engaged in a discussion that involved the following:

- Wisconsin Avenue appears to be a quality of life issue as opposed to a parking capacity issue.
- A discussion about when and why the parking surveys were taken.
- The effectiveness of police enforcement during the current health pandemic.
- Trying the pilot program approach and seeing how it goes.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to recommend the implementation of a No Parking 10 PM to 6 AM, 7 Day Per Week parking restriction on the 1150 S. Cuyler Avenue block between Fillmore Street and the alley north of Roosevelt Road.

Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Thompson, Fink, Moses, Stigger, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to recommend the implementation of a No Parking 10 PM to 6 AM, 7 Day Per Week parking restriction on the 1150 Wisconsin Avenue block between Fillmore Street and the alley north of Roosevelt Road.

Commissioner Katner seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Katner, Fink, Moses, Stigger, Burke

Nays: None



The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

9. PETITION TO INSTALL ON-STREET BUSINESS PERMIT PARKING ON THE 1200 N. EAST AVENUE BLOCK SOUTH OF NORTH AVENUE

PRC Calderon gave a presentation which included going through each exhibit.

The Commission engaged in a discussion on the following:

- Public testimony appears to be confused as to who will be using these parking spaces.
- About the type of permit being requested. It is employee permit parking.
- The existence of other employee permit parking zones in the Village.
- The availability of parking along North Avenue.
- The state of parking south of the alley.
- The perception that parking problems developed after there was building development in the area.
- A precedent of might be set of employers asking for employee permit parking if employee permit parking is granted at this location.
- The annual cost for the employee permit parking.
- Small businesses in the area are competing with each other for parking spaces on a busy business oriented street.
- Would the employee permit parking covers employees up to 10 PM.

PRC Calderon read a statement from Vladimir Arezina, of Cigar Oasis Oak Park, located across the street opposing the petition. His complete statement is attached.

The Commission continued its discussion as follows:

- Considered tabling this petition until compelling reasons are presented.

- That the petitioners business draws customers during both the early morning and late evening hours.
- The safety benefits of moving the handicapped parking space from off of North Avenue and onto East Avenue.

Commissioner Moses made a motion to recommend the denial of the petition to install three employee permit parking spaces on the west side of the 1200 N. East Avenue block immediately south of North Avenue.

Commissioner Stigger seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Moses, Stigger, Fink, Thompson, Burke

Nays: Katner

The motion passed 5 to 1.

#### 10. Adjourn

There being no further business, Commissioner Moses made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes - Moses, Thompson, Fink, Katner, Stigger, Burke

Nays - None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24 PM.

Submitted by:

Michael Koperniak

Staff Liaison Michael Koperniak

-- Twenty-eight pages of written testimony are attached --

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Overnight Parking Problems  
**Date:** Sunday, October 4, 2020 8:50:07 PM

---

Hello,

We were given this email by Tammie Grossman in order to express our concerns about the overnight parking ban being lifted for so many months. We would like to weigh in on this topic before you decide whether to continue with the lift on the ban or to put it back into place.

First of all, we have never understood why the ban was lifted in the first place. We were recently told that it was because of the pandemic with so many people working from home and the fact that college students were home with possibly an extra car. This does not make sense to us as the ban is overnight and when people were going to work they still had to park their cars in the garage at night. Lifting the ban because their cars may now be home during the day doesn't seem to make sense. When it comes to college students being at home that has come to an end for many students as they have gone back to their colleges this fall. It never really made sense anyway because it's not as if Oak Park lifted the ban during the summer months in past years when college students were home.

**We would like you to seriously consider putting the overnight parking ban back into effect for several reasons.** Our street rarely gets clean in front of our house because we have cars parked in the way and the street cleaner has to go around them. The debris has been built up around the sewer and we have to sweep it out of the way so that it doesn't overflow. We also want to make sure that we will be able to have leaf pick up and snow removal when the time comes.

We feel that we have been extremely patient as the dates to put the ban back into place have been pushed back from July to September and now the end of October.

If you wish to contact us we will be glad to talk to you about this matter. My cell phone number is [REDACTED].

Thank you for considering our concerns in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Kathy & Dave Paoli

**From:** [Kristen Woods](#)  
**To:** [Koperniak, Mike](#); [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [VOP Board](#)  
**Subject:** public comment: overnight parking  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 12:39:41 PM

---

**Below is the public comment I'd like to submit for the transportation commission meeting on 10/13. I would also like to request the comment be read in advance of the meeting.**

**Thank you,  
Kristen Woods**

I want to thank the village for recognizing the inequity in regards to overnight parking for renters who live in areas of the village not zoned for overnight permits, and for agreeing to allow the transportation commission to assess the need for revisions to the present regulations.

I live on the 700 block of Carpenter and regret my decision to rent in this building, as I did not realize that when I purchased a vehicle I wouldn't be able to purchase a permit to park it in front of, or anywhere near my home. Instead I have to walk 0.4 miles to and from the lot on Harrison and pay nearly \$1000 a year to do so. That's over 100 hours spent walking to and from my car in a year. It's deeply frustrating to do this in the cold, heat, and when I'm sick, and especially painful to see an empty street in front of my apartment. I understand the aesthetic appeal of a carless street, but would hope that my quality of life would be valued as much or more.

The question has been raised as to whether there is a need for a revision to the current parking regulations. I would suggest that the existence of a spreadsheet of neighbors renting out parking spaces is an indicator of a need.

I still don't understand why the village doesn't have uniform overnight parking regulations. However, I do appreciate the suggestion of allowing a certain number of overnight permits for renters in the aforementioned areas. If the board is committed to true equity for all residents, I ask that you price these permits the same as the already existing overnight on street permits (no more than \$137/quarter)

Thank you for your consideration,  
Kristen Woods

**From:** [Stefanie Papasoglu](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#); [Koperniak, Mike](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Overnight Parking  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 2:54:44 PM

---

Good afternoon,

I'd like to submit the following comment to be read at the Transportation Commission Meeting on October 13 regarding overnight parking.

I'm currently a resident in an apartment on the 700 block of Carpenter Ave, just north of Jackson Blvd. I have lived in this apartment for 2 years now, and my only discrepancy is the lack of parking nearby. Previously, I lived in a building within the Z7 overnight parking permit area. As I was moving, I contacted the Oak Park Parking Permits office for help getting parking close to my apartment. Even the employee I spoke to was shocked that there was nothing available nearby, and referred to this area as "**a parking dead zone**".

Attached you will find a map showing the [REDACTED] Carpenter Ave apartment building marked with a red dot, as shown on the GIS Consortium site linked by the Parking Permits website. Note that there are several parking zones in the surrounding area, but this specific area is not even a zone. The closest permitted parking areas are **Lot 1, Lot 11, Lot 98, and Zone Y9**, which you will see marked on the map.

In order for you to understand our frustrations, I'd like to describe these options for you. The closest lot - **Lot 1** - is a .4 mile walk, and is the most expensive at \$222 per quarter for a 24 hour permit. After several months on a waitlist I currently have a permit for Lot 1, and while I stretch my budget to pay for it, it is my best option. **Lot 98** is approximately a .5 mile walk, and the same price as Lot 1. I had a permit for Lot 98 for a few months while on the waitlist for Lot 1, and frequently felt unsafe walking in the dark all the way to Lot 98, effectively on the service drive next to the freeway at a dead end street. **Lot 11** is a more economical option where I have also had a permit and is .5 miles away, but is extremely inconvenient due to the limited parking hours since it is the parking lot of a bank. Parking is only allowed from 7pm to 7am when the bank is closed, and is therefore a night permit at \$152 quarterly. **Zone Y9** is also an option, but the closest spots on Euclid Ave are used by the apartment complexes located on Euclid, and the other available spots would be at least .5 miles away or further depending on availability.

These parking options are inconvenient at best, and place additional financial strain on apartment dwellers. Many of the residents in my building are healthcare workers, including nurses, paramedics, and medical school students who work long hard hours only to come home at odd hours after a shift and face an additional 10-15 minute walk from their car. Most often those with apartments, like me, cannot yet afford a home and the luxury of having a driveway or garage, and yet have no option but to pay an additional \$600-\$900 in parking annually for one car. For those households with more than one car, this is especially stressful.

During quarantine the ability to park in front of my home has been extremely convenient and the residents of my building have been thankful for it. **Even many residents on Carpenter Ave with homes, and therefore garages and driveways, have been parking on the street for months now.** I urge you to consider the needs of Oak Park residents like me, and reform the parking rules to better accommodate apartment residents in my area and allow for

overnight parking in front of our homes.

Sincerely,

Stefanie Papasoglu





**From:** [Martin Kokoszka](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Permit Parking for Cuyler Block  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 11:18:30 AM

---

I am a resident on the 1150 South block of Cuyler. The last several months people have packed our block to go to the bar on Roosevelt called Mike's place. It would be fine if cars were just on our block. But the problem is the last several months there are plastic cups, broken beer bottles, other bottles broken on my lawn and the sidewalk. Also, people blasting their music late at night or being way too loud at night. It is not acceptable that people are not respecting our block by being too loud and leaving trash everywhere. Thanks.



October 8, 2020

|                        |
|------------------------|
| 1020-2<br>4.1<br>15/36 |
|------------------------|

Dear Village of Oak Park Transportation Commission:

We have been proud Oak Park residents since 2008. Our family has thrived as a result of the community and family-oriented spirit of Southeast Oak Park. Our only child is an OPRFHS graduate, who is successfully in her last year of undergraduate studies. Our block has been a peaceful street to call home. Our goal is to ensure that our block remains calm at all hours of day and night.

Over the past 12 years, there have been at least 4 businesses that have occupied what is now known as Mike's Place, 6319 W. Roosevelt Rd, Berwyn. During this time, we have experienced disrupted sleep due to yelling, car alarms, car stereos, and bar patrons drinking and dancing on the hood of the cars. Most mornings, we have had to pick up garbage strewn across the block including wine bottles, liquor bottles, wine glasses, food trash, tampons, and toilet paper.

Currently, on a typical night, most bar patrons begin parking their cars along 1150 S Cuyler Ave block as early as 7pm. Throughout the night, music from cars, people yelling, car alarms, and partying in the middle of the street happen until the early morning hours. The block is filled with trash in the morning. Let us be clear: bar patrons deserve to have a good time to relax and unwind from the day-to-day. And, the majority of the bar patrons are black. At the same time, block residents also deserve a full night's peaceful rest. We have made a conscious decision to not call the Oak Park police given the tensions between the black community and the police. We do not want to escalate racial tensions during this historical time of reckoning for Black Lives. Yet, we need to find a solution that benefits all involved. This issue is best resolved with parking restrictions so that bar patrons can enjoy their leisure time *and* the 1150 S Cuyler Ave block residents can reclaim our right to living in a quiet residential area. Furthermore, if the Village of Oak Park is committed to racial equity within our community, approval to restrict parking on the block of 1150 S Cuyler Ave would demonstrate a proactive attempt at addressing a community issue that will trigger racial animosity if not resolved.

We have video and photos available upon request.

Sincerely,

The Calomese Torres Family

[REDACTED]

**From:** [Katie Broussard](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** statement to be read at the public hearing for 1150 S Cuyler  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 10:57:56 AM

---

I am a resident of the 1150 block of South Cuyler, and I think that it is necessary to have parking restrictions on our block. Patrons of a nearby nightclub park on our block throughout the week, and when they exit the nightclub to return to their cars, we are awakened by yelling and loud music playing from cars. We also find trash left behind in our front yard. We have an otherwise quiet, residential block with many young children, and this is not an appropriate place for people to park and socialize after going to a nightclub. I ask that you vote yes on our petition for parking restrictions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Katie Broussard



October 8, 2020

Transportation Committee  
Village of Oak Park

To whom it may concern –

The residents of the 1150 block of South Cuyler Avenue have petitioned to restrict parking to permanent residents from 8:00 PM – 2:30 AM.

My wife and I have lived on this block for 28 years. We have experienced problems related to the various businesses that have resided at 6319 Roosevelt Road in Berwyn for over 15 years.

To provide a quick timeline: a nightclub called Bugi's opened there in 2004. We almost immediately started experiencing problems with the clientele blaring their car stereos upon entering and leaving, often until 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning. The next morning we would discover empty liquor bottles and used cups strewn across ours and many of our neighbors' lawns. There were also quite a few loud arguments or brawls that occurred, waking us up, and requiring intervention by Oak Park police.

This situation led to a neighborhood meeting conducted by the Oak Park police and Parking Commission in April of 2005. The owner of the nightclub also attended, and promised to take steps to curtail the problems (like not overserving customers). The situation improved slightly after this meeting.

Eventually, Bugi's closed down and was replaced by another nightclub called Inclusive around 2007. The problems erupted all over again, and actually got worse. The problems escalated to a fever pitch in 2008, when violence broke out multiple times, culminating in the hospitalization of a Berwyn policeman. For details on this situation, there is an archived Wednesday Journal article available at <https://www.oakpark.com/News/Articles/1-8-2008/Inclusive-nightclub%27s-license-suspended-in-Berwyn/>.

The Inclusive owner eventually lost their lease, and the venue was taken over in 2011 by Antronio's, a gay nightclub. While the brawls and violence diminished, the problems with loud late-night behavior and littering still persisted.

Antronio's closed in 2016 and was replaced by the Krew Rock Lounge, a hard-rock nightclub. Again, problems persisted with late-night loudness, public urination, and littered streets.

Krew Rock Lounge was replaced by Angel's Place briefly until which time Mike's Place opened around late 2018. Almost immediately upon Mike's Place opening, their patrons started parking on the 1150 block of Cuyler, and similar problems persisted. Loud patrons leaving the bar, sometimes waking us up in the middle of the night; car stereos blaring at all hours; trash on our front lawns the next morning.

I presented this timeline in order to, hopefully, give you an understanding of the frustration my wife our family, and the rest of our neighbors, have been going through for many, many years. This petition is not a knee-jerk reaction to a passing nuisance. It's nothing personal against the proprietor of Mike's Place. This is a matter of Oak Park citizens whose quality of life and peace of mind have been diminished for quite some time by businesses run in Berwyn.

There are many businesses on Roosevelt Road, both on the Berwyn and Oak Park side, whose patrons park on the 1150 block of Cuyler: doctor's offices, day care centers, etc. We want businesses to thrive for both suburbs and have no problems with patrons of these businesses parking on our block during the day to conduct their business. But after sixteen years, we feel we are not unjustified in asking for these parking restrictions to provide ourselves and our neighbors evenings free of disruption.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Bill O'Neill

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** [Erin Berenz](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Resident permit request (statement)  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 7:24:39 AM

---

To whom it may concern,

My family lives at [REDACTED]. We are in support of resident permitted parking on our block, given the noise and littering (ex: broken glass) that occurs at night from patrons of the bars on Roosevelt. Allowing residents to get permits to park on the street would be the best solution to this issue and maintain the safety and peace on our block.

Thank you for considering,

Berenz Family

**From:** [Maki and Jerome Sato Massiot](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Petition for parking on 1150 Block of South Cuyler  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 7, 2020 9:27:24 PM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for taking the time to hear our petition. We are the family residing in [REDACTED], and we fervently support the petition to restrict parking overnight on our residential street. There are several bars and clubs nearby that hold events throughout the week, and we often hear the boisterous banter of their patrons when the events conclude in the middle of the night into early mornings. Even with our windows closed, we can hear the loud back-and-forth and often uncouth language of those patrons who clearly have very little respect for the residents on the street. They often turn up the music in their own cars to high volumes, windows down, and remain speaking and drinking on the sidewalks as if using the streets as their after-party location. We find empty beer bottles and litter scattered in front of our houses the following day. As new parents, we certainly do not need more interruptions to our precious sleep nor do we want to be picking up other people's trash in order for our front yards to be safe for our kids and pets. We hope the overnight parking restriction will help make our streets quieter, more peaceful, and safer for our whole neighborhood.

Sincerely,  
Maki and Jerome

**From:** [amikos](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Petition to restrict parking on 1150 block of South Cuyler Avenue  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 7, 2020 7:49:23 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I am a homeowner on the 1150 block of South Cuyler Ave. I am writing to express my complete support in favor of both petitions, to restrict parking on this section of street.

I have lived on the block for six years. During this entire time we have had to deal with the insanity that happens every Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights on the 1150 block of S Cuyler Ave, due to a business on Roosevelt St. Virtually every weekend of every month, year round. That might sound like an exaggeration, but I assure it is not. By insanity, I'm referring to huge crowds of people and cars on the street, music absolutely blasting, people screaming at each other and car horns going off. Both sides of S. Cuyler Ave. are full of parked cars with people just partying in the street. In the morning my front yard has bottles, broken glass and garbage all over. People urinating outside throughout the night is not uncommon.

You have to understand that the noise is constant. Usually starting around 9pm, all of this continues until at least 2am, frequently until 3am. Directly in front of my house where people have parked. As you can imagine, my entire family is woken up during the night. Other nights of the week can be bad, but the weekends are the most extreme.

Over the past five years I've called the Oak Park Police a number of times about this. The OPD has been to my house several times to discuss it. Most recently, I spoke with a Sargent who was parked at the end of the street in what he described as a pre-emptive move, knowing that the block would light up all night. At my wits end, I asked how do we stop this? His response was simple, "keep calling 911, keep calling 911". Having been through this for so many years, I can assure everyone at this meeting that calling 911 is not the answer. The police are great at dealing with drunk people coming out of the bar, but by then it's too late. The street is already packed with the parked cars of the bar customers and all the police can do is try to contain the crazy. An impossible job to expect them to do.

Right now, Oak Park needs to treat the problem and not the symptoms. The problem is that the 1150 block of S Cuyler Ave is constantly flooded with people going to the bar/location on Roosevelt. These parking restrictions will protect the property (and sanity) of the residents of S Cuyler Ave.. These restrictions are the most cost effective method to resolve this on-going problem. Especially on weekends, the resources of the police department could then be used in other areas that need them.

Please do not ignore this petition. During my six years on this block I have seen the bar/location on Roosevelt St. close and reopen four different times. Different names, but always the same problems. The bar there now, Mike's Place, is only the most recent. This problem will not just go away and the residents on the 1150 block of S. Cuyler Ave need the Village of Oak Park to stand with us.

Thank you very much,

Adam Mikos

**From:** [Stacey Hendricks](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** 1150 Block of South Cuyler Parking Restrictions  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 7, 2020 7:37:59 PM

---

Hello, I would like to provide comments in regards to the proposed parking restrictions. Our block (especially those of us at the south side of the block) have experienced several sleepless nights due to people leaving a nearby bar on Roosevelt and continuing the party from their cars which are parked in front of our homes. On any given night, including weeknights when our kids have to get up for school and we have to work, we would hear several people playing their music extremely loudly, shouting, yelling, drinking bottles of liquor which litter our yards and are broken on the roads, until all hours of the morning. We've heard it starting before going into the bar and when they come out of the bar. People from the bar have also urinated in our yard, broken our front tree in half and littered our yard with broken bottles. As of late, this is happening more and more frequently. We have called the police on several occasions, who come for a while but cannot camp out on our street all night, every night. This has happened on and off for the 5 years we've lived on South Cuyler, whenever a bar occupies the space on Roosevelt. It seems that the current owners of the bar have even more customers as there are more and more cars on our street several nights a week with us having to deal with the party in front of our homes all night. We would really appreciate your restricting the parking starting at 8:00pm.

Thank you for your consideration and please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
Stacey Hendricks



**From:** [Christopher Temperly](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Statement from Temperly for 1150 S. Cuyler Block  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 7, 2020 9:32:04 AM

---

Thank you for taking a moment to read this statement. My family lives on the 1150 block of S. Cuyler Ave. and in the past year traffic and parking have increased significantly. The latter is due to a bar called Mikes Place on Roosevelt Avenue in Berwyn. This year alone I have found broken glass, alcohol & beer bottles, cigarette butts & package and food packaging litter in & around my yard. These items were not there when we came inside for the night and only seem to be present when patrons of Mikes Place bar park on our street. These items are unsafe as we personally have two children under 3 and live on a family friendly block with other that play in the front yards. Yes, we live on the southmost block in Oak Park that butts up to a less desirable town, but that doesn't mean we deserve less than any other tax payer in the village. Please consider voting yes for parking restrictions for our block so we can have the same experience.

Residents of [REDACTED]

**From:** [Calderon, Cinthya](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 1150 block of Wisconsin Ave  
**Date:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 8:12:02 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

---


**From:** Paul Moore [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 12:21 AM  
**To:** Calderon, Cinthya [REDACTED]; Rachel Turkowski <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: 1150 block of Wisconsin Ave

Cinthya,

Please find attached link to information for the hearing. I included the original petition and signed version, block map diagram documenting households and giving the board an overview of the location, proximity to Berwyn Township . I have also added some photos of a regular night with cars parked on both sides of the street. The max we had was 52 cars on the block parked both sides solid. This is not totally uncommon.

I also added photos of the trash left over.


[1150 Wisconsin Block Parking Petition.pdf and 1 more file](#)



**1150 Wisconsin Block Parking Petition.pdf and 1 more file**

2 files sent via WeTransfer, the simplest way to send your files around the world

MEET THE BLOCK AND FAMILIES





1020-2  
4.1  
26/36



Sample garbage on a weekly bases, beer cans, liquor bottles, trash, junk food containers, plastic bottles, plastic cups. With the virus we dont really want to touch this stuff

1020-2  
4.1  
27/36



TYPICAL CARS ON FRIDAY AND SATURDAY  
NIGHT 23 CARS AT TIME OF PHOTO



TYPICAL NIGHTTIME ACTIVITY INCLUDING :  
DRINKING IN CARS, PLUS 3 DRINK MINIMUM IN BAR!!!!  
CONSTANT CAR ALARMS, RADIO PLAYING  
DRAG RACING  
DRIVING BACKWARDS DOWN STREET  
CONSTANT SHOUTING AND SCREAMING  
CONSISTENT POLICE ACIVITIY ON BERWYN AND OAK PARK SIDES  
SHOOTING THIS SPRING BEFORE COVID  
DRUG USE IN CARS  
PUBLIC URINATION IN THE YARDS  
CONSTANT GARBAGE BEING LEFT ON YARDS, BOTTLES, CANS LIQUOR BOTTLES  
PLASTIC BAR CUPS, TRASH BEING EMPTIED OUT OF CARS.

NO LET UP SINCE COVID.  
BAR OPENED IN 2018 NOVEMBER 2ND  
PETITION STARTED MARCH 2019 NOW OCTOBER 2020

We are submitting this statement in advance of the Oak Park Transportation Commission's meeting on Tuesday, October 13th concerning the Petition to Install On-Street Business Daytime Parking from 7 am to 10pm Monday-Saturday on the West Side of Street

From the Alley (South of North Avenue) to North Avenue ("Business Parking Petition"). We oppose the Business Parking Petition and request that it be considered holistically with other parking concerns on the street. A failure to do so will create more problems for both the community's businesses and residents.

We understand that several of our neighbors have separately submitted statements opposing the Business Parking Petition and requesting that it be considered along with residents' increasing concerns about the safety of turning from North Ave to/from East Ave, as well as a forthcoming petition to restrict parking on the 1200 Block of East Ave to permit holders on nights and weekends.

Though we have not seen the petition, our understanding is that the Business Parking Petition would cover three parking spaces on the West side of the street for a particular business' employees. We remain concerned that the designation of these three parking spaces will push even more parking south into the residential portion of the block by businesses on the south side of North Ave. We believe that there is a better solution. We enjoy our neighborhood and would like to work collaboratively with community members. Many of us have lived in other cities and townships where business and residential districts are in proximity and have seen that various options are available.

Our main concerns relate to the safety of traffic patterns and the enforcement of Oak Park ordinances including littering, as well as frequent gatherings in vehicles and on the street (instead of in the designated parking lot or on North Ave) by patrons of the daytime/nighttime business establishment near North and East Ave. We offer some alternatives to the current situation..

**Traffic Safety in turning on/off of North Ave:** The parking area between the alley and North Avenue acts as a buffer for cars entering East Avenue from North Avenue. On several occasions, after turning from North to East Avenue, we have found another vehicle coming in the opposite direction on East Avenue. With cars now parked regularly on the East side of East Avenue, the only choice for some of us to avoid mutual blocking has been to stop in the parking area in the West side of East Avenue until the other vehicle went by toward North Avenue.

If only certain cars are allowed to park on the West side of East Avenue, many of us will have no alternative but stopping in the East-bound lanes of North Avenue, which we believe is unnecessarily dangerous, given the speed of cars traveling on North Avenue. Turning left from North Avenue to East Avenue is difficult enough without additional cars parked in the West side of East Avenue.

Some of us witnessed this problem over the summer when construction crews for the new building on the east side of the street parked on both sides of East just north of the alleys. Cars would be backed-up more than halfway down East waiting to get through, or stuck halfway-turned from North (and thus sitting in the way of oncoming traffic). Allowing parking on both sides is essentially turning that part of East into a one-lane street from 7am to 10pm for six days of the week.

We believe that Village should carefully examine and address the safety ramifications of turning the northern entrance/exit of one of the busiest north/south streets in Oak Park (where it intersects with one of the busiest streets in Chicago) into an unofficial one-lane street. One alternative is to consider making a portion or all of the 1200 block a one-way street, with only northern traffic allowed. Otherwise, traffic builds up and safety issues increase. This is more concerning as there are children and elders with restricted mobility on the street.

**Permit Parking South of the Alley on East Ave:** We support the development of businesses on North Ave and believe that there are ways to address both businesses and residents' needs in the community. While there is ample parking on North Ave and a designated parking lot for patrons of the Cigar Oasis, we have seen that the bar's patrons choose instead to park on East Ave while many spaces are left empty in the designated lot. We have witnessed regular littering on the curbside and in the grass. Any night of the week, we also are able to hear loud music from the parked cars. In contrast, on the northside of North Ave, there are several businesses with day and nighttime hours and a parking lot for patrons. The street that borders the lot is Natoma Ave and is zoned as residential permit parking only in Chicago. We plan to submit a petition to have the street designated as permit parking only for evening and weekend hours and ask that it be considered holistically with the Business Parking Petition.

Thank you for consideration.

Sincerely,

Following Residents of the 1200 Block N East Ave in Oak Park

Ugo A. Buy

Sal and Tiwana Corna -

Colleen and Paul DeJarnett -

Kim and Matt Kemper -

Tom Lindsey -

Keri and Orson Morrison -

Carol Lin and Dillon Murphy

Jeremy and Tiffany Roberts

Alpita Shah

Janice Fletcher-Thomas and Thomas family -



**From:** [Tom Lindsey](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Cc:** [Juliano, Jill](#); [Trustee Andrews](#)  
**Subject:** Cigar Bar petition  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 6, 2020 9:41:47 PM

---

As resident and property owner at [REDACTED], I am opposed to the petition to change allowable parking hours on East Ave north of the alley.

Since opening earlier this year, Cigar Bar patrons have turned our residential street into a parking lot. On any given day, there are 2 or 3 cars parked in front of my house, starting around 3-4pm, until closing late at night. (Same for many other adjacent houses.) Often their patrons are noisy when they leave late at night. Since Cigar Bar has an outdoor fire pit and several outdoor TVs showing sports, there is often loud yelling, cheering and laughing late at night. Some of their patrons drive Harleys, and rev their engines late at night before leaving. They have a dedicated parking lot accessed off of North Ave., but it's easier (and closer) for Cigar Bar patrons to park on East Ave instead. To be honest, they have not been a good neighbor, and I am very much opposed to extending them the ability to allow more of their patrons to park on our RESIDENTIAL street. Why can't they use their own parking lot?

Tom Lindsey

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Rebecca Beasley](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Cc:** [Juliano, Jill](#); [Trustee Andrews](#)  
**Subject:** East Avenue Business Parking Petition  
**Date:** Monday, October 5, 2020 9:23:09 PM

---

Good Evening,

I just received a letter in the mail slot regarding a petition to install on-street business daytime parking on North East Avenue.

This is very concerning for many reasons:

- 1) How many parking spaces will be gained? North Avenue has ample business parking. Why aren't North Ave businesses asking patrons to leverage North Ave?
- 2) Cigar Oasis patrons choose to park on North Avenue (a residential street) over the Cigar Oasis designated parking lot. Often times patrons are parked from the middle of the block to North Avenue. We are now experiencing an influx of late night parking on the block. On a recent weekday night, there were 3 cars in the parking lot and 18 parked on East Avenue.
- 3) What holistic approaches are being considered? Please reference the cul-de-sac and traffic diverter approach over the years. 82% of 1200 blocks have traffic calming devices installed like bump outs, diverters, cul-de-sacs, stoplights, do not enter signs and rush hour turn restrictions. East Ave petitioned unsuccessfully for two years and was only able to secure a speed table. The traffic study conducted by the Village proved East Ave had the highest volume of traffic as compared to the surrounding blocks who successfully secured diverters, bump outs, cul-de-sacs and other traffic calming devices at the end of the block.
- 4) Business patrons unfortunately contribute to increased litter, loitering and use of resident driveways to turnaround. As a resident with a driveway, we have personally had it blocked.
- 5) What data is being leveraged to support this petition?
- 6) If portions of the block are designated for business parking then the residential portion of the street (south of the alley to Le Moyne) should be designated as residential only. Will the Village support this approach?

While we do not support this petition as it stands, we do support discussions (with proper residential representation) aimed at identifying holistic solutions informed by quantitative and qualitative data.

Regards,  
Jonathan and Rebecca Beasley

**From:** [Rebecca Beasley](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Cc:** [Juliano, Jill](#); [Trustee Andrews](#)  
**Subject:** Re: East Avenue Business Parking Petition  
**Date:** Monday, October 5, 2020 9:46:45 PM

---

Correction on #2-Cigar Oasis Patrons prefer to park on East Avenue, not North Avenue. Please confirm this correction will be captured.

Thank you,

On Mon, Oct 5, 2020 at 9:22 PM Rebecca Beasley [REDACTED] > wrote:  
Good Evening,

I just received a letter in the mail slot regarding a petition to install on-street business daytime parking on North East Avenue.

This is very concerning for many reasons:

- 1) How many parking spaces will be gained? North Avenue has ample business parking. Why aren't North Ave businesses asking patrons to leverage North Ave?
- 2) Cigar Oasis patrons choose to park on North Avenue (a residential street) over the Cigar Oasis designated parking lot. Often times patrons are parked from the middle of the block to North Avenue. We are now experiencing an influx of late night parking on the block. On a recent weekday night, there were 3 cars in the parking lot and 18 parked on East Avenue.
- 3) What holistic approaches are being considered? Please reference the cul-de-sac and traffic diverter approach over the years. 82% of 1200 blocks have traffic calming devices installed like bump outs, diverters, cul-de-sacs, stoplights, do not enter signs and rush hour turn restrictions. East Ave petitioned unsuccessfully for two years and was only able to secure a speed table. The traffic study conducted by the Village proved East Ave had the highest volume of traffic as compared to the surrounding blocks who successfully secured diverters, bump outs, cul-de-sacs and other traffic calming devices at the end of the block.
- 4) Business patrons unfortunately contribute to increased litter, loitering and use of resident driveways to turnaround. As a resident with a driveway, we have personally had it blocked.
- 5) What data is being leveraged to support this petition?
- 6) If portions of the block are designated for business parking then the residential portion of the street (south of the alley to Le Moyne) should be designated as residential only. Will the Village support this approach?

While we do not support this petition as it stands, we do support discussions (with proper residential representation) aimed at identifying holistic solutions informed by quantitative and qualitative data.

Regards,  
Jonathan and Rebecca Beasley  
[REDACTED]

**From:** Ben DeBruin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2020 5:23 PM  
**To:** Transportation  
**Cc:** Alpita Shah  
**Subject:** Non-Agenda Public Comment for 10/13 Transportation Commission Meeting

Good evening,

I wanted to submit a non-agenda public comment for tonight's transportation commission meeting on behalf of the residents on my block. As a resident on the 1200 block of East Avenue, we have had to deal with customers of the cigar bar, Cigar Oasis, at the end of our block parking on our block instead of the establishment's parking lot every night and all day on most weekends. The increased amount of parking on our block has brought along with it littering, loitering, increased noise and more. To address this consistent issue, the block has already received 12 of the necessary 14 signatures to request resident permit parking on our block. We hope that the transportation commission will hear our request expeditiously once we collect the remaining few signatures needed. Obviously the concerns addressed tonight for residents near Roosevelt Road are also concerns we have living near North Avenue as well.

Thank you,

Ben DeBruin  
[REDACTED]

**From:** Vladimir Arezina [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2020 1:04 PM  
**To:** Transportation  
**Subject:** East Avenue - Petition to Install On-Street Business Parking

Dear Sir Or Madam:

My name is Vladimir Arezina, and I am one of the principals and owners of Cigar Oasis Oak Park, located on the corner of N. East Ave. and North Ave. We recently learned that there has been a petition filed to install two-hour business parking from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM on the west side of East Avenue from North Ave. to the alley. From what we understand, this petition to have been filed by a therapist who operates her practice from her home located on the opposite side of East Avenue from our business. We understand that the Village is considering this petition tonight. While we apologize for the late reply, we just learned of this development, and we feel obligated to respond.

**We are strongly against this petition, and we strongly encourage the Village of Oak Park to deny it.**

First of all, the area in which the parking is being sought already is a two-hour business parking zone, albeit from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM. (See attached photo).



Why a therapist's practice would need hours beyond 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM is unclear - but certainly if the Village is going to even entertain such a petition, it should require the petitioner to actually demonstrate that they intend to use the parking spaces for the hours being requested. We are highly skeptical that the petitioner is seeing clients/patients at 7:00 AM, or at 9:00 PM - 10:00 PM. From our understanding, the petitioner's practice has been there for quite some time, without any need for such extreme business hours - so it is curious why this petition is being sought now.

To us, it seems clear that the motivation for the request is to use it as a mechanism to harass customers of Cigar Oasis Oak Park, who park in the designated parking spots after 5:00 PM, and disrupt our business. As a cigar lounge, it should not be surprising to anyone that many of our customers frequent our establishment after work (after 5:00 PM), and often into the evening. Many stay for more than two hours - and would be inconvenienced by the need to move their

cars after two hours (or risk getting a parking ticket). Perhaps that is exactly the result the petitioner seeks - inconveniencing and disrupting our business and its customers.

1020-2  
4.1  
36/36

We understand that not all of our neighbors “like” the business of Cigar Oasis, but we are a lawful, well-run business that has helped revitalize the North Ave. business district of Oak Park. We have been, and will remain courteous and respectful of our neighbors. And we follow the law (and will continue to do so).

But we do not take lightly the notion that someone would seek to amend the parking zones in an effort to harm our business or harass our customers, when they themselves, apparently, have no legitimate need for the parking they are requesting. If the petitioner cannot show a legitimate business interest in having extended parking hours that she seeks, her request should be rejected. We would hope the Village would discourage the weaponization of parking zones to be used by neighboring businesses that do not approve of others commercial affairs. That is an inappropriate use, and inconsistent with the Village’s goals of revitalizing Oak Park’s commercial district on North Ave. Indeed, we understand that this same petitioner was behind the request to move the handicapped parking spot formerly in front of our business on North Ave. to the east side of North Ave. on the side of our business (where it now is located). While the petitioner succeeded in having this accomplished, this action, too, served no legitimate purpose - and simply took away one parking spot from our business (as well as the petitioner’s business, ironically).

In the end, we trust that the Village is motivated by supporting actual needs of its local businesses, and not interested in fostering animosity for purposes that are not even sought in good faith. We ask that the petition be denied.

Thank you,

Vladimir Arezina  
Cigar Oasis Oak Park

## Village Of Oak Park

### Transportation Commission Agenda Item

#### Item Title: Staff's Recommendations Regarding Overnight Parking Options.

Review Date: October 28, 2020

Prepared By: Tammie Grossman

#### Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed):

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 health pandemic, all on-street daytime and overnight parking restrictions have been relaxed since March 13th. On July 27th, the Village Board of Trustees extended the relaxation of the overnight parking ban to September 30th and directed Staff to bring back alternatives for expanding overnight parking options. On September 24, 2020, staff presented two recommendations to the Village Board and informed the Village Board that parking restrictions would be enforced starting October 26, 2020. The Village Board requested that the Transportation Commission review the two staff recommendations to expand overnight parking options for residents: (1) expanding the size of the overnight on-street permit parking zones and (2) expanding the overnight Parking pass program from 10 passes to 15 passes per month. The Transportation Commission was given an introductory presentation at its October 13th meeting. Tonight will be a full presentation and discussion.

#### Staff Recommendation(s):

A Motion to Accept Staff's Recommendation Regarding Changes to the overnight Parking Ban and Direct Staff to Prepare the Necessary Ordinance Amendments

This is tonight's agenda item 5.3

Supporting Documentation Is Attached

Public Testimony is included as agenda item 5.2

The September 21, 2020, Village Board of Trustees meeting agenda item is included as agenda item 5.3

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: E-Mail from the Village of oak Park  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 21, 2020 9:44:18 AM

---

On Oct 15, 2020, at 6:03 PM, Davis, Cameron <[cdavis@oak-park.us](mailto:cdavis@oak-park.us)> wrote:

**Ms. Swisher:**

**Thank you for the e-mail below. We will make sure that Director Grossman receives your e-mail. We certainly appreciate it when residents take the time to communicate with us regarding issues of concern. Thank you again. Have a safe and enjoyable week.**

**Respectfully,  
VILLAGE OF OAK PARK**

**Cameron Davis  
Development Customer Services Department**

**From:** Martha Swisher [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 15, 2020 10:30 AM  
**To:** VOP Village  
**Subject:** Citizen Message to Tammie Grossman

**Please direct to Ms. Grossman. I was unable to find her email on the website.**

*Hello, Ms. Grossman,*

*I am writing to express appreciation for the parking allowances that have been made during this trying time. On March 10 I got divorced and moved on March 20th to an apartment on the same block where I previously lived. I lost the use of my garage and had to navigate street parking in a very difficult area of our village to find parking at night.*

*Not having to dread coming home late and fretting about parking my car has been a Godsend. The problem was alleviated by the ability to park on the south side of Pleasant Street, next to Pleasant Home where normally no parking is allowed overnight. The south side of Pleasant was filled every night and all of us in the apartment complex/ Fountain Head Apartments felt a great relief in being able to park there. I have gotten to know many of the residents here I'm talking about those of us that purchased Y2 permits and are happy to continue to do so.*

*I don't know when the ticketing will resume if cars are parks on the south side of our 1000 block of Pleasant Street, but I can tell you that I am so very grateful for the ability to do so these past months and wanted you to know the stress it relieved for me.*



## Martha Swisher

She/Her/Hers

C21 Women's Ensemble, Artistic Director

[REDACTED]

Music Director

Unity Temple Unitarian Universalist Congregation

[REDACTED]

Private Vocal and Conducting Instruction

[REDACTED]

**From:** [David Boon](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Cc:** [Chad Ingram](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Parking on 300 block of S Grove  
**Date:** Monday, October 19, 2020 5:26:17 PM

---

Please see below

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** David Boon <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 17, 2020 1:18 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Lisa Boon  
**Subject:** Re: Parking on 300 block of S Grove

Dear Village of Oak Park Board:

My wife Lisa and I would like to add our names to the list of neighbors in the 300 block of S Grove to reinstate the ban on overnight parking.

We agree with the concerns others have voiced and have noticed a number of negative consequences since the pilot program was launched:

Skyrocketing litter on our street. In front of our homes. I myself, multiple times, have walked our block with gloves and trash bag collecting over 100 items of refuse. Yes - I counted as I gathered. Just this morning, which is not uncommon, an entire bag of garbage - the remains of a fast-food meal - Dunkin Donuts, McDonalds, Wendys, etc, is sitting in front of our house. Occurs weekly.

As well - "Dutch" sweet tobacco / smoking product wrappers - and other paraphernalia.

This stems from residential units which do not have dedicated parking. Specifically, the rental building on the northwest corner of Grove and Washington. Some of these residents return home late night. They sit in their cars on Grove, play loud music, eat, smoke, and discard their refuse on the street before turning in for the evening. My wife and I have been awoken by the music multiple times this summer. On one occasion, I personally called the Oak Park Police around 2 am to report the disturbance. Police came within 4 minutes and resolved the matter.

Parking: Cars remain on our street for long periods of time. The street - our block specifically - becomes overly congested with two-way traffic and parked cars.

Speeding: Grove seems to be a parallel offshoot for Oak Park Avenue. Can we install a speed-hump in the middle of our block?

Both of the foregoing items are also a safety matter as well.

Renters: Renters are made aware, when they rent, that there is no parking that comes with their unit. Long-term renters are very aware of this, and new renters should understand that they are responsible for their vehicles. The ban on overnight parking was in place for quite some time and individuals who rent were able to make arrangements for their vehicles. Obviously, they did. This may have caused individuals who rent some inconvenience, yes. But it is their choice to own a vehicle and rent at that location. Car owners are also responsible for other inconveniences such as paying insurance, repairs, registration, licensing, etc. This issue needs to be balanced against the interests of the (very HIGH tax paying) home owners and the issues we suffer, previously enumerated, from the pilot parking program.

Lisa and I ask the Oak Park Board to re-instate the over-night parking ban on our street. We ask that you address this issue and keep us informed.

Thank you

Lisa and David Boon



Sent from [Outlook](#)

**From:** [Nicole M. Davis](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Overnight Parking Ban  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 14, 2020 2:18:02 PM


---

Good afternoon,

I am writing you today to submit my thoughts on the overnight parking ban in preparation of the October 28th meeting.

I am in support of the overnight parking ban. We live on South Harvey and get a lot of fast driving cars (can we please have a cul de sac) and traffic from Mike's Place on Roosevelt Rd late at night. That said, would be in support of offering an overnight parking pass (1 per home) to residents. This pass should include a vehicle sticker that can be easily recognized. I only suggest this because I know people have college students home and it's challenging to find parking if you have to rent a garage space from someone who may not even live on your block. If mom and dad need the garage for their cars, where do the teens/young adults park theirs?

Best regards,  
Nicole



**From:** [Robert Fox](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Overnight Parking Ban  
**Date:** Sunday, October 18, 2020 6:53:31 AM

---

I am in favor of keeping the ban in place in single family residential areas. Safety for bicycle riders and aesthetics are primary reasons. People come to Oak Park to enjoy the beautiful homes. By in large these homeowners can afford other parking options. Streets with multi-unit buildings can be treated differently.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Michelle Siu](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Overnight Parking Ban  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 14, 2020 2:17:11 PM

---

Dear Transportation Committee,

I support permanently lifting the overnight parking ban. I live on the 1100 N Euclid block and have not found that there are more cars parking on our block than normal. I like the convenience of guests or household members being able to park in front of our house overnight.

Thank you,  
Michelle Siu

**From:** [Thomas Ptacek](#)  
**To:** [Transportation](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment for October 28 Trans Com  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 14, 2020 1:13:13 PM

---

Through an open records request, I obtained all overnight parking citations issued in 2019 (the last full, "normal" year of enforcement).

I then conducted an informal driving survey of the village, recording the rough locations of multi-family housing.

I've made a plot of this data available at [OAK-PARK-PARKING.FLY.DEV](#).

As is apparent from the data, enforcement of Oak Park's overnight parking ban heavily targets renters. There are corners on blocks with multifamily housing where the village has issued over \$10,000 in citations, while most Oak Park blocks see less than \$500 in citations.

I write in opposition to Oak Park's overnight parking ban. I'm an Oak Park homeowner with a 3-car garage; my concern is simply the unfairness of the rule. Regardless of what the commission recommends to the board, I encourage you to look further into hot spots like Madison & Cuyler and find out what's going wrong with our parking regulations there.

---

Thomas H. Ptacek  




**From:** [Grossman, Tammie](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Parking on 300 block of S. Grove Ave.  
**Date:** Monday, October 19, 2020 9:10:55 AM

---

Mr. Schwartz – Thank you for your email. The restrictions are due to resume on October 26, 2020. The Transportation Commission is reviewing the overnight parking ban on October 28, 2020. I will include this email in the public comments for their meeting. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Tammie Grossman  
Director  
Development Customer Services  
Village of Oak Park

[REDACTED]  
[www.oak-park.us](http://www.oak-park.us)

Development Customer Services

*This message is confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message may also be privileged or protected by work product laws and regulations. If you have received it by mistake, please resend this message to the sender and delete it from your system without copying it or disclosing its contents to anyone.*

**From:** Dave Schwartz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 10:22 PM  
**To:** VOP Board  
**Subject:** Parking on 300 block of S. Grove Ave.

My wife and I own the house at [REDACTED]. We are concerned about the parking situation on the street, including in front of our house. As you know, the Village temporarily removed all parking restrictions. Now, at all hours, the street is full of parked cars. We can't even park in front of our own house because people park their cars for days. Importantly, my wife is afraid to walk our dog at night. She is concerned that there are too many places that people can be hiding between the parked cars. We think that the temporary change in parking restrictions is a failure.

Dave Schwartz  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [Kristen Woods](#)  
**To:** [Koperniak, Mike](#); [VOP Board](#); [Transportation](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: public comment: overnight parking  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 21, 2020 1:40:08 PM

---

Good afternoon,

My neighbors and I felt compelled to send a follow up email after watching the transportation commission meeting from 10/13.

We appreciate that the transportation commission and village board are looking into this issue after receiving public feedback. Unfortunately, the proposed recommendations will not resolve the parking challenges faced by those of us who live in the three apartment buildings near the intersection of Carpenter and Jackson, as our buildings are not designated at R7 buildings. I'm not sure why, as these are multi-family buildings.

When looking at the proposed adjustment to the overnight parking permit zones, please take our buildings into consideration. Extending the zone will still not include our units. We were hopeful that the new apartment building being built on the corner of Oak Park Ave and Van Buren would prompt the implementation of zonage for on-street overnight parking in our area. However, that building has been absorbed by the Y9 zone, which it was not previously a part of.

To be clear, we are not asking for free parking or elimination of the overnight parking restrictions. We are asking for the same rights and privileges as other village apartment dwellers who are fortunate enough to live in an R7 building. We will abide by posted signage allowing for street cleaning/snow removal on certain days/sides of the street.

We would appreciate the opportunity to designate a representative to speak on behalf of these three buildings with approx 60 residents during the Oct. 28th meeting.

Thank you for your time,  
Kristen Woods  
[REDACTED]

On Thu, Oct 8, 2020 at 3:13 PM Koperniak, Mike <[mkoperniak@oak-park.us](mailto:mkoperniak@oak-park.us)> wrote:

Ms. Woods:

The Village of Oak Park has received your public testimony email below. Since the agenda packet is still being worked on, your email below will be included in the agenda packet as public testimony. The Transportation Commission members will be able to read your public testimony prior to the meeting. As a consequence, there is no need to read your testimony aloud at the meeting because it will be included in the agenda packet as a public document for public viewing for all interested parties to read.

Michael Koperniak, Staff Liaison

Transportation Commission

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Email: [mkoperniak@oak-park.us](mailto:mkoperniak@oak-park.us)

**From:** Kristen Woods [mailto:[kcwchi@gmail.com](mailto:kcwchi@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 8, 2020 12:39 PM

**To:** Koperniak, Mike; Public Comment

**Cc:** VOP Board

**Subject:** public comment: overnight parking

**Below is the public comment I'd like to submit for the transportation commission meeting on 10/13. I would also like to request the comment be read in advance of the meeting.**

**Thank you,**

**Kristen Woods**

I want to thank the village for recognizing the inequity in regards to overnight parking for renters who live in areas of the village not zoned for overnight permits, and for agreeing to allow the transportation commission to assess the need for revisions to the present regulations.

I live on the 700 block of Carpenter and regret my decision to rent in this building, as I did not realize that when I purchased a vehicle I wouldn't be able to purchase a permit to park it in front of, or anywhere near my home. Instead I have to walk 0.4 miles to and from the lot on Harrison and pay nearly \$1000 a year to do so. That's over 100 hours spent walking to and from my car in a year. It's deeply frustrating to do this in the cold, heat, and when I'm sick, and especially painful to see an empty street in front of my apartment. I understand the aesthetic appeal of a carless street, but would hope that my quality of life would be valued as much or more.

The question has been raised as to whether there is a need for a revision to the current parking regulations. I would suggest that the existence of a spreadsheet of

neighbors renting out parking spaces is an indicator of a need.

I still don't understand why the village doesn't have uniform overnight parking regulations. However, I do appreciate the suggestion of allowing a certain number of overnight permits for renters in the aforementioned areas. If the board is committed to true equity for all residents, I ask that you price these permits the same as the already existing overnight on street permits (no more than \$137/quarter)

Thank you for your consideration,

Kristen Woods

**From:** [Grossman, Tammie](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Reinstate overnight parking ban  
**Date:** Monday, October 19, 2020 9:12:41 AM

---

Ms. Johnston -

Thank you for your email. The restrictions are due to resume on October 26, 2020. The Transportation Commission is reviewing the overnight parking ban on October 28, 2020. I will include this email in the public comments for their meeting. In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Tammie Grossman  
Director  
Development Customer Services  
Village of Oak Park  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[www.oak-park.us](http://www.oak-park.us)

Development Customer Services

This message is confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message may also be privileged or protected by work product laws and regulations. If you have received it by mistake, please resend this message to the sender and delete it from your system without copying it or disclosing its contents to anyone.

-----Original Message-----

From: Pam Johnston [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2020 3:50 PM  
To: VOP Board  
Subject: Reinstate overnight parking ban

Hi, I'm Pam Johnston and I live at [REDACTED] I'm writing to implore you to reinstate the parking ban for the 300 block of S. Grove. The parking without limitations comes with many issues. Just to mention a few, the people hanging out in their car for hours and cars being left for days which in turn creates the problem of not being able to even park in front of your own home. It also causes even more "U turns" because someone sees a spot to park overnight. That's always a problem but the lack of limitations has made it even worse. Picking up trash that people have thrown out doesn't make my day either. Please put the overnight parking limitations back in place. We have all had enough on S. Grove!!!

Regards,  
Pam Johnston

Sent from my iPhone

**Submitted By**

Tammie Grossman, Director Development Customer Services

1020-2

5.3

1/139

**Reviewed By**

LKS

**Agenda Item Title****A Motion to Accept Staff's Recommendation Regarding Changes to the Overnight Parking Ban and Direct Staff to Prepare the Necessary Ordinance Amendments****Overview**

Pursuant to 15-1-2 of the Village Code, the Chief of Police has the authority to make or enforce temporary traffic and parking regulations to cover emergencies or special circumstances. Since March 13, 2020, due to the Covid 19 emergency, the Chief of Police has authorized the relaxation of all of the on-street daytime parking restrictions including street cleaning restrictions and the overnight parking restrictions. On July 27, 2020, the Village Board extended the relaxation of the overnight parking ban to September 30, 2020 and directed staff to bring back alternatives expanding overnight parking options.

**Recommendation**

Staff is proposing two recommendations to expand overnight parking options for residents. Staff recommends the following:

**Expand the zone:** Expand the overnight on-street zones by changing the ordinance to allow the overnight zones for on street, overnight parking zones to include street frontage adjacent to property within 750 (instead of 500) feet of an R-7 multi-family zone or within 750 (instead of 500) feet of a retail or commercial zone adjacent to an R-7 zone. (See attached map). The Map is for illustration purposes only. The new areas would need to be reviewed and verified in the field. Staff would bring the new zone boundaries to the Transportation Commission for review and recommendation to the Village Board for final approval.

**Expand the Passes:** Expand the overnight parking pass program from 10 passes to 15 passes per month. The Village issues parking passes that override posted parking restrictions to provide short-term relief under specific circumstances. The quantity of parking passes is subject to limitations. A parking pass applicant is expected to identify the purpose of the request, vehicle and driver information. Parking passes are not issued to vehicles with outstanding parking tickets.

There are two types of passes: a single overnight pass or an extended pass. Staff recommends increasing the overnight parking passes from 10 passes (3 free and 7 at \$7 each) to 15 (or some higher number) passes (5 free and 10 at \$7 each) between the months of April 1st to October 31st each year. In order to not interfere with leaf collection and snow removal, from November 1st to March 31st, each vehicle would only be allowed the 10 total overnight passes. Passport would be able to make this configuration change for us at no charge to the Village. We could also allow these passes to over ride daytime restrictions except for street cleaning and rush hour restrictions. We would then be able to eliminate the Village's administrative pass system and have all passes be requested through the Passport App. This would also reduce administrative upkeep in managing the pass system.

**Fiscal Impact**

As part of the budget amendments approved by the Village Board on June 15, 2020, the Parking Fund revenue was decreased by \$3,612,920 or approximately 48%. This estimate was predicated on the assumption that overnight parking restrictions would resume in the near future. Due to the continued relaxation of the overnight parking ban coupled with the 50% discount for Q2 and Q3 permits, parking revenue is anticipated to fall below the already reduced budgeted amount.

Attachment 13 of this agenda item summarizes the parking permit revenue collected by quarter (from Q2 of 2019 to present), broken down by parking lots, garages and on street night permits. It should be noted that Q4 2020 revenue only includes revenue collected to date. When comparing total permit revenue collected for Q2 and Q3 of 2020 to the same period last year, the Village has collected approximately 80% less in revenue. Even with the \$1,231,118 in expenditure reductions approved by the Village Board on June 15, 2020, the Parking Fund is projected to end the year with a negative fund balance.

The Parking Fund's debt service obligations include principal and interest payments for the following bond issuances: 2010C (70% of total paid from Parking Fund), 2016B, 2016E, and 2020A (fiber optic ring project). Due to the timing of the 2020A issuance, we do not yet know what the annual debt service will be on this. Attachment 14 of this agenda item summarizes the Parking Fund's outstanding debt obligations. Existing debt obligations should be a primary fiscal consideration in making any changes to or relaxation of parking restrictions.

**Background**

Attached to the agenda item is a history of the Village's Overnight Parking ban.

On May 14, 2018, staff presented a parking pilot program that would have altered the overnight parking ban to allow residents that purchased an on-street overnight parking permit to park throughout the Village and parkers would not be restricted to specific overnight zones. On street overnight parking permits currently cost \$117 to \$137 per quarter or \$468 to \$546 annually depending on location. In high demand areas, only one car per address may purchase a permit unless there are available spaces for a second car which is handled at the end of a quarter through a waitlist system. Since the overnight parking zones can cover a large geographic distance, sometimes parkers are required to park blocks away from their home.

Due to the overnight parking ban, parkers are required to park on designated streets but there may be a closer street nearer their home. The staff proposal would have allowed residents greater flexibility to park by allowing permit holders to park on any residential street with a valid permit rather than specific areas. As an alternative, staff presented a back-up proposal to expand the overnight zones to nearby parking meter locations instead of residential streets. The Village Board decided to move forward with the alternative proposal to allow permit holders to park at meters. See attached May 14, 2018 PowerPoint and Board minutes.

On July 16, 2018, staff presented a follow up parking pilot presentation to address additional non-overnight parking issues that were raised during the May 14, 2018 presentation. See attached July 16, 2018 PowerPoint and minutes.



On October 15, 2018, the Village Board adopted the Parking Pilot recommendations. As a result, the following changes were made in the parking pilot area bordered by Harlem and C Park Ave and Harrison and South Boulevard. See attached History of the Parking Pilot meetings.

- o Standardized all on-street daytime restrictions to 3 hours.
- o Established a pass system for residents to request an override of the on-street daytime restrictions for guests
- o Allowed on-street overnight permit holders to park at designated meters to increase spaces available in overnight on-street zones
- o Extended parking meter collection to 8pm in Downtown Oak Park, Pleasant and Hemingway Districts
- o Established a graduated parking pricing structure for the business district parking meters to encourage long-term parkers to go to the parking garage structures

On March 2, 2020, the Village Board amended the daytime parking restrictions in the pilot area to remove the 3 hour daytime restrictions from two residential blocks and add a 2 hour daytime parking restriction to the parking pilot area.

Staff had planned on conducting an extensive survey of the residents in the parking pilot area in the Spring of 2020. However, due to the Covid 19 crisis and the relaxation of the parking restrictions, staff believes that the survey should be put on hold. After the survey was conducted, the Transportation Commission was going to hold a series of public meetings. The results of the survey and public meetings would have been presented to the Village Board for a review of the Parking Pilot. While initially the staff did receive some negative feedback about the pilot specifically the addition of meters on Madison, the majority of residents have expressed positive comments to staff. In particular, residents like the ability to expand the overnight zone by using the meters and residents like the Passport pass system which allows their guests to override the daytime parking restrictions.

### **Alternatives**

An alternative would be to eliminate overnight zones completely and allow all residents the ability to purchase an overnight parking permit that would enable the resident to park overnight anywhere within the Village. We would need to evaluate the charge of our current rate of \$117 to \$137 per quarter or \$468 to \$546 annually depending on location. However, staff believes that we would need to set a maximum number of overnight parking permits and a priority system for ability to obtain. For example, residents of multi-family buildings without on-site parking would be a number one priority.

### **Previous Board Action**

On July 27, 2020, the Village Board extended the relaxation of the overnight parking ban to September 20, 2020 and directed staff to bring back alternatives expanding overnight parking options.

On March 2, 2020, the Village Board amended the daytime parking restrictions in the pilot area to remove the 3 hour daytime restrictions from two residential blocks and add a 2 hour daytime parking restriction to the parking pilot area.

On October 15, 2018, the Village Board adopted the ordinance establishing the Parking Pilot Program.

**Citizen Advisory Commission Action**


See attached history of Parking Pilot Meetings before the Transportation Commission.

**Anticipated Future Actions/Commitments**

Adoption of ordinance.

**Intergovernmental Cooperation Opportunities**

NA



# Parking Permit Map

1020-2  
5.3  
6/139

## Legend

On-Street

Off-Street


Multi-Family dwellings eligible for overnight

Please refer to specific permit lot/zone guidelines for additional information.

\*For the interactive, online map use

[www.oak-park.us/parkingmap](http://www.oak-park.us/parkingmap)

\*\* This map is a graphic representation of the parking areas. Always park in areas designated by signs in the field and follow applicable guidelines.



0 0.1 0.2 0.3  
Miles

1:12,750

DISCLAIMER: This drawing is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey, and is not intended to be used as such. This drawing is a compilation of records, information and data located in various village, county and state offices, and other sources, affecting the land area displayed and is to be used for reference purposes only. The Village of Oak Park shall not be responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained. If discrepancies are found, please contact Parking and Mobility Services.



## Parking Information Guide

| Lot # | Location                                 | Meters/<br>Pay By<br>Space | 24-<br>Hour | Day | Night |
|-------|--|----------------------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| 1     | Euclid N. of Harrison                    | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 2     | North Blvd E. of Oak Park - Garage       | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| 3     | Marion S. of Lake                        | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              |             |     |       |
| 7     | Chicago E. of Harlem                     | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 10    | North Blvd W. of Forest                  | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              |             |     |       |
| 11    | Wesley N. of Harrison                    |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 13    | Lake W. of Grove                         | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 15    | Oak Park S. of Garfield                  | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 16    | Lake W. of Kenilworth                    | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 18    | Marion/Lake & Harlem/Ontario -<br>Garage | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| 19    | Scoville N. of Lake - OPRFHS Garage      | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 22    | Lake W. of Elmwood                       |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 24    | Taylor N. of Madison                     | ✓                          | ✓           |     |       |
| 25A   | Adams W. of Austin                       |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 25F   | Fillmore W. of Austin                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 25I   | Iowa W. of Austin                        |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 25P   | Pleasant W. of Austin                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 25S   | Superior W. of Austin                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 25V   | Van Buren W. of Austin                   |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 29    | Garfield E. of Jackson                   |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 30    | Austin N. of Jackson                     |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 31    | Austin N. of Randolph                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 32    | Forest N. of Lake - Garage               | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| 33    | Humphrey S. of Harrison                  |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 34    | South Blvd E. of Ridgeland               | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 35    | South Blvd. W. of Austin                 | ✓                          | ✓           |     |       |
| 36    | Washington W. of Austin                  |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 37    | Grove N. of Roosevelt                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 39    | Harvard W. of Austin                     |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 44    | W. Side of Highland S. of Madison        |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 45    | Madison W. of Cuyler                     |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 46    | Cuyler S. of Washington                  |                            | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 47    | Lombard S. of Madison                    |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 48E   | Cuyler S. of Madison (E. side)           |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 48W   | Cuyler S. of Madison (W. side)           | ✓                          |             |     |       |
| 50N   | Humphrey N. of Lake                      | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 51N   | Humphrey N. of Chicago                   | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 51S   | Humphrey S. of Chicago                   | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 53    | Garfield E. of East                      |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 54    | Flournoy E. of Taylor                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 55    | North Blvd E. of Kenilworth              |                            | ✓           | ✓   |       |
| 56    | Madison W. of Harvey                     |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 58    | Madison E. of Highland                   |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 59    | Kenilworth S. of South Blvd              |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 61    | North Blvd W. of Austin                  |                            | ✓           | ✓   |       |
| 62E   | Harrison W. of Elmwood                   |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 62W   | Harrison W. of Gunderson                 |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 64    | South Blvd W. of Taylor                  |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 65    | South Blvd W. of Lombard                 |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 66    | North Blvd, Bishop to East               |                            | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| 66N   | North Blvd, E. of Euclid to Bishop       | ✓                          | ✓           |     |       |
| 67    | Lombard S. of Lake                       |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 68    | Austin N. of Harrison                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 70    | East S. of Washington                    |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 71E   | Euclid N. of Madison (E. side)           |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 71W   | Euclid N. of Madison (W. side)           |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 72    | Garfield W. of Clinton                   |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 73    | Humphrey N. of Madison                   | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 74    | Madison E. of Lombard                    |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 79    | Roosevelt W. of Euclid                   |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 81    | Marion N. of Randolph                    |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 82    | Humphrey N. of Washington                |                            |             |     | ✓     |

| Lot # | Location  | Meters/<br>Pay By<br>Space | 24-<br>Hour | Day | Night |
|-------|---|----------------------------|-------------|-----|-------|
| 83    | Taylor N. of Washington                             |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 85    | Kenilworth S. of Randolph (Brooks<br>Middle School) |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 86    | Scoville N. of Washington                           |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 87    | Harrison E. of East                                 |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 90    | Thomas W. of Austin                                 |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 91    | Wesley N. of Madison                                |                            |             |     |       |
| 92    | Lombard N. of Madison                               | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 93    | Taylor S. of Harrison                               |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 94    | Wisconsin S. of Madison                             | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 96    | North Blvd W. of Oak Park                           |                            | ✓           | ✓   |       |
| 97    | Washington E. of Ridgeland                          |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 98    | Harrison E. of Maple                                |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 99    | Humphrey S. of North Ave                            | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 100   | Clinton N. of Madison                               |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 101   | Humphrey S. of Lake                                 |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 102   | Lombard N. of Roosevelt                             | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 103   | Lyman S. of Harrison                                |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 104   | Harvey N. of Madison                                | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 107   | Cuyler N. of Madison                                |                            |             |     | ✓     |
| 109   | Scoville S. of Washington                           | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| 110   | Scoville N. of Madison                              |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 111   | Greenfield W. of Austin                             |                            | ✓           |     |       |
| 114   | Austin S. of Harrison                               |                            | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| 118   | Marion N. of Lake                                   | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              |             |     |       |
| SB1   | South Blvd W. of Humphrey                           |                            | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB2   | South Blvd W. of Harvey                             | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB3   | South Blvd W. of Ridgeland                          | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB4   | South Blvd E. of East                               | ✓                          | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB5   | South Blvd E. of Wesley                             |                            | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| SB6   | South Blvd E. of Oak Park                           | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              | ✓           |     |       |
| SB6E  | South Blvd E. of Euclid                             | ✓                          |             |     | ✓     |
| SB7   | South Blvd W. of Oak Park                           | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB8   | South Blvd W. of Kenilworth                         |                            | ✓           | ✓   | ✓     |
| SB9   | South Blvd W. of Clinton                            | ✓                          | ✓           |     | ✓     |
| SB10  | South Blvd W. of Home                               |                            |             | ✓   |       |
| NB10  | North Blvd E. of Forest                             | 3 HR<br>LIMIT              | ✓           | ✓   |       |

0

Indicates lots available for temporary overnight passes.  
Call 708.358.7275 for more information

1020-2  
5.3  
7/139



## 2018 Parking Permit Fee Schedule

The Village of Oak Park  
123 Madison St.  
Oak Park, IL 60302-4272

708.358.7275  
parking@oak-pa  
www.oak-park.u

1020-2

5.3

8/139

### GARAGES IN HIGH DEMAND AREAS (2, 18 & 32)

| Per quarter                                    |       | Renewal Dates             |
|--|-------|---------------------------|
| Day Permit                                     | \$235 | 1st Quarter 01/01 - 03/31 |
| Night Permit                                   | \$185 | 2nd Quarter 04/01 - 06/30 |
| 24-hour Permit                                 | \$265 | 3rd Quarter 07/01 - 09/30 |
|  |       | 4th Quarter 10/01 - 12/31 |
| 30-day Use Card \$130 (plus \$7.80 county tax) |       |                           |

### GARAGES OUTSIDE OF HIGH DEMAND AREAS (19)

| Resident (per quarter) | Non-resident (per quarter)                     | Renewal Dates             |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Day Permit \$195       | Day Permit \$245                               | 1st Quarter 01/01 - 03/31 |
| Night Permit \$160     | Night Permit \$200                             | 2nd Quarter 04/01 - 06/30 |
| 24-hour Permit \$230   | 24-hour Permit \$290 (plus \$17.40 county tax) | 3rd Quarter 07/01 - 09/30 |
|                        |  | 4th Quarter 10/01 - 12/31 |

### LOTS IN HIGH DEMAND AREAS (55, 59, 96, SB10)

| Resident (per quarter) | Non-resident (per quarter)                     | Renewal Dates             |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Day Permit \$225       | Day Permit \$280 (plus \$16.80 county tax)     | 1st Quarter 01/01 - 03/31 |
| Night Permit \$175     | Night Permit \$195                             | 2nd Quarter 04/01 - 06/30 |
| 24-Hour Permit \$255   | 24-hour Permit \$330 (plus \$19.80 county tax) | 3rd Quarter 07/01 - 09/30 |
|                        |  | 4th Quarter 10/01 - 12/31 |

### LOTS OUTSIDE OF HIGH DEMAND AREAS (1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 22, 24, 25A, 25F, 25I, 25P, 25S, 25V, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48E, 48W, 50N, 51N, 51S, 53, 54, 56, 58, 62E, 62W, 67, 68, 70, 71E, 71W, 72, 73, 74, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 109, 110, 111, 114)

| Resident (per quarter) | Non-resident (per quarter)                     | Renewal Dates             |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Day Permit \$185       | Day Permit \$235                               | 1st Quarter 01/01 - 03/31 |
| Night Permit \$150     | Night Permit \$190                             | 2nd Quarter 04/01 - 06/30 |
| 24-hour Permit \$220   | 24-hour Permit \$280 (plus \$16.80 county tax) | 3rd Quarter 07/01 - 09/30 |
|                        |  | 4th Quarter 10/01 - 12/31 |

### COMMUTER LOTS (34, 35, 61, 64, 65, 66, 66N, NB10, SB1, SB2, SB3, SB4, SB5, SB6, SB6E, SB7, SB8, SB9)

| Resident (per quarter) | Non-resident (per quarter)                     | Renewal Dates             |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Day Permit \$215       | Day Permit \$270                               | 1st Quarter 01/01 - 03/31 |
| Night Permit \$150     | Night Permit \$190                             | 2nd Quarter 04/01 - 06/30 |
| 24-hour Permit \$225   | 24-hour Permit \$285 (plus \$17.10 county tax) | 3rd Quarter 07/01 - 09/30 |
|                        |  | 4th Quarter 10/01 - 12/31 |

### ON-STREET ZONES (NIGHT PARKING ONLY)

|  | Renewal Dates             |
|--|---------------------------|
| High Demand Zones (Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4, Y5, Y6, Y7, Y8, Y9, Z3, Z6, Z7, Z9) = \$135 | 1st Quarter 02/01 - 04/30 |
| Medium Demand Zones (Z1, Z4, Z5) = \$125                                       | 2nd Quarter 05/01 - 07/31 |
| Low Demand Zones (Z2) = \$115  | 3rd Quarter 08/01 - 10/31 |
|  | 4th Quarter 11/01 - 1/31  |

### ON-STREET RESIDENTIAL DAYTIME PARKING

| Permit Price Per Year = \$70  | Renewal Dates          |
|---|------------------------|
| Visitor passes (book of 20, only available in certain areas) = \$5 per book | Annually 07/01 - 06/30 |

### ON-STREET BUSINESS DAYTIME PARKING

| Permit Price Per Year = \$120         | Renewal Dates          |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| For business permits in limited areas | Annually 07/01 - 06/30 |

Replacement for quarterly permits = \$5

Pricing current as of Nov. 6, 2017

## History of the Overnight Parking Ban in Oak Park

### A. Overnight Parking Ban

The Village of Oak Park has had an on-street overnight parking ban in effect since at least 1937. The Village originally prohibited parking from 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. on all Village streets. In 1939, the code was amended to change those hours to 2:30 to 6:00 a.m.

### B. Establishment of Overnight Parking in Parking Enclaves

In 1980, the Village first addressed the demand for overnight parking by adopting an ordinance, 1980-O-33, which established overnight parking in enclaves. The ordinance outlined a process by which the Board could establish overnight parking enclaves in cul-de-sacs and curb cuts in the parkway in high demand areas. Enclave parking was limited to permit holders who resided within 4 blocks of the enclave or designated area.

Shortly thereafter, in 1980, the Board also adopted ordinances designating the Chicago and Northwestern train embankment as an area where overnight parking was permitted, as well as areas along the Eisenhower expressway.

In 1986, the ordinance was amended so that enclave parking could only be established in areas where it would not have a negative impact on police protection. The parking enclave ordinance is now codified in Section 15-3-15 and 16 of the Village Code. The requirements are as follows:

- Curb cuts and cul-de-sac parking enclaves must be separate from the physical flow of normal street traffic.
- Enclaves will also be permitted adjacent to the Chicago and Northwestern or Eisenhower Expressway embankments, as parking in these unique areas does not affect street cleaning or leaf and snow removal to as great an extent as normally traveled street areas.
- The proposed parking enclave will not have a substantial negative impact on police protection.
- The area must be in or adjacent to areas having the severest parking space shortages in the Village.
- Curb cut parking enclaves shall not be permitted if there is a substantially negative effect on grassed parkways.
- Parking by monthly permit.
- Parking only for residents of the surrounding four block area.
- Parking from six o'clock (6:00) P.M. to eight o'clock (8:00) A.M., except as modified by resolution of the Village Board, based on unique parking needs of the area.



From 1980 to present, the Village has adopted various ordinances and resolutions establishing enclave parking in areas.

The Village also provides off-street, overnight parking for residents in forty -two (42) off-street parking lots it owns or leases.

### C. On-Street Overnight Parking

In 1988, in a continuing effort to address the demand for overnight parking, the Village Board adopted Ordinance 1988-O-58, which first established on-street, overnight permit parking in certain R-7 multi-family zoning districts on a two year trial basis. The Village found that the overnight parking ban enhanced police surveillance, and allowed public works street maintenance operations, such as street sweeping, leaf pick up and snow plowing to occur. However, the lack of parking for residents of multi-family buildings created an economic hardship on rental property owners because it limited tenants to those without vehicles. In addition, due to a lack of legal overnight parking, residents were parking illegally to the extent that 160,000 tickets were issued in the eighteen month period from January 1987, to June 1988. These illegal parkers thwarted the goals of the overnight parking ban. To meet the competing demands, the ordinance established the following:

- On-street, overnight parking permitted in certain designated R-7 zoning districts shown on a map, except for blocks where single-family homes occupy more than 50% of the street frontage.
- Permit zones may be created by a petition of 51% of the residents in the area, or by staff referral. The Village Board then refers the matter to the Parking and Traffic Commission (now the Transportation Commission) for hearing.
- Parking and Traffic must find that there is a severe shortage of parking in the area and that there are no reasonable alternatives to on-street parking.
- Parking for residents only which must be established by ID and Village vehicle sticker.
- Permits not available to residents who live within 2 blocks of an available off-street parking space.
- Parking limited to one vehicle per dwelling unit.
- Parking by permit in 90% of the available spaces in a designated zone. The remaining 10% reserved for guests.
- Parking on alternate sides of the street between 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., except as varied by resolution adopted by the Village Board for a particular area.
- Parking fees which exceed the cost of administering the system are deposited into an Off-Street Parking Fund.

In 1990, by Ordinance 1990-O-30, the Village Board extended the two year trial period of on-street parking system for an additional five years, noting that every parking space created by this system was sold in 1990. This ordinance also established that in order to purchase a permit, the vehicle owner can not have any outstanding parking tickets.

In 1991, by Ordinance 1991-O-14, the Village expanded the overnight parking zones to include the street frontage across the street from the previously established zones (so that the established system of alternate side parking would include the other side of the street.)

In 1994, by Ordinance 1994-O-60, the Village made on-street, overnight parking permanent by removing the “trial basis” language, noting that since its inception, all available parking spaces were sold. The Board found that the percentage of tenants who do not own vehicles is decreasing, while the percentage of households owning two or more vehicles continues to increase. The Village Board found that the stability of the Village’s multi-family housing stock is directly affected by a lack of available parking, which was the primary cause of turnover in multi-family buildings. At the time this ordinance was adopted, forty-nine (49%) of multi-family residential housing units did not have on-site parking and over 2,000 vehicle owners were still in need of parking.

The highlights of the 1994 ordinance are as follows:

- On-street, overnight parking is permanent (trial basis removed)
- Parking on both sides of the street (as opposed to alternating sides) from 2:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m.
- Ninety percent (90%) of available street footage in a zone is permit parking.
- Permits are restricted to residents
- Ten percent (10%) of available parking spaces are reserved for visitors
- Permits not available to residents who have off-street parking available within one block of their residence
- No permit may be sold to an individual who has outstanding parking tickets
- More than one permits may be sold per household, but only if excess parking is available after the due date for permit renewals (so that each household had a chance to obtain one permit)
- Parking is prohibited between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. to allow for street sweeping, snow removal and leaf pick up
- Permissible overnight parking zones were expanded to:

- areas where at least one side of the street is in an R-7 zoning district
- areas adjacent to an R-7 District in a less restrictive zoning district (B or C)
- streets in front of public property
- an area along Pleasant Street between Kenilworth and Grove in an R-6 zone
- No overnight parking zones may be established in areas where more than fifty percent (50%) of the linear feet of a block is occupied by single-family homes, a church, a school, or a public park.

In 1995, the Village adopted Ordinance 1995-O-68 to further expand the areas where on-street, overnight parking may be established to include:

- Streets adjacent to properties located within 500 feet of an R-7 zoned district which contains a multi-family dwelling of four or more units which is owned and operated as a legal, non-conforming use
- Portions of streets where at least one side is adjacent to an R-7 zoning district
- Streets adjacent to public property which is adjacent to an R-7 multi-family district
- Streets in front of multi-family buildings without regard to the percentage of single-family footage on the block.

In 1996, the Village adopted Ordinance 1996-O-83 which changed the “no parking from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.” restriction so that street maintenance activities could occur between 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., or 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m., or 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. This was in response to the operational impossibility of performing street maintenance activities in all on-street parking zones during a single two-hour window.

In 2004, the Village adopted Ordinance 2004-O-07 which sought to further address the need for times when street maintenance activities could be performed by permitting on-street, overnight permit parking from 9:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m., six days a week, except on the north and east sides of the street on Tuesdays, and on the south and west sides of the street Wednesdays, when parking terminates at 8:00 a.m.. This ordinance also clarified that parking on the reserved ten percent (10%) of the overnight permit zones was still subject to the overnight parking ban. This made sure that those reserved spaces would be available to a variety of users, rather than being open and unregulated parking.

In 2005, by Ordinance 2005-O-22, the Village further expanded the permissible areas for on-street, overnight parking zones to include street frontage adjacent to property within 500 feet of

an R-7 multi-family zone or within 500 feet of a retail or commercial zone adjacent to an R-7 zone.

In 2008, by Ordinance 2008-O-10, the Village again expanded the permissible on-street, overnight parking zones by amending the language prohibiting zones from being established in areas where more than 50% of the street frontage is occupied by single-family homes, a church, a school or a public park to remove the latter three uses from the calculation.

In 2009, the Village adopted Ordinance 2009-O-57 which permitted residents of one permit parking area to purchase permits remaining available in another permit area regardless of where the person lives.

In 2011, the Village reconfigured available parking in the Harrison Arts District area to address shared parking concerns and to prohibit parking by non-permit holders after 11 p.m. or before 6:00 a.m.

Each of these ordinances maintains the requirement that the establishment of overnight parking by ordinance be based on the following findings:

- That the area has a severe shortage of overnight off-street parking
- No reasonable solution can be identified
- The establishment of overnight parking on-street parking will substantially improve existing conditions for police protection and street maintenance activities
- It is in the best interest of the designated area and the community as a whole that on-street parking be established in the area.

The purpose of these findings is to distinguish between those areas where overnight parking is needed while still maintaining the overnight parking ban in other areas.

#### D. Supply and Demand

The Village provides the following parking:

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| • 42 off-street parking lots | 1,524 permit spaces and<br>124 metered spaces |
| • 4 parking garages          | 2,385 parking spaces                          |
| • 60 parking enclaves        | 951 parking spaces                            |
| • 17 on-street parking zones | <u>2,330</u> parking spaces                   |
| Total spaces                 | 7,314 overnight parking spaces.               |

According to the latest census, the Village has 24,519 housing units, with 55.1% or 13,509 being multi-family units, with an average of 2.34 persons per household across all housing types. (Many multi-family units provide their own parking so these statistics do not reflect off site parking demand.)

The Village has historically tracked the success of the overnight permit parking system by the reduction in the number of illegal parkers. Available data on the number of overnight parking tickets issued shows the following:

|                  |         |                             |
|------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| 1/1987 to 6/1988 | 160,000 | (18 month period)           |
| 1993             | 71,367  |                             |
| 1994             | 74,248  | extrapolated from 6 mo data |
| ----             |         |                             |
| 2004             | 28,368  |                             |
| 2005             | 22,733  |                             |
| 2006             | 21,706  |                             |
| 2007             | 21,025  |                             |
| 2008             | 18,979  |                             |
| 2009             | 16,361  |                             |
| 2010             | 16,679  |                             |
| 2011             | 16,772  |                             |
| 2012             | 17,508  |                             |

#### E. Short Term parking passes

Aside from reserving ten percent (10%) of permit parking zones for visitors in multi-family areas, the Village has not formally established a system of on-street parking for visitors of either multi-family or single-family residents, including guests, care givers, contractors, or for the occasional short term needs of residents for parking beyond what they legally have, such as during reconstruction of an existing garage, due to a medical need, or when permit holders who do not have 24 hour parking permits leave town.

Instead, the Village has addressed these short term needs by an administrative system of passes which allow parking outside the overnight permit zones, such as in single-family districts.

The Village has undertaken various initiatives to formalizing the pass system since 1995. A 1998 file memo noted that staff generated 10,000 passes per month at that time, with 91% being for overnight parking. With the establishment of more legal overnight parking over the years, staff now issue 72,000 on-street overnight, daytime and extended parking passes to residents and their visitors. Further details of this pass system are beyond the scope of this memo.

#### F. Legal Authority to Regulate Parking on Public Streets

The Illinois Vehicle Code empowers municipalities to use their police power “to regulate standing or parking of vehicles,” 625 ILCS 5/11-208, with certain limitations not relevant to this discussion.

In 1975, the Village’s overnight parking ban was challenged in a lawsuit brought by a parking ticketholder, *Flanagan v. Village of Oak Park*, 35 Ill.App.3d 6 (1<sup>st</sup> Dist. 1975). In the context of that lawsuit the court held:

It is clear that a municipality has the authority to regulate parking, and the only remaining question is whether the exercise of that authority is reasonable.

Oak Park established the reasonableness of the overnight parking ban in the *Flanagan* case by testimony that the ordinance assists with snow and leaf removal and street sweeping; and minimizes auto thefts, facilitates the discovery of stolen cars, and eliminates hiding places for criminals. While these reasons were sufficient to establish the reasonable basis for the overnight parking ban, they are not the only valid factors the Village Board may consider in determining how to regulate parking. Instead, the Village may regulate parking on the public streets in any manner that is reasonable, so long as the regulation serves a public purpose.

Courts generally defer to the wisdom of local governments in determining what is “reasonable.” In *City of Crystal Lake v. Cunningham*, 52 Ill.App.3d 819 (1977), a similar parking ticket challenge, the court held that even though the city offered no specific evidence as to the reasonableness of its overnight parking ban ordinance, the parking ticket holder challenging the reasonableness of the ordinance was required to offer convincing proof that the ordinance bears no reasonable relation to a legitimate exercise of municipal police power. In other words, a parking ordinance is presumed valid by the court unless a challenger can prove that there is no reasonable basis for the parking regulation. In *Evergreen Park v. Russell*, 102 Ill.App.3d 723 (1981), the court held that so long as the ordinance serves a public purpose, it is presumed valid. This gives the Village wide latitude to address the parking demand in the context of other valid public concerns, such as maintaining the residential character of neighborhoods, the value of both single-family and multi-family properties, the need for street maintenance activities, or any other public concern. It should be noted that in the past, the Board was advised that amendments to the system of overnight parking would “weaken the ban.” This is not sound advice as any reasonable parking scheme will be upheld by a court. The Village Board has wide latitude to regulate parking, including having a general overnight parking ban and a system of passes to provide relief from the ban, so long as the Village Board has a reasonable reason for doing so.

In *City of Milwaukee v. Hoffman*, 29 Wisc.2d 193 (Wis. 1965), a case from the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, the court upheld a Milwaukee ordinance which prohibits overnight parking on certain streets but allows individuals to park on those same streets if they purchase a permit. The court held that Milwaukee’s ordinance was a reasonable technique for regulating night parking on its streets.

So long as the Village addresses present day realities in a reasonable manner, a parking ordinance will be upheld by the courts.

## G. Conclusion

As is apparent by the above review, the Village has continually been asked to address the demand for overnight parking. Past efforts have attempted to balance the operational needs of street maintenance activities, the preservation of the residential quality of single-family housing areas and the preservation of multi-family housing values with the need for parking. In 2006, the Village conducted a citizen survey which demonstrated that community members are sharply divided in their opinions on a host of proposals to change the way parking is addressed in the Village. The results of that survey are provided on the following page.



| 1. How many cars or trucks do you park overnight in the Village? | Survey Count |
|--|--------------|
| more   | 34           |
| none   | 179          |
| one  | 780          |
| three  | 101          |
| two  | 613          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>   | <b>1707</b>  |

| 2. Where do you park overnight now? | Survey Count |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| not-applicable                      | 60           |
| private-garage                      | 763          |
| private-space                       | 330          |
| village-garage                      | 62           |
| village off-street parking lot      | 106          |
| village on-street parking zone      | 386          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                  | <b>1707</b>  |

| 3. Do you live north or south of Lake Street? | Survey Count |
|---|--------------|
| north   | 657          |
| south   | 1050         |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                            | <b>1707</b>  |

| 4. Do you live east or west of East Avenue? | Survey Count |
|---|--------------|
| east  | 736          |
| west  | 971          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                          | <b>1707</b>  |

| 5. What best describes your home? | Survey Count |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| building with 2 or 3 Units        | 80           |
| building with 4 or more Units     | 721          |
| Duplex or Townhouses              | 81           |
| Single-family                     | 776          |
| Other                             | 49           |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                | <b>1707</b>  |

| 6. Do you rent or own your home? | Survey Count |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| own                              | 1297         |
| rent                             | 410          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>               | <b>1707</b>  |

| 7. Is this a condominium? | Survey Count |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| no                        | 1198         |
| yes                       | 509          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>        | <b>1707</b>  |

| 8. How long have you lived in Oak Park? | Survey Count |
|---|--------------|
| More than 1, less than 3 years          | 372          |
| More than 3, less than 5 years          | 227          |
| More than 5, less than 10 years         | 292          |
| Less than 1 years                       | 213          |
| 10 or more years                        | 603          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                      | <b>1707</b>  |

| 9. In which category is your age? | Survey Count |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 18-24                             | 66           |
| 25-34                             | 539          |
| 35-44                             | 485          |
| 45-54                             | 327          |
| 55-64                             | 224          |
| 65 or older                       | 66           |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                | <b>1707</b>  |

| 10a Repeal the overnight parking ban | Survey Count |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| Strongly Support                     | 655          |
| Somewhat Support                     | 251          |
| Somewhat Oppose                      | 149          |
| Strongly Oppose                      | 652          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                   | <b>1707</b>  |

| <b>10b Remove the overnight parking ban and establish alternate side parking</b> | <b>Survey Count</b> |
|--|---------------------|
| Strongly Support   | 470                 |
| Somewhat Support   | 398                 |
| Somewhat Oppose  | 219                 |
| Strongly Oppose  | 620                 |
| <b>Grand Total</b>   | <b>1707</b>         |

| <b>10c Limit overnight parking to vehicle owners who purchase passes for themselves and their visitors</b> | <b>Survey Count</b> |
|--|---------------------|
| Strongly Support   | 361                 |
| Somewhat Support   | 458                 |
| Somewhat Oppose  | 314                 |
| Strongly Oppose  | 574                 |
| <b>Grand Total</b>   | <b>1707</b>         |

| <b>10d Leave the overnight parking ban in place as is, but expand the existing overnight on-street parking permit areas</b> | <b>Survey Count</b> |
|---|---------------------|
| Strongly Support  | 246                 |
| Somewhat Support  | 496                 |
| Somewhat Oppose   | 361                 |
| Strongly Oppose   | 604                 |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>1707</b>         |

| <b>10e Alter overnight parking ban to allow parking throughout the Village by permit only, and on alternate sides of the street except on streets wide enough to accommodate dual-side parking</b> | <b>Survey Count</b> |
|--|---------------------|
| Strongly Support   | 156                 |
| Somewhat Support   | 385                 |
| Somewhat Oppose  | 376                 |
| Strongly Oppose  | 790                 |
| <b>Grand Total</b>   | <b>1707</b>         |

| <b>10f. Leave the overnight parking ban in place as is, but expand existing on-street permit zones and sell zone-specific parking passes that residents may use or issue to their visitors, as well a non-zone specific parking pass that residents may purchase to park vehicles in areas not designated as overnight permit parking zones</b> | <b>Survey Count</b> |
|---|---------------------|
| Strongly Support  | 227                 |
| Somewhat Support  | 455                 |
| Somewhat Oppose   | 346                 |
| Strongly Oppose   | 679                 |
| <b>Grand Total</b>  | <b>1707</b>         |



# Parking Pilot Program

Village Board of Trustees

May 14, 2018

Village Hall

# Comprehensive Parking Review

In 2017, the Village of Oak Park began a comprehensive parking review including

- 5 Board Study Sessions
- 2 Consultant Public Forums
- 13 Transportation Commission Meetings
  - Including 2 at Gwendolyn Brooks Middle School


This review has resulted in a proposed parking pilot program

# Evolution of the Parking Pilot Program

- Odd-Even Rule
  - Not enough parking spaces
  - Complaints about having to move cars daily
- 72-Hour Rule
  - Complicated
  - When do things get done on street?
- Original Borders: Harlem Avenue to Oak Park Avenue & South Boulevard to Madison Street
- Expanded Borders: Harlem Avenue to Oak Park Avenue & South Boulevard to Madison Street

# Parking Pilot Borders

## South Blvd



Harlem Ave

Oak Park Ave

Harrison St

1020-2  
5.3  
22/139

# What does the parking pilot program attempt to resolve?

## Create more parking options

- Day parking
  - Residents
  - Guests
  - Services workers
  - Service providers
- Overnight parking
  - Residents
  - Guests
- Strengthen parking restrictions
  - Residential streets
  - Overnight ban

# What does the parking pilot program attempt to resolve?

(continued)

## Simplify Parking Rules/Restrictions

- Easier to understand and communicate
- Consistency
- Enforcement efficiencies
- Adjudication efficiencies
- Compliance



# Parking Pilot Program Overview

- Pay-By-Plate/Meters
- Day Parking On-Street
- Night Parking On-Street
- Off-Street Parking
- Additional Information
- Measuring Success

# Pay-By-Plate/Meters



Meters will be converted to Pay-By-Plate technology

# Pay-By-Plate/Meters

## Parking Pilot Program Proposal

| <u>Regulation</u>          | <u>Proposal</u>  | <u>Purpose</u>  |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Add Paid Parking</b>    | Add pay-by-plate (meters) on Madison Street                              | The meters in this area are needed as a parking management tool   |
| <b>Remove Paid Parking</b> | There are no identified locations to remove meters in the pilot area     | The meters in this area are needed as a parking management tool   |
| <b>6AM - 8AM</b>           | Unrestricted   | Parking is unrestricted, at no cost during this timeframe   |
| <b>8AM - 8PM</b>           | Add paid parking hours to increase and create turnover                   | Charging after 6 pm creates an opportunity for an additional dinner shift for businesses. Also, makes enforcement easier since your either compliant with payment or non-compliant. Any increases to paid hours must be Village-Wide  |
| <b>8PM - 2:30AM</b>        | Unrestricted   | Parking is unrestricted, at no cost during this timeframe   |
| <b>2:30AM - 6AM</b>        | Need A Permit/Pass   | Registered pilot permits and/or authorized passes will be valid to park at designated metered space (on both sides of pleasant, the diagonal spaces on the West side of Marion, and on Madison) 2:30AM to 6AM. Paid parking regulations apply Monday - Saturday 8AM to 8PM or unless otherwise posted |
| <b>Paid</b>                | Monday - Saturday  | Meters will be converted to Pay-By-Plate technology   |
| <b>Free</b>                | Sunday   | Parking is unrestricted 6AM until 2:30AM Monday morning, at no cost during this timeframe   |
| <b>Rate Structure</b>      | Paid - Dynamic Pricing (3 hr. plus escalated hourly rate - no time limit | \$1 an hour, rate will be established for the first 3 hours of paid parking at a meter or pay station. Vehicles that extend their stay beyond the initial 3 hours will pay an escalated hourly for example, \$3/hour for any additional time with no time   |

1020-2  
5.3  
27/139

# Pay-By-Plate/Meters

- Transportation Commission Vote: 6 - 0

8AM - 6PM

Don't add more meter hours without  
additional review

- **Transportation Commission**  
**Recommendation:** Keep the meter payment until 6pm, however, staff should evaluate the need to go later in certain parts of the Village
- **Staff supports the business district: Expand meter payment to 8 pm**

# Pay-By-Plate/Meters

## Budget Impacts

- New technology is budgeted, with no additional costs. Estimated revenue to generate additional \$11,000/year.
- Additional meters on Madison, estimated revenue \$40,000/year.
- Adding hours past 6pm, Village-wide, would generate an estimated \$150,000 per each hour added.

| Estimated Revenue | Hour Added |
|-------------------|------------|
| – \$150,000       | 6pm-7pm    |
| – \$300,000       | 7pm-8pm    |
| – \$450,000       | 8pm-9pm    |
| – \$600,000       | 9pm-10pm   |

\* Uses current rates of \$1 an hour.

# Day Parking On-Street Pilot Proposal

| <u>Regulation</u>           | <u>Proposal</u>  | <u>Purpose</u>   |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Unrestricted</b>         | As-Is  | Current streets in the pilot area without parking regulations will not have any policy changes   |
| <b>Time Limits</b>          | 3 Hour Parking (8am - 8pm)(Permit/Pass to override)<br><br>*Short Term (non-residential) Time Limits like 15 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, 45 minutes, and 1 Hour Parking can be standardized as well | Any pilot street that has a time limit will be standardized to a 3 hour parking time limit 8AM - 8PM Monday-Saturday. Time limits are how long you allowed to park on a street. Time limits will not apply to pilot parking permits (\$70/year) and/or authorized passes during this time unless otherwise posted.   |
| <b>Time Restrictions</b>    | As an example current No Parking 8am-10am<br><br>These types of restrictions will convert to 3 Hour Parking (8am - 8pm) (Permit/Pass to override)  | Any pilot street that has a time restriction will be standardized to a 3 Hour parking time limit from 8AM-8PM Monday-Saturday. Time restrictions are when you cannot park and therefore are the most restrictive type of parking, however, registered pilot permits (\$70/year) and/or authorized passes will be valid during time limits and you will not be required to move your car unless otherwise posted. This creates consistency. |
| <b>How Far?</b>             | As-Is, Tracked by block  | This is the current practice and prevents people from moving 1 space up on the block.  |
| <b>Restricted Days</b>      | Mon - Sat  | As-Is with standardization   |
| <b>Non-Restricted</b>       | Sunday   | As-Is with standardization   |
| <b>Special Restrictions</b> | As-Is  | Staff is defining special restrictions as State le school safety, or hospital area restrictions. These remain as-is.   |

1020-2  
5.3  
30/139

# Day Parking On-Street

- Transportation Commission Vote: 3 – 3

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Time Restrictions | As an example current No Parking 8am-10am<br>These types of restrictions will standardize to No<br>Parking 8am-10am M-F |
| Restricted Days   | Mon - Fri   |

- **Transportation Commission Recommendation:**
  - Do not convert time restrictions to time limits
  - Do not have any restrictions on Saturday
  - Village vehicle sticker becomes Day Permit
- **Staff Recommendation:**
  - **Standardize to 3 Hour time limit**
  - **No Restrictions on Saturday and Sunday**
  - **\$70 Day Permit**

# Day Parking On-Street Budget Impacts

- 2018 adopted budget includes signs
- Efficiencies would help reduce costs
- Day Permit, currently \$70/year, would generate an estimated \$140,000 in the pilot area (2000 cars on the street on average day)



# Night Parking On-Street Pilot Proposal

| <u>Regulation</u>             | <u>Proposal</u>   | <u>Purpose</u>  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Existing Permit Spaces</b> | Permit/Pass   | Open parking 8PM to 2:30AM. Any vehicle parked after 2:30AM must be registered with a permit/pass on any street within the pilot area (i.e. where restrictions exist, a permit/pass would be allowed to park except no parking zones like red curbs & fire hydrants. Permit parking will be added to every street in the pilot area.  |
| <b>Existing Pass Spaces</b>   | Permit/Pass   | Open parking 8PM to 2:30AM. Any vehicle parked after 2:30AM must be registered with a permit/pass on any street within the pilot area (i.e. current registered overnight passes park on any non-permitted side street, these vehicle would be allowed to park at any on street location except no parking zones like red curbs & fire hydrants. Permit parking will be added to every street in the pilot area. |
| <b>Who?</b>                   | Residents of the pilot area, Residents Guests, Resident Service works only!<br><br>Consideration for local employees without parking options on East/West Streets   | This means that any registered cars in the pilot area during overnight hours are known to be Oak Park residents or their guests.  |
| <b>How Long?</b>              | Once a week.<br>Designated Day - For example NO PARKING on the South Side of the Street (i.e. Monday 8AM-1PM).<br>Permit or Pass does not override.<br>Allows for Vehicle Abatement, street maintenance, leaf removal, etc. | Each block face will posted with a mandatory NO PARKING regulation to allow for vehicle abatement, street maintenance, leaf pick up, catch basin cleaning and tree trimming services. No permits or passes will be valid during this posted regulation.   |
| <b>Additional Permits</b>     | Higher tiered pricing (additional permits per unit)   | It is anticipated that additional permits for purchase will be available. There is a consideration that second vehicles permits would be priced at a higher rate.   |

1020-2  
5.3  
33/139

# Night Parking On-Street

- Transportation Commission Vote: 4 – 2

|                        |             |
|------------------------|-------------|
| Existing Permit Spaces | Permit/Pass |
| Existing Pass Spaces   | Permit/Pass |

- **Transportation Commission & Staff Recommendation:**
- Cap on the amount of permits, passes, and 2<sup>nd</sup> vehicles, to keep from over-crowding
- Want a phased in approach. Example: 100 additional permits at time
  - Currently sell 1100 Parking Permits and Passes
  - Proposal results in 1800 spaces

# Night Parking On-Street Budget Impacts

- 2018 adopted budget includes signs
- Efficiencies would help reduce costs
- Night Permits, currently \$540/year, would generate an estimated \$54,000 in the pilot program area, per each 100 additional permits

# Off-Street Parking

## Paid Parking

| <u>Regulation</u> | <u>Proposal</u>   | <u>Proposal</u>   |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Unrestricted      | As-Is   | Parking lots and enclaves in the pilot area without parking regulations will not have any policy changes  |
| Time Limits       | 3 Hour Parking  | These are removed per the new rate structure  |
| Rate Structure    | Paid - Dynamic Pricing (3 hr. plus escalated hourly rate - no time limit) | \$1 an hour, rate will be established for the first 3 hours of paid parking at a meter or pay station. Vehicles that extend their stay beyond the initial 3 hours will pay an escalated hourly rate, for example, \$3/hour for any additional time with no time limit until 8PM |

## Permit Parking

| <u>Regulation</u>      | <u>Proposal</u>                | <u>Proposal</u>  |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Existing Permit Spaces | As-Is (w/ Future Staff Review) | Existing Permit Spaces can be day, night or 24/hours. Each current location will be evaluated by staff using the Transportation guidelines to determine how these spaces could be allocated. These guidelines will be established in the future as a tool for staff to make changes in lot |

1020-2  
5.3  
36/139

# Off-Street Parking

- Transportation Commission Vote: 5 – 1
- **Transportation Commission**  
**Recommendation:** Concur with staff.

# Off-Street Parking Budget Impacts

- There are no budget impacts pertaining to Off-Street Parking.

# Additional Information

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Signage</b>              | Standard from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration | Use of standard signs with language as needed for rules<br><br>Easier rules should result in less confusion                                 |
| <b>Enforcement</b>          | Clear and Consistent Message  | This will make enforcement efforts easier thus increasing compliance<br><br>There will be dedicated enforcement personnel to the Pilot area |
| <b>Warnings</b>             | Warning per plate with link to new rules  | This will make enforcement efforts easier and create an education period for drivers  |
| <b>Pilot Time Frame</b>     | 180 days (6 mos.) experiment with 180 days (6 mos.) extension   | With updates to the Transportation Commission and Board of Trustees   |
| <b>Pilot Permits/Passes</b> | Valid within the boundaries only  | Harlem to Oak Park<br>South Blvd to Harrison  |

1020-2  
5.3  
39/139



# Additional Information

## 2017 Parking Sign Pilot



# Additional Information

## Proposed Signage



# Additional Information

- Transportation Commission Vote: 6 – 0
- **Transportation Commission**  
**Recommendation:** Concur with staff.

# Implementation

- If a parking pilot program is implemented
  - Measuring Success
  - Next Steps

# Measuring Success of Pilot Program

**Public Feedback (Residents and Businesses)**

**Compliance**

**Data for duplicate offenders (between warning tickets and tickets)**

**Police Department in conjunction with the Adjudication Department will verify the comparison of parking citations for the pilot period as compared to previous years**

**Information Technology in conjunction with the Finance Department will verify the comparison of Vehicle Stickers compliance for the pilot period, as compared to previous years**

**Staff will report back to Transportation Commission at multiple times during the pilot**

**Staff will report back to the Village Board at multiple times during the pilot**

# Measuring Success of Pilot Program

- Transportation Commission Vote: 5 – 1
- **Transportation Commission Recommendation:** Would like the Board to appoint a task force to assess the outcome of the parking pilot program
- **Staff Recommendation:** Do not add an additional task force. Transportation Commission should remain responsible for measuring the Pilot Programs success

# Staff's Nest Steps (1)

- On-street pay stations to replace meters are in progress
- On-street parking regulation sign updates are budgeted for and will be implemented once pilot area rules are defined
- Unified Parking Technology Upgrade is budgeted for
  - Parking Technology
  - Citation Management Technology
  - Parking Enforcement Handhelds & Systems
  - Mobile License Plate Recognition Systems for Vehicles



# Staff's Next Steps (2)

- Bring forth a Draft Ordinance on Parking Pilot
- Explore increasing the maximum wage for 'Garage Employee Parking Discount Card', now \$14
- Explore increasing the date range restrictions from 'Garage 30-Use Card', now 30 days



# Village of Oak Park

123 Madison St  
Oak Park, Illinois 60454  
www.oak-park.il.us

1020-2  
5.3  
48/139

## Meeting Minutes

### President and Board of Trustees

---

Monday, May 14, 2018

7:00 PM

Village Hall

---

#### I. Call to Order

Village President Abu-Taleb called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

#### II. Roll Call

**Present:** 6 - Village Trustee Button, Village Trustee Taglia, Village President Abu-Taleb, Village Trustee Moroney, Village Trustee Boutet, and Village Trustee Andrews

**Absent:** 1 - Village Trustee Tucker

#### III. Agenda Approval

It was moved by Village Trustee Moroney, seconded by Village Trustee Andrews, to approve the agenda. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved.

#### IV. Public Comment

There was no non-agenda public comment.

#### V. Regular Agenda

**A. [ID 18-872](#) Presentation and discussion of recommendations to establish a Parking Pilot Area comprised of Harlem Ave. to Oak Park Ave. & South Blvd. to Harrison St.**

Village Manager Pavlicek discussed what items will be part of the presentation. Staff will be giving a holistic overview of their progress regarding the parking study. Staff is not looking for direction or consensus at this time, but would like feedback from the Board in order to have a follow-up Study Session in June. Recommended ordinances will be brought to the Board in July and will go into effect in October.

Village President Abu-Taleb commented that it is important to note that this is the first time the Board will be seeing or hearing anything regarding the parking pilot program.

Kristi Sloniger. Ms. Sloniger has been following the parking program and asked that the Board limit the dramatic changes being proposed. She provided suggestions for high demand areas and others.

Mary Prudden. Ms. Prudden discussed overnight parking expansion, and hoped that the Board will vote to preserve the current restrictions and enforce daytime parking limitations.

Kimberly Watkins. Ms. Watkins is a new resident in the Village and feels that the

daytime parking restrictions are oppressive.

Anne Pezalla, representing the Hemingway Business Association. Ms. Pezalla spoke in favor of the pilot program and asked that it include all the downtown business districts.

Carrie Hageman. Ms. Hageman noted that parking in Oak Park has been a long term problem. However, the pilot program lacks vision and was developed with limited data. She suggested stakeholder meetings to get a broader perspective.

Director of Development Customer Services Tammie Grossman commented that one of the Board goals adopted in 2017 was looking at the entire parking system. She gave a history of steps taken thus far and discussed various approaches that were considered to make parking more streamlined. Staff is trying to make a parking system that is consistent and easier to understand that will increase efficiencies and compliance. There will be six topics discussed; pay-by-plate and meters, on-street day parking, on-street night parking, off-street parking, additional information regarding signs, etc., and measuring success.

Ms. Grossman stated that they are looking to replace coin meters with pay-by-plate technology and to add back paid parking on Madison Street. They are also proposing that 6:00 am to 8:00 am and 8:00 pm to 2:30 am restrictions be removed, extend 8:00 am to 6:00 pm paid parking to 8:00 pm, and allow designated meter parking from 2:30 am to 6:00 am with a registered permit or authorized pass. Also being proposed are paid meters from Monday through Saturday with Sunday free and changing three hour parking limitations to dynamic pricing - three hours plus escalated hourly rates with no time limit. Ms. Grossman stated that the expected increase in yearly revenue from pay-by-plate is \$11,000, paid parking on Madison Street will generate approximately \$40,000 and the addition of paid hours past 6:00 will generate an estimated \$150,000 per hour added.

Ms. Grossman discussed on-street day parking time restrictions and time limits. Staff is proposing the option of overriding those with an on-street parking permit at \$70 per year, standardizing all restrictions to a three-hour time limit with no restrictions on Saturdays and Sundays. No new restrictions are being added. Budget impact is dependent upon how many day permits at \$70 per year would be purchased.

Ms. Grossman stated that staff is not proposing to eliminate the all-night parking ban or proposing that anyone outside of the pilot area will be able to park within the pilot area overnight. Staff is opening up all-night parking within the pilot area because there has been a lot of feedback from renters who cannot find parking in their area when they get home at night aside from spots where it is not allowed. Permit and pass parking will be added to every street in the pilot area. Ms. Grossman believes that people will park closest to their homes. With the opening of parking meters and addition of Madison Street, people should not have to gravitate to the residential streets. Staff is not planning on changing the pass process, although another option would be to register guests of residents. In order to avoid overcrowding, there will be a limit on permits and passes, which will be released for sale in increments. The current number of permits allowed is 1,100 out of 1,800 total spaces. The budget impact would be approximately \$54,000 in revenue per year in the pilot area.

The next area that staff is trying to simplify is off-street parking. This includes parking lots and enclaves. Certain enclaves are unrestricted and will not be changed. Staff is proposing three-hour parking or dynamic parking in metered enclaves. There are no budget impacts related to this.

Ms. Grossman discussed signage. Staff is satisfied with their traditional signs will not go through the expense of creating new ones. There will be dedicated enforcement personnel for the pilot area and staff has requested that one warning per plate be issued with a link to the new rules to educate drivers. It is being proposed that the pilot time frame be a six month period with updates to the Transportation Commission and the Board of Trustees. No one with a permit for any other area will be allowed to park in the pilot area.

Ms. Grossman stated that staff has established methods with which to measure the success of the pilot program and the Transportation Commission supports them. These can be revised if the Board wishes and staff will continue to work with the Transportation Commission. She answered questions and heard comments from the Board.

There was a discussion regarding changing the meters from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm. in the downtown business districts, and overnight permit parking on residential streets. Ms. Grossman clarified that no more than one permit per household will be issued. Village Trustees Boutet, Andrews and Moroney expressed reservations regarding opening up overnight parking. Village Trustee Button expressed a different opinion and noted that renters who pay for a permit should have as much right to park and find a spot as someone who owns their home. Oak Park is supposed to be a welcoming and diverse community, both racially and economically. Parking restrictions are unduly burdensome for those in the community that need the most help. She asked for data regarding percentage of African Americans who are renters and what percent are single family homeowners. She agrees with staff's recommendation. Ms. Grossman clarified that at this time, staff is only asking for an additional 100 permits; the 1,800 figure mentioned earlier is the total amount of available spaces. Village Manager Pavlicek explained how permit holders can be put in the position mentioned by Village Trustee Button. There was further discussion.

Village President Abu-Taleb was undecided. He believes the pilot program should be put aside. He would like to see how the technology with the new meters works out without having to resolve all these issues at one time. He believes that residents are not in favor of lifting the overnight parking ban. Village Trustee Boutet agreed. She was in favor of expanding the permit zones in order to provide more parking for multi-family dwelling residents. Village Trustee Taglia also felt that this should not be rushed. Village Trustee Button commented that this wouldn't go into effect until October. Staff has gone through a lot of work; this is a pilot program. She is not in favor of dropping it entirely. Village President Abu-Taleb clarified that certain parts of it would be used; there could be additional overnight parking in metered areas on Madison, Pleasant and Marion. Village Trustee Button would like a follow-up conversation. She would like to know where those metered spots are in relation to the multi-family dwellings. She acknowledged that this is a complicated problem but not beyond their abilities to solve. Village Trustee Andrews did not want to table this either. However, he would like the increase in permits to be done conservatively and be limited to the metered areas. Village Trustee Boutet would also like to make sure there is some 24-hour parking available. Ms. Grossman stated that staff will look at some options and get back to the Board.

There was a discussion regarding day parking and whether having a Village sticker or a \$70 permit should be required for homeowners to park in front of their house, and whether restrictions should be lifted for homecare workers and service people. Ms. Grossman stated that she would look into this further but noted that streets without restrictions will not be changed. Village Trustee Moroney asked why the Transportation Commission was split regarding standardizing the three-hour time limit. Transportation Chair Jack Chalabian stated that their concern was not so much standardizing it but the fact that it is difficult to enforce. They believe that the two-hour limit is effective and is the industrial

standard. There was further discussion. There was consensus to reject the proposal of the \$70 permit to allow residents to park in front of their house. Village President Abu-Taleb asked for further explanation of the pay-by-plate technology. He also asked if there would be legal consequences for removing a restriction that residents on a specific block petitioned for and were granted. Village Attorney Stephanides said there is not; it is up to the Board.

Village President Abu-Taleb stated that there seems to be consensus to expand the meter supply on Madison Street for overnight parking, install and execute the technology piece and come back with pricing on the meters, as well as addressing the discussion on multi-family dwellings. He verified that there was consensus not to create a task force to oversee the pilot. Village Trustee Button wanted to know why the Transportation Commission was recommending one instead of overseeing it themselves. Mr. Chalabian stated that aside from wanting to take a break from parking, having a task force of stakeholders will create a sense of ownership and allow for benchmarks to be set. There will be a lot of data collected, and that is a lot to take on. Village Trustees Boutet and Button expressed concern regarding burn out experienced by the commission. Mr. Chalabian spoke in favor of a task force, which would bring in a fresh set of eyes and different perspectives. Village President Abu-Taleb did not want to complicate matters by creating another layer. Village Trustee Andrews suggested a sub-committee of the Transportation Commission. If that was not possible, they can reassess this.

## VI. Adjourn

**It was moved by Village Trustee Andrews, seconded by Village Trustee Moroney, to adjourn. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M., Monday, May 14, 2018,**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**MaryAnn Schoenneman  
Deputy Village Clerk**



# **Parking Pilot**

## **Follow-Up on Process to Create a Scaled-Back Program**

Village Board of Trustees

July 16, 2018

Village Hall

# Scaled-Back Parking Pilot Program

At the May 14, 2018 Special Board meeting staff brought forth a number of recommendations for a parking pilot.

There are three topic areas that require further Board direction.

- On-Street Paid Parking
- On-Street Day Parking
- On-Street Night Parking

# Scaled-Back Parking Pilot Program

## On-Street Parking - Paid

| Pay-By-Plate (Previously known as Metered Parking) |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Add Paid Parking</b>                            | Add pay-by-plate (meters) on Madison Street   | The meters in this area are needed as a parking management tool. <b>Estimated 93 Spaces.</b>  |
| <b>6AM - 8AM</b>                                   | Unrestricted  | Parking is unrestricted, at no cost during this timeframe   |
| <b>8AM - 8PM</b>                                   | Add paid parking hours to increase and create turnover <b>in 3 business districts (Pleasant, Hemingway, and DTOP).</b>                        | Charging after 6 pm creates an opportunity for an additional dinner shift for businesses. Also, makes enforcement easier since your either compliant with payment or non-compliant.   |
| <b>8PM - 2:30AM</b>                                | Unrestricted  | Parking is unrestricted, at no cost during this timeframe   |
| <b>2:30AM - 6AM</b>                                | Need A Permit   | Registered pilot <b>permits</b> will be valid to park at designated metered space (on both sides of pleasant, the diagonal spaces on the West side of Marion, and on Madison) 2:30AM to 6AM. Paid parking regulations apply Monday - Saturday 8AM to 8PM or unless otherwise posted |
| <b>Paid Days</b>                                   | Monday - Saturday   | As-is. Meters will be converted to Pay-By-Plate technology  |
| <b>Free Days</b>                                   | Sunday  | As-is; Parking is unrestricted 6AM until 2:30AM Monday morning, at no cost during this timeframe  |
| <b>Rate Structure</b>                              | <b>3 Hour Parking - Old Fashion Meters</b><br><b>3 Hour Dynamic Pricing – Pay Stations (3 hr. plus escalated hourly rate - no time limit)</b> | \$1 an hour, rate will be established for the first 3 hours of paid parking at a meter or pay station. Vehicles that extend their stay beyond the initial 3 hours will pay an escalated hourly rate, for example, \$3/hour for any additional time with no time limit.              |

Green text represents updates to the presentation per direction of Village Board on 05/14/18

1020-2  
5.3  
54/139



# Updates On-Street Parking - Paid

- Staff has confirmed the interest of local business associations to extend paid meter hours to 8 pm. This includes Pleasant, Hemmingway, and DTOP.
- Locations where Cale paystations will be installed:
  - 2018 – Madison Street and the Pleasant Dist.
  - 2019 – Lake Street and Downtown Dist.
  - 2020 – North/South Blvd and Hemmingway Dist.

# Scaled-Back Parking Pilot Program

## On-Street Parking - Day

### Day Restrictions (RESIDENTIAL AREAS)

|                      |  |   |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Unrestricted         | As-Is  | Current streets in the pilot area without parking regulations will not have any policy changes  |
| Time Limits          | <p>3 Hour Parking (8am - 8pm) (Block Resident with Vehicle Sticker to override)</p> <p>*Short Term (non-residential) Time Limits like 15 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, 45 minutes, and 1 Hour Parking can be standardized as well</p> | Any pilot street that has a time limit will be standardized to a 3 hour parking time limit 8AM - 8PM Monday-Saturday. Time limits are how long you allowed to park on a street. Time limits will not apply to pilot parking vehicle sticker holders when parking on their block unless otherwise posted.  |
| Time Restrictions    | <p>As an example current No Parking 8am-10am</p> <p>These types of restrictions will convert to 3 Hour Parking (8am - 8pm) (Block Resident with Vehicle Sticker to override)</p>   | Any pilot street that has a time restriction will be standardized to a 3 Hour parking time limit from 8AM-8PM Monday-Saturday. Time restrictions are when you cannot park and therefore are the most restrictive type of parking, however, these will not apply to vehicle sticker holders when parking on their block unless otherwise posted. This creates consistency. |
| How Far?             | As-Is, Tracked by block  | This is the current practice and prevents people from moving 1 space up on the block.   |
| Restricted Days      | Mon - Fri  | As-Is with standardization  |
| Non-Restricted       | Saturday & Sunday  | As-Is with standardization  |
| Special Restrictions | As-Is  | Staff is defining special restrictions as State level, school safety, or hospital area restrictions. These will remain as-is.   |

Green text represents updates to the presentation per direction of Village Board on 05/14/18

1020-2  
5.3  
56/139

# Updates On-Street Parking - Day

- The ability to override will now be based on having a Vehicle Sticker and there will be no separate charge.
  - No budget impacts.
  - There will still be one (1) mandatory “Street Cleaning Day.”
  - Snow ban will still apply during major snow falls.

# Scaled-Back Parking Pilot Program

## On-Street Parking - Night

### Night Restrictions - Permit/Pass Parking (2:30am-6am)

|                        |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Existing Permit Spaces | Permit   | <p>Existing Permit Parking areas and designated meters will remain permit parking only.</p> <p>Staff will continue to review the overnight parking ban and permit parking ordinances to see if it is possible to add more parking spaces.</p>                        |
| Existing Pass Spaces   | Pass   | <p>Existing Pass Parking areas will remain pass parking only.</p> <p>Staff will review a plan to simplify the extensive pass system as part of the technology implementation in late 2018.</p>   |
| Who?                   | <p>Residents of the pilot area, Residents Guests, Resident Service works only!</p> <p>Consideration for local employees without parking options on East/West Streets</p>   | <p>This means that any registered cars in the pilot area during overnight hours are known to be Oak Park residents or their guests.</p> <p>Staff will review a plan to simplify the extensive pass system as part of the technology implementation in late 2018.</p> |
| How Long?              | <p>Once a week.</p> <p>Designated Day - For example NO PARKING on the South Side of the Street (i.e. Monday 8AM-1PM).</p> <p>Permit or Pass does not override.</p> <p>Allows for Vehicle Abatement, street maintenance, leaf removal....</p> | <p>Each block face will posted with a mandatory NO PARKING regulation to allow for vehicle abatement, street maintenance, leaf pick up, catch basin cleaning and tree trimming services. No permits or passes will be valid during this posted regulation.</p>       |
| Additional Permits     | <p>Staff recommends not adding any additional (2<sup>nd</sup>) permits until staff can evaluate the supply and demand of the new pilot area.</p>   | <p>Staff recommends not adding any additional (2<sup>nd</sup>) permits until staff can evaluate the supply and demand of the new pilot area.</p>   |

Green text represents updates to the presentation per direction of Village Board on 05/14/18

1020-2  
5.3  
58/139

# Additional Information

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Signage</b>              | Standard from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices from the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration | Use of standard signs with language as needed for rules<br><br>Easier rules should result in less confusion                                 |
| <b>Enforcement</b>          | Clear and Consistent Message  | This will make enforcement efforts easier thus increasing compliance<br><br>There will be dedicated enforcement personnel to the pilot area |
| <b>Warnings</b>             | Warning per plate with link to new rules  | This will make enforcement efforts easier and create an education period for drivers  |
| <b>Pilot Time Frame</b>     | 180 days (6 mos.) experiment with 180 days (6 mos.) extension   | With updates to the Transportation Commission and Board of Trustees   |
| <b>Pilot Permits/Passes</b> | Valid within the boundaries only  | Harlem Ave. to Oak Park Av<br>South Blvd to Harrison St.  |

1020-2  
5.3  
59/139

# Signage



# Measuring Success/Evaluations of Pilot

- What defines success?
  - Residents and Businesses Feedback
  - Compliance
  - Check for duplicate offenders
  - Police Department, in conjunction with the Adjudication Department, will verify the comparison of parking citations for the pilot period as compared to previous years.
  - Information Technology, in conjunction with the Finance Department, will verify the comparison of Vehicle Stickers compliance for the pilot period as compared to previous years.
  - Staff will report back to TC at multiple times during the pilot.
  - Staff will report back to Board at multiple times during the pilot.

# Next Steps

- Prepare draft ordinances for Village Board consideration.
- Public promotion of changes.
- Create an implementation schedule.
- Staff will begin to analyze expansion of zones.
- Return to the Village Board for review in 6 months.





# Village of Oak Park

123 Madison St  
Oak Park, Illinois 60454  
www.oak-park.il.us

1020-2  
5.3  
63/139

## Meeting Minutes

### President and Board of Trustees

---

Monday, July 16, 2018

6:30 PM

Village Hall

---

#### I. Call to Order

Village President Abu-Taleb called the Meeting to order at 6:32 P.M.

#### II. Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Village Trustee Button, Village Trustee Taglia, Village President Abu-Taleb, Village Trustee Tucker, Village Trustee Moroney, Village Trustee Boutet, and Village Trustee Andrews

**Absent:** 0

#### III. Consideration of Motion to Adjourn to Executive Session to Discuss Sale of Property.

It was moved by Village Trustee Tucker, seconded by Village Trustee Button, to enter into Executive Session pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(6) - sale of property. The motion was approved. The roll call on the vote was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 - Village Trustee Button, Village Trustee Taglia, Village President Abu-Taleb, Village Trustee Tucker, Village Trustee Moroney, Village Trustee Boutet, and Village Trustee Andrews

**NAYS:** 0

**ABSENT:** 0

#### V. Reconvene to Regular Meeting in Conference Room 101 and Call to Order

The Regular Meeting reconvened at 7:03 P.M.

#### VI. Roll Call

**Present:** 7 - Village Trustee Button, Village Trustee Taglia, Village President Abu-Taleb, Village Trustee Tucker, Village Trustee Moroney, Village Trustee Boutet, and Village Trustee Andrews

**Absent:** 0

#### VII. Agenda Approval

It was moved by Village Trustee Tucker, seconded by Village Trustee Boutet, to approve the Agenda. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved.

#### VIII. Public Comment

Chris Donovan. Mr. Donovan discussed the delay in Board action regarding the Madison

Street Project and lack of enforcement of the Complete Streets Policy.

## IX. Regular Agenda

### A. [ID 18-908](#) **Update and Recommendations to Establish a Reduced Parking Pilot Area From Harlem Ave. to Oak Park Ave. & South Blvd. to Harrison St.**

Village Manager Pavlicek stated that as a follow up to the May 14 discussion related to a parking pilot area, staff is bringing back final recommendations based on that conversation and citizen input. Staff would like to begin drafting an ordinance for adoption.

Kristi Sloniger. Ms. Sloniger, representing residents of the 100 - 300 blocks of South Grove, thanked the Board and staff for the new scaled back version of the pilot program. She expressed concern regarding communication to residents regarding the new regulations.

Director of Development Customer Services Tammie Grossman presented updates made to Paid On-Street Parking. At the Board's direction, pay-by-plate has been added to Madison Street for an additional 93 spaces. Staff is recommending adding paid parking hours to increase and create turnover in the Pleasant, Hemingway and Downtown Districts and need Board direction. All three Districts support the increase to 8:00 P.M. Staff is also recommending that the three hour parking signs be retained at meters, but introduce dynamic rate pricing at pay stations. This would consist of charging \$1 per hour for the first three hours. Vehicles that extend their stay beyond that will pay an escalated hourly rate, such as \$3, for additional time, with no time limit.

Village Trustees Andrews, Boutet, Tucker, Button and Taglia were supportive of the increase to 8:00 P.M. Village President Abu-Taleb was not in favor of that, as the Village tried this once and had to change it back. However, he gave direction to proceed with that change.

Village Trustee Moroney asked how staff decided on \$3 after the first three hours. Ms. Grossman stated that this price point may encourage people to move their vehicle; it will be closely monitored to make sure the amount is enough for reasonable turnover of parking spaces. Village Trustees Moroney, Taglia and Andrews expressed support. Village Trustee Boutet liked the concept but noted that it needs to be made very clear in order not to upset people. Village Trustee Tucker agreed that some people may get upset, but he would like to see how it plays out. Village Trustee Button supported it but wanted to make sure it will not affect garages. Village President Abu-Taleb was supportive, as it offers people an option to stay if they choose, even at a premium. He gave direction for staff to proceed.

In regards to On-Street Day Parking, staff is recommending that existing restrictions made on a residential block by block basis be standardized to a three hour limit from 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. Vehicles displaying a valid vehicle sticker will override restrictions and allow residents to park on their block. Village Trustee Boutet expressed concern that this may be problematic for guests and household employees of residents.

Ms. Grossman discussed On-Street Night Parking. Existing permit spaces would stay the same, with the addition of the spaces on Madison Street and some diagonal parking on Pleasant. She noted that there was concern regarding expanding that parking without encroaching on residential streets. Staff would like to continue to review the overnight parking ban and permit parking ordinances to see if it is possible to add more spaces.

They may be bringing back recommendations regarding that. Village Trustee Button commented that those additional 93 spaces may be blocks away from some multi-unit dwelling residents and is not sufficient. She would like staff to come back with additional parking. Village Trustee Tucker agreed.

Ms. Grossman stated that the pass-parking system will remain unchanged. However, they would like to expand this to homecare workers, service workers, etc. She described the current permit procedure and asked if the Board wanted to limit that to one per household. Village Trustee Boutet stated that households that currently have two permits will be negatively affected. Ms. Grossman explained that currently, areas are initially sold/renewed as one per household. Any remaining permits are sold for second vehicles on a first come, first served basis. Second cars are never automatically renewed. She asked the Board for clarification if they prefer the system the way it is or change it. Village Trustee Boutet commented that residents need certainty and was opposed to changing it. Village Trustee Button agreed and asked what staff is doing to ensure that parking permit holders are given the best opportunity possible to maintain their parking spot. Ms. Grossman discussed how the new technology will improve that. Village Trustee Tucker also would like it to stay the same. Village President Abu-Taleb does not like that people have to spend half a day standing in line at Village Hall four times a year to renew a permit. Ms. Grossman again referred to the new technology. She discussed next steps. The target start date of the pilot will be early 2019.

**B.** [ID 18-917](#)

**Update on Options for a Dockless Bike Share Program in the Village of Oak Park**

Village Manager Pavlicek stated that on May 5, the Board directed staff to look at bike sharing alternatives.

Cameron Davis, Assistant Director of Development Customer Services, who has been working on the project explained how dockless (DoBi) systems operate. Unlike traditional bike sharing systems, there are no docking stations. Riders can find the bikes through a GPS smart phone app and unlock it through the app. When they are finished with their ride, they park and lock it in an appropriate place. It then becomes available for it's next customer. Mr. Davis stated that staff has researched bike sharing opportunities and found that several DoBi operators are interested in Oak Park. They are all privately funded so there is no cost to the Village. Staff has found through their research that DoBi operators should be regulated in order to mitigate any negative impacts. Working with stakeholders to develop a regulatory ordinance and permit procedure is the best way to ensure that operators meet certain standards. In addition, they have found that using multiple operators will allow for private sector competition to ensure a good quality of service. Staff has gathered documentation from other communities and has established a steering committee to develop the framework of the program. He gave a timeline of the program, which is expected to roll out in spring or early summer of 2019.

Village Trustee Tucker expressed support for the program.

Village Trustee Moroney expressed concern regarding bike pollution; it would be worthwhile to reach out to the parks, schools and libraries to perhaps use their facilities as designated parking stations (ponds). He also suggested reaching out to Forest Park and River Forest as partners in the program.

Village Trustee Andrews discussed connectivity to other areas. He also agreed with Village Trustee Moroney regarding ponds.

Village Trustee Button thanked Mr. Davis for addressing this and asked what companies

he has talked with and what amount of companies would be reasonable to work with at one time. Mr. Davis clarified that five companies have expressed interest. He would like to see at least two for the sake of competition, but wants regulations established first.

Village Trustee Tucker discussed infrastructure for biking and didn't want to lose focus on making the community more bike friendly.

Village Trustee Boutet spoke about the issue of bikes strewn all over the community and liked the idea of mandatory designated drop-off locations.

Village Trustee Andrews would like to see the companies' proposals for discounted rates for those who need them. He would like to ensure that access to the bicycles is easy and what their solutions are.

**C. [ID 18-918](#)**

**Unified Parking Technology Update**

Village Manager Pavlicek noted that it has been a multi-year process to update the technology. She gave an overview of old and new programs.

Ms. Grossman stated that staff did an RFP in November for a unified technology system for all parking processes. Nine proposals were received and five vendors were interviewed. Staff will be recommending Passport Parking as the preferred vendor due to their ability to link the on-street payment systems with a customized app that enables users to fulfill all of their parking needs in the Village. The contract will be forthcoming for approval on the first Regular Meeting in September. Staff is also looking to obtain equipment for the police to provide consistency.

Village Trustee Andrews raised the topic of push notifications being used for advertising to help pay for the app.

Village Trustee Boutet liked that this will help eliminate the line for permits. She asked how people without the app will operate. Ms. Grossman commented that the stations all accept cash and credit cards and there will still be staff at Village Hall to assist people.

Village Trustee Taglia asked what the budget for this is. Ms. Grossman gave a breakdown of costs and noted that they have stayed within budget.

Ms. Grossman described how the various components of the parking operations are linked.

**X. Adjourn**

**It was moved by Village Trustee Button, seconded by Village Trustee Boutet, to adjourn. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at 8:23 P.M., Monday, July 16, 2018.**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**MaryAnn Schoenneman  
Deputy Village Clerk**

The Village Board Goals for 2016-2017 included revisiting the overall parking systems within Oak Park in a holistic manner and with consideration for neighborhoods and business districts in order to understand the impact on residents, visitors and employees in the community. As a part of the study, staff will review the recommended goals for this review and a proposed schedule.

Additionally, the following Goals were established for review of the public parking system:

- Parking Ordinances must be simple and user friendly (e.g. language is clear and concise)
- Parking Signage of all types must be standardized and more streamlined so that residents, visitors and employees in Oak Park are able to understand regulatory language that may be required and directional information is clear and concise.
- Parking Technology must support efficient parking administration and operation while also being customer service focused.

After the July 10, 2017 Village Board Special Meeting, where the Board asked the Transportation Commission and Consultant Dixon Resources Unlimited to review a Pilot Area for a comprehensive review of the parking restrictions to determine if there were improvements that could be made in a comprehensive manner. The Transportation Commission began working with staff and consultant Dixon Resources Unlimited to determine the parking options that would help improve the parking experience in the Village of Oak Park. The idea of Odd/Even parking was significantly studied. Due to strong opposition from parkers who believe moving their car daily is a burden, personally and to the environment, the Transportation Commission looked at an additional concept known as the 72-hour rule. The community reaction was negative about both of these concepts, therefore, staff, the Transportation Commission, and consultant began working on a concept which closely kept the Village's existing rules but allowed for simplification and efficiencies. Most importantly the new set of recommended rules attempted to make the life of an Oak Park parker easier, while making the process of providing Village services on streets a more efficient process.

The Village Board held the following special meetings on the parking study:

Study Session 1 – January 2017: Pleasant Business District/South and Harlem Redevelopment Project/Gwendolyn Brooks Middle School, including Recommendations from the Transportation Commission Related to On-Street Resident Parking

Study Session 2 – February 2017: Parking Technology Best Practices.

Study Session 3 – March 2017: Parking Signage Recommendations.

Study Session 4 – May 2017: On-Street Parking Austin Blvd & Harlem Avenue, Including Adjacent Areas.

Study Session 5 – July 2017: On-Street Parking North Avenue and Roosevelt Road, Including Adjacent Areas.

Study Session 6 - May 14, 2018: Parking Pilot Discussion

The Village Board approved the following agenda items pertaining to the parking study:

June 19, 2017: A Motion to Amend the 2017 Work Plan for Transportation Commission to Include “Conduct Public Meetings for the Comprehensive Parking Study, Identify Community Needs and Develop Recommendations within the Approved Timeline in Conjunction with the Parking Consultant and Village Staff for Consideration by the Village Board”

June 19, 2017: A Resolution Approving an Amendment to the Professional Services Agreement with Dixon Resources Unlimited to Provide Parking Support Services for the Village-Wide Parking Study in a Total Amount not to Exceed

The Transportation Commission held the following meetings on the parking pilot program:

June 26, 2017: Introduction of Village-Wide Parking Study Consultant, Dixon Resources Unlimited

July 24, 2017: Update on the Village Wide Parking Study, Parking Near Transit (CTA & Metra Lines)

August 22, 2017: Open Parking Forums with Public and Consultant at Village Hall

-Over 30 Guests, Sharing Their Opinion on General Parking Problems in the Village Of Oak Park

August 23, 2017: Open Parking Forums with Public and Consultant at Village Hall

-Over 30 Guests, Sharing Their Opinion on General Parking Problems in the Village Of Oak Park

August 28, 2017: Discussion on the Village Wide Parking Study, Parking Near Transit (CTA & Metra Lines)

September 25, 2017: Update and On-Going Discussion of Parking Study

October 23, 2017: Update and On-Going Discussion of Parking Study

November 9, 2017: Parking Pilot Public Forum

-Presentation of Odd/Even Parking Concept and 72-Hour Rule

-Over 320 Guests in attendance during 2 Sessions

November 27, 2017: Review and Discussion of Proposed Parking Pilot

January 8, 2018: Review and Discussion of Proposed Parking Pilot Program

January 29, 2018: 2nd Parking Pilot Public Forum

-Presentation of New Standardization Parking Concept

-Over 140 Guests in Attendance during 1 Session

February 12, 2018: Review and Discussion of Proposed Parking Pilot Program

February 26, 2018: Final Staff Recommendation on Parking Pilot Program

April 23, 2018: Parking Pilot Program (Continued From February 26, 2018 Meeting)

April 30, 2018: Parking Pilot Program (Continued From April 23, 2018 Meeting)

May 14, 2018: Parking Pilot Program presentation to the Village Board.

July 9, 2018: Parking Pilot Program update with the Transportation Commission.

## **Parking Pilot Program Comments** **Nov. 10 – Dec. 8, 2017**

### **Parking in Oak Park**

Submitted by Lisa Ruhland on Fri, 2017-11-10 10:34

I attended the meeting on November 9 and listened to the proposal given by Dixon Resources Unlimited and to a number of those making comments and asking questions. I felt that the proposed 72 hour plan is preferred to the Odd/Even plan. I don't know how you can even think that you could propose a plan with only 1400 available parking spots when you have concluded that there are roughly 4500 residences. At least with the 72 hour plan, there are 3800 parking spots. I very much like living in Oak Park and parking is my only complaint and frustration about living there. I live at 1036 Washington Blvd and that location is ideal due to proximity to I-290 and also to Metra, CTA, and downtown. Due to the abundance of Multi-unit dwellings in this area, parking is difficult. And has become more difficult with the removal of a number of parking spots in front on my building and across the street. I don't think I should have to be stressed about finding a place to park when I am driving home. I believe that I should be able to drive to my home and park. I am mindful of the street cleaning days but feel that weekly street cleaning is going overboard. Maybe this could move to once a month.

In proposing the Odd/Even plan with only 1400 parking spots available, what would you have the remaining people do with their cars? Are you trying to say that people want to have a car they should live in a house with a garage or they should move out of Oak Park? That's what it feels like. Like I said, I love living in Oak Park and I don't want a single family home. When I moved in, I rented a parking spot in a lot which now has townhomes on it so I am parking on the street. And I am okay with parking on the street, I would just like to know that there will be a place for me to park my car.

### **Parking**

Submitted by Laura JN Rodriguez on Tue, 2017-11-21 07:56

I agree with all your proposals

### **Parking Pilot Program**

Submitted by Barry Jung on Fri, 2017-11-10 10:36

Several people at the 11/9 forum spoke in favor of the overnight parking ban and indicated they did "not want cars on MY STREET". The ban is an aesthetics issue, not one of safety, and it is pitting single family residents against condo/rental residents. I don't have children. Should I refer to schools as "YOUR SCHOOLS" when issues of new construction, teacher hiring, new programs are proposed? Should I tell parents those are YOUR schools, don't ask me to pay. This is supposed to be a COMMUNITY of the WHOLE not one of narrow interests. It should be OUR streets and OUR schools. There are those who say that demand will meet the supply if overnight parking is allowed. School demand is currently chasing and meeting supply but we don't penalize parents who have more than one child in school.

Eliminate the overnight ban and create the following truly simple resident parking plan: 1. issue upon request an on-street permit to any RESIDENT car owner (one permit per car), at cost (administrative cost only) 2. the permit would allow parking on any street subject only to



snow and street cleaning restrictions (and enforce the restrictions with tickets/towing) 3. c without permits would be subject to X hour time limits 4. raise the cost of the village vehicle sticker to cover the lost permit revenue.

The aesthetic of an overnight parking ban has long since lost any justification in equity in such a densely populated area as the WHOLE COMMUNITY of Oak Park.

Barry Jung

723 Erie Street 3C

[barry.jung@yahoo.com](mailto:barry.jung@yahoo.com)

708-763-0316

### I agree

Submitted by Kathleen Huttner on Fri, 2017-11-10 11:46

Wonderful idea !!

### I agree!

Submitted by Leila El-Badawi on Fri, 2017-11-10 22:07

I think the suggestion above is completely reasonable. The two plans suggested just don't seem feasible. If there were only 1,400 spots with the odd/even plan, I don't understand what the remaining residents are supposed to do. I feel that that plan should be completely excluded as it really does not work for the number of residents in the area. In regard to the 72-hour plan, I don't understand what is supposed to happen after 72 hours. Say that someone moves their car to another spot but it's in the same area, would they get a ticket?

Ultimately, it seems like Barry has come up with the best plan. Parking is a pain right now, but that's primarily because the construction limits the number of spots. If Oak Park stopped the construction and allowed residents to park on any street with a pass, parking would not be an issue.

### agreed, Barry Jung's plan is simpler than the proposals

Submitted by Shar Mac on Mon, 2017-11-13 16:40

The proposals are confusing and it's unclear what the benefits of overnight parking bans are in the first place. One sticker, park anywhere. Thanks, Barry!

### Couldn't agree more! Cheers.

Submitted by Laura K. on Fri, 2017-11-10 22:24

Couldn't agree more!

Cheers.

### Great idea

Submitted by Steph C on Sat, 2017-11-11 05:31

I wholeheartedly agree with Barry J's idea! I also agree that the Weekly street cleaning is excessive and seems to rarely happen as it is, two weeks a month seems more practical. I like the idea of issuing special permits for local business employees and opening up the meters by the train stations to all day. This would surely keep some commuters off the residential streets. Both plans appear to require an awful lot of moving around and having to keep track of what day a car was parked in a certain place and that just seems unnecessary. If I had to pick one, definitely the 72 hour as the odd/even limits parking spaces by so much.

### I agree

Submitted by Jennifer E. Bell on Sat, 2017-11-11 17:59

I totally agree with Mr. Jung. The overnight parking ban is outdated. I asked at the forum what actual data/research the Village is using to justify the overnight parking ban. There was no answer to this--only that this was the "status quo" and "this is a historical decision." The current density issue and the changing of Oak Park

from an suburb to urban center with increased highrises and reduced parking lots in the neighborhoods calls for a total reevaluation of outdated policies such as the overnight parking ban. There are more people who live in Oak Park besides single-family homeowners, and yet multiunit dwellers, many of whom own their condos and pay taxes, deserve the same respect that single family home owners get. We also have needs. The overnight parking ban is outdated and unrealistic considering the era we are living in. The proposed parking changes for our area are punitive and treat the multiunit residents of the Oak Park community like second-class citizens who are "lucky to have this option at all." The proposed changes are overly simplistic and only seem to address keeping commuters from parking in the area. The proposed changes do not do anything to actually improve the parking situation for residents who actually live in the area. I am against both of the proposed changes. Neither will work. Neither addresses the issue. This is just a "bandaid" instead of really analyzing other options and changing old policies which only appease the single family homeowners who don't even have a parking problem.

### **Parking**

Submitted by Simone on Wed, 2017-11-15 07:31

I agree with Barry! The 2 plans suggested are awful and we really need to do away with the overnight parking ban. I feel overnight parking bans work best in communities of mostly single family homes. Oak Park is densely populated and has a large number of condos and apartments so residents should be able to park on any street if they own a village sticker. This is the only plan that is fair to ALL residents. I already have to remember to move my car every Tues/Wed and park my car 5 blocks away (extended pass) when I'm out of town. Now this! It is ridiculous!!

### **Agreed with barry**

Submitted by Julie on Wed, 2017-11-15 10:50

This is the simplest solution. I've never lived anywhere that parking is so complicated for no reason. NO EVEN/ODD. I also like the idea of being able to purchase visitors passes like the city of Chicago has, for visitors over 4 hours. NO OVERNIGHT PARKING BAN. Its unrealistic and regressive and punishes those who can't afford single-family homes.

### **Agree!**

Submitted by Knelson on Thu, 2017-11-16 17:09

Agree!

### **overnight parking ban**

Submitted by Annette Miller on Mon, 2017-11-20 11:51

I totally agree with Barry Jung's suggestion. While I own a house with a detached garage, I very much resent paying a ticket for parking in front of my own house. I pay property taxes which should allow me to park in front of my own house on the rare occasion.

### **Yes!**

Submitted by Matt Cormack on Tue, 2017-11-21 14:52

Excellent Idea Mr. Jung!

### **Overnight parking ban is ridiculous in this day and age**

Submitted by SiDi Huang on Sat, 2017-12-02 23:00

3 nights a month for parking is simply lacking in a day and age where having a car for the commute is necessary for so many of us. Why is there a parking ban where I can't even park in front of my own house? As long as I have a village sticker, I should be able to freely park in front of my house and vacate the street for cleanings. Currently I am just penalized for having a car and no space to park it due to an archaic bylaw.

### **Residential Permit Pass**

Submitted by peter harlan on Fri, 2017-11-10 11:13

It was not discussed at the November 9 meeting about what the cost of the Residential/Visitor Permit would cost? Is it a yearly cost? And the 2 hour limit from 9am to 9pm (to park in front of your home/condo in a residential area) is absolutely unacceptable. Come on people, I really have to move my car every 120 minutes during the day?

### 2 hour limit for residents

Submitted by Loretta Olive on Wed, 2017-11-15 12:39

The 2 hour limit is a burden. Can't get the flu, can't work from home, can't take the el downtown for a day, can't just relax at home. You're bound to your car's parking requirements!

### Parking Pilot Program

Submitted by Kathleen Huttner on Fri, 2017-11-10 11:45

Barry Jung has the best idea yet !! Please take notice of what he outlined in his comment. It would surely satisfy a lot of people and potentially prevent a lot of people from leaving Oak Park.

### Suggestions

Submitted by Marc B. on Fri, 2017-11-10 12:44

Here a few suggestions that incorporate some of what is being proposed.

- 1.) I agree the two hour limit for non-residence is unacceptable for GUESTS of residence. I understand the need to deter commuters from parking all day on Oak Park streets then taking the 'L' downtown, but for guests this is more complicated. Three alternatives: apply the two hour limit to Mon. - Fri. only since most residence would have guests over on weekends (granted, this does nothing for residence who do not work on weekdays), implement a way for residence to register guests so they can stay parked longer, or change the limit from 2 hours to 4 hours. This still deters commuters but opens it up for guests bit.
- 2.) I'm not a big fan of either Odd/Even or 72-hr simply because you're forcing residence to constantly move and still fight for spaces. My proposal would be that, unlike now that requires us to move two days a week because of street cleaning (which they never do, by the way), change it two street cleaning once a month. On those days that street cleaning is in effect require no parking on one side during the day.
- 3.) Change the paid parking spaces near the 'L' stations back to all day instead of 3 hours. It generates money for the village as well as gets those people off residential streets.
- 4.) There was some discussion about the number of permits for residence and their cost. It was proposed that the first permit is one cost, and each additional vehicle permit is more expensive. There seemed some resistance to that so I would suggest perhaps two permits per household at the same cost, and any additional vehicle per household is more expensive. Example: the first two permits are \$75/quarter each while anything more then that is \$125+. Sorry, but not everyone in the house needs their own personal car.

5.) Also related to cost, there was concern regarding owners and/or employees of businesses and where they can park. I would suggest a special permit the owner of the business can purchase and provide to their employees that allow for parking in residential areas near the business.

Something obviously needs to be done and I applaud those working on it for trying to find common ground for a relatively difficult problem. As mentioned in the meeting last night there is no perfect solution and it's all about compromise.

#### **More headaches/no (much needed) parking solutions...**

Submitted by Laura K. on Fri, 2017-11-10 22:22

After recently taking away about 22 parking spaces on Washington between the west and east alleys of Wisconsin, as well as approximately 100-plus spots in the former YMCA parking lot in the lot behind Washington and Pennsylvania Avenue in the recent past, so the Village could earn more revenue on real estate taxes for all the townhomes they agreed to have built instead, AND hiring a professional consulting group to come up with supposedly better and more fair parking solutions, I am astounded by the proposed asinine solutions they seem to have come up with by merely placing more restrictions on people and parking than currently in place. There should be no need for anyone to have to move their car on a daily basis, nor every three days -- as a lot of people either do travel/vacation -- in order to accommodate for so-called street sweeping, which I haven't personally seen in at least two years, and/or supposedly making it harder for snow cleaning crews to get in and out. What about families w/babies having to park blocks away w/child carriers, elderly people who don't simply want to be dropped off at a door unassisted while their other companion parks the car?!

Luckily I have secured private parking, by the grace of God, since my car was declared a total loss after our mid-October flooding and the unlevel street due to all the construction around Washington/Wisconsin, but this still concerns me, especially for the guest parking proposed, nonsensical rules. I had asked MANY moons ago to get a light over here at Washington and Wisconsin, after countless accidents, including me and my former dog getting nearly struck by a car, only to be told by the Village that the light would be "too close to Harlem and would delay traffic; therefore a light would be put in at Home." Well, guess what? Now we have a light at Harlem, will have one at Washington, and already have one at Home. My only hope is that drivers will take alternate routes and not want to be stopped at every single light on Washington, backed up, with their fumes coming into my home with my windows open in the summer, as well as horns blowing at those who don't move fast enough for others' lack of patience. The Village cares about absolutely nobody except themselves and the kickbacks they get for awarding these contracts to others. It had already been publicly stated online how much we were intending/budgeted on spending for the light at the corner of Washington and Wisconsin versus what we are paying in reality.

What a real shame...

Shame on you, Village of Oak Park!!

#### **Parking Pilot Program**

Submitted by Gloria Hearn on Sat, 2017-11-11 07:57

I wanted to attend the meeting very much but didn't because I feared I would not get a parking spot when I returned back home. I have lived in Oak Park about 20 years and I enjoy living here. However parking has become a real challenge. Non residents (many working out at the YMCA, taking the trains or attending events) are allowed to park in the spots that the residents pay for.

When I come home from work or grocery shopping I have to circle the block several times just to find a park or park on another street. Then I have to remember to call in my car, otherwise I'll get a ticket. And whenever there is an event in the area, forget about it, I can't find a park. This just doesn't seem fair. Why do I have to call in my car when parking on another street when clearly I can't find a park on the street where I pay to park on?

Now because parking is allowed on both sides of the street, it's a REAL NIGHTMARE!

Someone hit my car while it was parked. There's no common courtesy anymore because people just refuse to slow down or pull over to the side just for a moment to allow another driver to pass. I really dread when we get a lot of snow.

Many people I know have moved because they could no longer deal with all the parking tickets and constantly having to move their cars. They refer to Oak Park as No Park.

I'm glad for opportunity for us to voice our opinions and will try to come up with suggestions. I would really like to stay in Oak Park and I'm hopeful the parking will get better.

#### **Y4 parking**

Submitted by THERESE DOYLE on Sat, 2017-11-11 08:11

Hello, Thank you for looking at the parking issue. I have lived at 836 washington for 3 years. Parking is a never ending source of frustration. I am a nurse midwife at Univ of Illinois Med Center and I work varied shifts - sometimes coming home at midnight - other times leaving at 430 am. Frequently I have to drive around and around looking for parking - always concerned with getting a ticket. Sometimes I have no choice but to park in an illegal area on Grove only to get a ticket - and I find it extremely frustrating. So much so that I am considering moving out of the area. One morning at 430 am I had to walk more than 1/2 block to my car - passing by a man sleeping on the sidewalk. Since Randolph is now open I need to walk through the alley at night to get to my apt. Isn't there a way to assign spots? The parking is NOT CHEAP - and the ticket costs add an additional burden - not to mention the anxiety - so many people park without consideration of others - taking up 2 spots when all parking is at a premium. Why can't Grove be opened up? Thank you  
Therese Doyle  
836 waashington Blvd

#### **residential daily visitor parking**

Submitted by Nora Abboreno on Sat, 2017-11-11 11:03

The main issue we have with parking is that guests can only park for two hours near our house (Oak Park Avenue). I am aware that this is an issue mainly with people who are home

during the day. That demographic, however, includes those who work from home and retired people. When you include the snow restrictions, I have friends that will not come to Oak Park at any time during the winter.

I would like to see a program similar to Chicago's. Residents buy a certain number of stickers each quarter. Displaying the sticker allows any car to park in a two hour restricted zone for an extended time (in the city that is 24 hours, but it could be 4 or 6 hours in Oak Park). People who do not want the stickers don't have to buy them.

Signage definitely has to be clarified. The snow restrictions in particular are poorly labeled.

#### [guest passes/hang tags: see Somerville, MA](#)

Submitted by Shar Mac on Mon, 2017-11-13 16:37

I love the idea of residents buying passes for visitors. I do like the temporary overnight passes you can obtain online, but the current system for temporary daytime passes is not efficient or convenient (you have to call the parking office before 8:00am, so if you miss the window you're out of luck). I would use a booklet of temp passes for when I'm sick or have a babysitter or relative stay for a few hours.

In Somerville, MA you can purchase a reusable guest pass that visitors display in their car. The pass is good for daytime hours only for a period of one year (or a quarter?). It is useful for businesses and individuals.

#### [Parking Pilot Program](#)

Submitted by Mark Blum on Sat, 2017-11-11 13:36

Barry Jung said it best!! If the village is trying to simplify parking for residents, they simply should issue a residential parking pass to all residents, who may park anywhere in the village except the central business district. We should scrap Y1,Y2,Y3,Etc. parking. A resident should be able to park their car anytime day or night on the street except when we have street cleaning or snow removal. It should be that simple. If you need to block out a few of the streets for the individuals who feel unsafe (the highfalutin powers-that-be on the single family streets) you can just install signs on those streets that say no parking on this street because the residents feel unsafe with cars parked overnight!! There is no reason to have this incredibly complicated parking system...let's go back to basics folks.

#### [Get rid of overnight parking](#)

Submitted by Duane James on Sat, 2017-11-11 21:37

I've been a resident of Oak Park for 10 years. It's a great home for my children but I can't afford to continue to pay for permits at night and the cost of living. Tickets being issued for residents that shop in Oak Park fund Oak Park as well as an active member in the 97 school district. An Oak Park resident sticker should be enough. My daughter is becoming a driver in the spring of 2018 and I won't be able to afford 2 overnight parking passes. I'm not fortunate enough to own a home with a garage in Oak Park

#### [Even/Odd](#)

Submitted by Elizabeth O. on Sun, 2017-11-12 20:32

It's hard enough remembering to go out and move my car on snow days. I can't imagine having to do this year-round. PLEASE do not choose an even-odd system!

#### [Even/Odd Days](#)



Submitted by Karen H. on Mon, 2017-11-13 12:02

I would like to suggest allowing residents who live in Oak Park to be able to purchase Village stickers which will allow you to park anywhere in Oak Park. Having to purchase a night sticker along with a Village sticker just to park your car on the street is becoming expensive. If you purchase a 24-hour sticker, you need to walk several blocks just to retrieve/park your car which is so ridiculous. My daughter attends UofI in Urbana and comes home for holidays/breaks/some weekends just to unwind and she shouldn't be penalized to park her car. It's very difficult remembering to move your car on Tuesdays and Wednesdays to the correct side of the street. I'm not too familiar with the snow parking ban but it seems to me that knowing what side of the street (odd/even) to park on when it's snowing is crazy. If it's snowing, most people would want to be inside their homes instead of outside driving around to find a parking spot. I'm a new resident in Oak Park and I find these procedures very hard to understand. I've received over 6 tickets since moving to Oak Park just because of the so-called parking bans/street cleaning restrictions for parking. I believe the Village makes a lot of money on parking alone. There is no need to discourage your residents who live in Oak Park with more ridiculous restrictions or having us pay more money than we are already paying. Thank you!

#### [Listen to Barry or build a garage](#)

Submitted by Katy Groves on Mon, 2017-11-13 22:50

Barry Jung's solution is the clear winner. There are also large lots of unused storefronts and space on Madison, including the old Robinson's, that could be made into a residential multi level garage with no restrictions. The spurious \$40 parking tickets I've paid since moving from a place with a garage in July should cover the costs of construction. The odd/even solution is monstrous and obviously a ploy to make the 72 hour plan seem generous and well-planned, which it is not. I am a single mother with an adorable one year old who works a second shift job as a therapist. Just tonight I had to take my child in the cold at 9pm for a three block walk home because there were no spots left on the non-street cleaning side of the street anywhere near our home at Madison and Kenilworth. Parking on the wrong side means I'd need to wake up early and leave my child alone in order to move my car, and I'm so worried about missing it that I barely sleep. Is the street cleaned weekly? No. I have one permit, one extremely small Honda Fit, family in the area, and only two major complaints about Oak Park: exclusionary and silly parking rules and weekly mail delivery. No one is going to move out of Oak Park if parking is expanded to be in front of their homes, but people will definitely leave Oak Park for farther west suburbs if you lose your progressive credibility and become a crowded and boring baby Hinsdale.

#### [I want to echo Barry Jung's](#)

Submitted by JP on Mon, 2017-11-13 23:52

I want to echo Barry Jung's and others comments. A simple village wide resident permit makes so much more sense than the Byzantine system currently in place.

If the odd even or 72 hour rules are adopted I can honestly say that I'll be moving out of the village. Parking is such a headache already, I am shocked that people were paid money to come up with such ridiculous options. I have never seen such a GREAT community make it so

difficult for non home owning residents. Oak Park likes to talk up their liberal and inclusive values, but anyone who can't afford a million dollar home with a garage is treated like a second class citizen. The simple suggestion made by Barry is a great opportunity to rectify this.

#### **Parking Pilot program**

Submitted by Echelon Jackson on Tue, 2017-11-14 16:22

I have been a Oak Park resident for over 11 years. And I have to say that the past 3 months have been the most frustrating. Since the parking spaces were removed in front of my building, to make way for unnecessary left turn lanes on Washington Blvd, I have been inconvenienced. During construction, I had to walk blocks just to get to my home. Many times, rushing from work just to get a so-called "good park". Or trying to figure out how to carry groceries in stages. Or delaying plans because I don't want to come home after a certain time because I'd have to park so far away late at night. Now, the village proposes these completely ridiculous odd/even or 72 hour programs. I am awe struck that this is even a consideration. I can not believe any reasonable person would think an odd/even parking option is fair to residents who pay to park!! And the 72 hr option is nearly as bad. PLEASE VILLAGE OFFICIALS: stop with the parking shenanigans. Stop pitting home owners against condo owners/renters of multi-unit buildings. Just stop the madness. If the option is to choose one or the other, I choose none. Keep the overnight parking ban in effect if this is really the best that you can come up with. These proposed pilot programs are not going to help Oak Park residents. These odd/even or 72 hr programs are unreasonable and do NOT solve our parking issues. They only make more people seriously consider leaving this village!!!

#### **Questions**

Submitted by Judith Warren on Tue, 2017-11-14 16:29

How much will the permits be? Paid quarterly or yearly? Yearly could be a hardship to those who aren't qualified for income. How do you plan to fit all the cars on an odd/even schedule? How many people deciding these things actually use the current permits and understand the issues from personal experience? Where do I put my car during vacation? It seems instead of simplifying for those who need overnight parking you are causing much stress.

#### **Look to other communities too**

Submitted by Daniel Lauber on Tue, 2017-11-14 17:40

As Oak Park's senior planner many years ago, I was told point blank by the Chief of Police that the overnight parking ban bore no relationship to preventing crime. The sole purpose, quite honestly, was as so many Oak Park leaders would say, "So we don't look like Chicago." (I'll skip over the many disgusting aspects of that attitude.)

Oak Park, however, should also look at how other higher density, inner ring suburbs have dealt with the overnight parking issue. When I lived in southeast Evanston, we went to an even-odd overnight parking regime when it snowed -- otherwise you could park on both sides of the street overnight. To avoid the expense of posting signs for each street cleaning, a two-hour time period one day a week was designated no parking for street cleaning purposes. It worked.



I hope that Oak Park's leadership won't make overnight parking more complicated than it is to be. And I hope that anybody who opposes easing this inexcusable ban be asked whether they rent spaces on their property to others. In the past, there have been village trustees who rented out spaces thanks to the overnight ban who voted to continue the ban rather than recuse themselves due to this obvious conflict of interest which had financial implications for them.

By the way, there is even less of an excuse for banning overnight parking in River Forest. But with the paucity of multifamily housing (especially affordable housing), I don't have high hopes that any relaxation or elimination of this needless restriction has a chance in hell.

So kudos to Oak Park's leadership for finally doing something about this. Hopefully they will not yield to the regressive elements who seem to treat residents of multifamily buildings as second class citizens.

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Brandi Carson on Tue, 2017-11-14 20:51

I attended the meeting on November 9, and I just want to start by first saying thank you for sharing the information and for seeking resident feedback. I feel like the conversation was helpful and much needed, and I really appreciated what everyone had to contribute.

I would agree with most of my neighbors who spoke with the concern regarding an odd/even program. Like most of them, I do not understand how an odd/even situation would be helpful or what "problem" it's even solving. I currently pay \$540 a year to park on the streets near my apartment building. Potentially having to move my car whenever I'm home (sick, vacation, late work day start, etc) during restricted daytime hours sounds like a punishment I'm paying a steep amount for. I guess my main question would be...why should residents who PAY to park their cars have to move them in the first place? I understand moving my car for cleaning and snow, but I think what we have now for that works just fine. I can also see why there may be daily/hourly restrictions for visitors in some situations, but why as a resident who displays the proper sticker should it matter which side of the street I park on when I'm paying to do so? I think one of the questions asked on the evening of Nov 9 was "how long is too long for a resident to be parked on the street?" My answer to that would be that if I'm paying to park my car by my residence, and I don't own a garage, what is the alternative? I have lived in Oak Park for 13 years. I work as a home visiting therapist...serving children with disabilities. I have to have a car for my job. I live in a studio apartment in an apartment complex. I do not have access to a garage. The issue to me is not in resident parking during the day; it is not having enough spaces to park as a resident in the evening. I have found myself many a time having to call in my car to park on a residential street (not in my zone parking area) because depending on when I get home in the evening all the spots are taken or people have not parked in a way that allows for all space to be utilized.

In a general statement, I really worry about my future in Oak Park. I absolutely LOVE living here, and I feel like I'm a person who does her part to add value to this community. But I worry

that with the growth and expansion, I'm also going to be one of the first people to be pushed out of a community I can no longer afford. I do not make a lot of money, but I'm pretty sure I fall into that category of "well, you make too much to get assistance".

Thank you for your time in reading these comments and considering the concerns. I really hope that if a parking pilot is implemented in 2018, that it addresses the true parking issues that we currently have and it does not make unnecessary and punishing changes to residents who pay for parking and call Oak Park home.

#### **Parking Pilot Feedback**

Submitted by Bruce DeViller on Tue, 2017-11-14 22:17

After attending the 8:00 PM meeting I did not come away with as much info as I expected. The consultant sped through the presentation, which I know was intended to allow as much time for feedback. But it was difficult to offer informed feedback with such little information. And with no time-limit enforcement on each person's chance to vent, few had the opportunity to ask for greater details.

It wasn't clear how the odd/even option creates more spaces (if that was the message). On the surface it would seem that such a plan would diminish available spaces by at least half.

The 72-hour option seems to mean that permit holders would need to frequently jockey their vehicles, which somehow would make room for other vehicles. To where are permit holders moving their vehicles if not to another space within the permitted area? This option adds a lot of "busy work" to residents who don't move their vehicle almost everyday (like many did in past days of traditional M-F, 9-5 jobs). Today many residents require a vehicle even if that requirement does not involve driving it every day. (e.g., telecommuters, part-timers, "gig economy" workers)

The same is true with the 3-hour limit. If I don't drive to work everyday, am I moving my car two or more times in a single day just to avoid ticketing? Or, what if I get home @ 5:30 pm, and the permit hours don't begin until 9:00 pm? Am I at risk of citation from 8:30 - 9:00? The benefits of an expensive permit seems greatly diminished.

I understand and agree that the current rules and regs are complex and complicated, and we would all prefer better solutions. I don't know that these proposed options are the best options.

(Less complicated than this problem is knowing that Oak Park is a village and not a city. The presentation materials shared with villagers should reflect that knowledge, and help the esteemed consultant avoid being tagged as a carpetbagger.)

#### **Parking on Pleasant**

Submitted by MJohnson on Tue, 2017-11-14 23:50

I have been in Oak Park for over 25 years but recently moved into apartments near Mills Park on Pleasant (between Marion and Home). It has been extremely frustrating finding a place to

park when I arrive home late evenings. I do not understand the many restrictions when there are several places to park right outside my building...but it is not for "overnight parking". I find it quite confusing and frankly do not understand the restrictions. I live on a street with the new signage---don't get how it is legal to park in back of the sign, but you get a ticket if your car is just in front of the same sign. Huh??

My suggestion is to simply eliminate the overnight ban. Since this IS a pilot program...try something totally different (NOT the odd/even street musical chairs). Of course if the pilot program is not successful---try your PlanB. To simply move cars to different sides of the street is not very innovative and not sure why something that simplistic needs to Pilot.

My bigger concern when parking late at night is safety. I am a single female and walking a few blocks in the dark I think is more dangerous for OP residents than some cars on the street. I would not mind paying more for my vehicle sticker if I am able to park closer to my residence.

Thank you for this opportunity to share ideas on this matter.

#### [Parking Pilot](#)

Submitted by Angel on Wed, 2017-11-15 13:49

I would rather do the 72-hour proposal or keep it as it is right now. With the new signs & how they have it set up in my area (near Washington & Clinton) finally works better than in prior years. Anything is better than what it was. But the even/odd will not & does not work.

#### [Parking](#)

Submitted by Kristen on Thu, 2017-11-16 14:46

As a resident of Oak Park for the last seven years, parking has been a constant headache. I feel that I pay a lot of money, but I do not know what I am 'getting' for that money. I walk a block or two to get to my lot from my house and other non-permit cars park in my lot constantly with seemingly no or little repercussion.

If the Village does not care who parks in the lot, then why am I paying \$215 a quarter? If they do care, then signs need to be clear, and tickets should be issued out of respect for the residents. (To be clear, there is TONS of non-resident parking by my lot. I am not trying to sound territorial, but, again, I am paying for this 'privilege'. I would park in the non-resident parking, but I cannot leave my car there overnight.)

I am hopeful that the Village is requesting these comments, and I am thankful for the conversation. I trust they will do what is best to respect the residents, our guests, and the mission of beloved Village.

#### [Parking zones](#)

Submitted by Knelson on Thu, 2017-11-16 17:02

If the zones are opened up to a wider area, then anyone within the zone with a sticker can park on the streets by the el stops. This is going to be a new nightmare for those folks close to the commuter lines with parking as well as increased traffic-especially if the owner of the

parking pass can easily change the license plate associated with it. It will be much worse on the weekends too, etc. Someone suggested opening up the metered spots to all day. That makes sense plus encourage the garages close by.

#### **Pilot program not a solution**

Submitted by Dawn on Thu, 2017-11-16 19:45

If it comes down to the odd/even days or 72-hour approach, I vote keep what we have. Those are the only two choices? You can do better!!

We keep paying for these parking studies and it only gets more expensive, restrictive and complicated for those of us who don't have garages or driveways. Stop penalizing us.

My first choice is to eliminate the overnight parking ban. Second, don't make us move our cars continually. Think about how you'd feel if you had to do that. That's right, give up your garage or driveway and do what I have to do by parking on the street. I already fight for parking as it is.

I've lived in the village nearly 20 years and this is the third time I've been asked to submit my opinions and every time, it's the same old story. Those of us who live in multi-tenant buildings are paying out the nose for the "privilege" of parking on the street and ask to eliminate the overnight bans and the homeowners who have garages and driveways win. The overnight ban stays. I'm paying nearly \$700 a year for the "privilege" of parking on my street and it's a total hassle. I already have to move my car twice a week for so-called street cleaning that never happens. A week ago, there were so many leaves piled up, I finally threw them out in the middle of the street to force cleaning. Ding! It worked.

Third, make enforcement consistent and stop giving exceptions to people at random. There are three people who live in my building in the Y9/A6 zone that each drives his/her own car and park without restrictions 24/7 on the A6 "resident" side of the street and at least one of the three does not have any permits. I can't park there 24/7. So why is it that you're making exceptions like this? In other words, you're allowing a couple of multi-tenant people to park in the "residential" zone around-the-clock 365 days a year. I'd sure love to be able to do that. That's a pretty sweet deal. Jennifer is aware -- I've spoken to her about it. Still, nothing changes.

Meanwhile, the parking fees increase \$5 each quarter consistently. So next quarter, I'll be paying even more while the neighbors who park on the A6 side day and day out pay nothing -- and don't get tickets.

Fourth: Since you're not cleaning our street regularly (I often work from home, so I know you're not), adjust your schedule and stop making us move for no reason. Stop with the pretense of cleaning.

Bottom line: If you continue to make it more difficult and expensive for me to park, I will move elsewhere. Adding an odd/even rule or 72-hour rule fits that description. You're literally driving people away.

#### **The pilot sounds worse**

Submitted by Stephanie on Sat, 2017-11-18 15:58

Both of the proposed ideas sound like they will be worse than the current situation. The odd/even plan seems to eliminate MORE spaces. How is that even considered an option? The 72 hour plan sounds completely ineffective as someone can just move their car to another space nearby for another 72 hours. How can either of these ideas even be considered as options? They're both terrible.

I live near Mills Park and it's insane that you can't park on Pleasant Street overnight. Why? Why do I pay so much money to walk blocks back to my apartment late at night (if I can find a space, that is), only to see the street in front of my building is completely empty! Why won't the city prioritize the safety of its residents by opening up parking on that street, or any of the other streets where parking is currently banned?

I find it very hard to believe these two options are the best that the city can provide as solutions to this problem.

When will a decision be made about these programs? My lease is up in the spring and if we have to do either one of these pilot programs, I'm moving out of Oak Park.

#### **Pilot doesn't seem to solve anything**

Submitted by JC on Mon, 2017-11-20 09:08

I am in a single family home on a residential street that typically is filled with parking from non-residents during the day (hospital is just a block away). It doesn't really bother me since we park in our garage. What I like about our current parking rules is that when we have folks over for dinner, Thanksgiving, Christmas, etc., they have plenty of street parking without having to worry about moving the car. With the proposed parking rules, they can only park for two hours. And then where would they go? So they have to run out of Thanksgiving dinner to park on another street? Totally doesn't make sense.

By the way, your "weekly" leaf pickup does not occur on a weekly basis.

#### **2 Hour Parking Restrictions**

Submitted by Ken Munz on Mon, 2017-11-20 09:51

2 hour restrictions for parking will create problems for the residents who have guests visiting. I am against it or at least make it M-F and not on weekends.

#### **K.I.S.S.**

Submitted by JPerez on Mon, 2017-11-20 16:46

I moved to Oak Park nearly 5 years ago and wholeheartedly regret my decision because of the ridiculous parking situation. I've paid thousands of dollars to park on a main street near my

home. I've had 3 cars hit (1 totaled) while parked on this main street, so you can tack on the cost of repairs and a new car to that. This pilot only serves to further complicate a system that is already too complicated and wholly unnecessary (if the overnight parking ban is truly not about crime prevention, as another commenter mentions).

#### Here's a thought....

Submitted by MJohnson on Mon, 2017-11-20 22:06

We all know that the parking ban will be relaxed during the Thanksgiving holiday---why not see how it works with no ban as Oak Parkers can simply park their cars as needed!

Since your meeting is just after the holiday, assess the street during the ban hours and let's see if mayhem exists. I know it is only for a few days, but why not utilize this 4day weekend as a 'pilot' to see if removing the ban makes a big difference on the street.

I know it's not "The Purge" but hey...let's see if we can survive without a ban for four days! ;-)

#### Another One Bites the Dust

Submitted by Cheryl on Mon, 2017-11-20 22:58

After seeing both proposals for parking, I regret my decision on purchasing a condo in Oak Park. I have been a resident for the past few years and have been hunting for a new town to live in due to all this parking non-sense. We live in a household of 2 working people that each need a car. Sometimes you get sick or work from home. I really do not think either plan is conducive to this. We pay enough money to park our cars on the street without these weird parking plans. Now we are going to add confusion to the mix? I thought the goal was to lessen confusion of parking, not make it more complicated and frustrating.

Do the proposers of the two new parking ideas actually park their cars in Oak Park on the street? Both ideas sound awful and very impractical. The odd/even plan only allows 1 permit per household. If this gets implemented, I believe many people will move out of oak park if they are a 2 household working family. It isn't feasible. Plus moving your car everyday sounds horribly tiresome. The 72 hour plan how will anyone be able to monitor if people are actually moving their car? It seems hard to enforce, so what is the point? If I got a ticket for having my car in the same spot for 72 hours, I would contest it and say I moved it and it happened to fall on the same spot.

Sounds like Barry introduced a simpler idea to the village. Maybe the village should consider taking a step back and listen to their residents who actually park their cars on the street to see how it would change their day-to-day lives.

I hope these comments are actually read and taken into consideration by the proposers.

#### Y4 - Parking BAD PROPOSAL for any zone - 72h or odd/even

Submitted by Mareczku on Tue, 2017-11-21 08:37

Barry Jung has the best idea yet. It is simple and easy to understand. Also cleaning street doesn't happen every week Tuesday/Wednesday . I would say ones or twice a month is OK.

Many families with kid or kids have two cars and prefer to park as close as possible to their home or apartment but school events are nightmare during school year. I got tickets for not



parking in my zone , but I parked in my zone next to the sign or a few meters behind sign. I am not in favor of proposal and PILOT program - badly done . Barry Jung has the best idea yet.

#### **These “new” ideas are more of the same**

Submitted by C. May on Tue, 2017-11-21 08:48

We live on a quiet one way residential street that's half houses, half multi family building and inexplicably have 2 hour parking all the time even though parking is not particularly highly in demand. Then I have a friend on the other side of town who has no parking from 8-10 on her entire street and for several blocks on either side which means no one can visit her at all between 8-10. But why? We all know the current rules are random and confusing. Even/odd and 72 hour plans will be more of the same. The comments on these proposals are overwhelmingly against either of these new pilot ideas. Just because you paid someone to come up with them doesn't mean you HAVE to try them. They're just more of the same. Since it's a pilot program, try something truly revolutionary and simplify the whole thing to one permit sticker as Barry Jung suggested. It would be less of headache for residents AND the village!

#### **I attended the meeting on 11**

Submitted by L. Larsen on Tue, 2017-11-21 10:50

I attended the meeting on 11/9 and also have attended many a transportation meeting or other meetings to express my opinion on the parking. And my feeling is no matter what we say on here or at meetings it will just fall on deaf ears. If we live in multi unit buildings or condos then we are 2nd class citizens to anyone in a house even though all buildings pay property taxes in Oak Park, yet the people in houses who typically have garages get to determine who, how and when everyone else parks on the street. There is no "safety" issue for cars being parked on the street. The safety issues lies in having to walk blocks from you car to your house in the dark. The two recommendations are both jokes. Neither will help it just will cause more confusion. I agree with Barry Jung's ideas. We pay a premium to park on the street in Oak Park and for a lot of us its a giant hassle especially when you come home to no spot and no one enforcing it. I also hate having to call the police all the time to tell them to ticket in the area that I park as this still does not open up a parking space to me. And forget when downtown oak park is having an event because either you can't move your car all weekend or come home till the event is over because NO ONE reads the signs and just park in all the permit areas. All downtown events should be using the garages not allowing people to take our parking on the street. Same with the YMCA, they need to tell members to park in their lot or at meters not in the permit areas. The recommendation needs to be to simplify the parking not make it more complex for the residents of the community. The overnight parking ban needs to go.

#### **Big picture and bottom line**

Submitted by Encourage Civility on Tue, 2017-11-21 12:10

1) Any new parking 'solution' that doesn't generate more permitted spaces is a failure. In addition to meeting demand, more permitted spaces are needed to cover the expense of new signage, consultant fees, and enforcement. Someone with line-of-sight to the finances needs

to determine the minimum number of new spaces needed to break-even within 1-3 years (without adding cost per vehicle).

2) Less people would drive (or need parking) if Pace bus connections were more frequent and reliable. The buses bunch up and are delayed during afternoon rush hour; it only takes me only 20 minutes to get in from the Medical District by train, and then the Pace bus is ~45 minutes away in Oak Park - RIDICULOUS. If we can do a better job of connecting people to-and-from the THREE rail lines that cross Oak Park we can significantly reduce our driving/parking dependency. For the few times a month where a car would be absolutely necessary, there are zip cars and uber/lyft. This won't work for everyone, but some cars can be eliminated.

3) Meters and non-permitted-street-parking near rail lines should not be extended to all day - we need to encourage car-to-rail commuters to use (pay) our village parking lots and garages, like the one near the Oak Park Green Line stop. Our tax dollars continue to pay for these structures whether or not they are used. Moving commuters to the garages also improves residents' ability to find parking in our permitted zones.

#### Leave the parking rules alone

Submitted by Pete on Tue, 2017-11-21 12:57

What is wrong with the current parking rules? You should move on to more pressing matters, like lowering property taxes.

#### Absurd parking rules and regulations bordering insanity

Submitted by Hal on Wed, 2017-11-22 15:37

This is INSANE! Village with a small footprint has a complicated web of rules spelled out in 120 parking ordinances with more than 10,000 signs (hard to decipher) throughout the Village. When we moved here we were shocked with the fact that regardless of having a parking sticker or not, we could not park in front of our residence! This exhibits a total lack of practical mindedness and care of it's own residents from an out of control village management and elected officials! Car owners and especially renters are treated like second class citizens! Regardless of its attractions things of this nature will force many people out of this village.

#### Parking

Submitted by Anonymous on Sun, 2017-11-26 22:54

I was not able to attend the meeting, but these are issues I have with the parking in Oak Park.

(1) Parking on both sides of the street in Oak Park is absurd when the streets are typically not wide enough to begin with. Quite often, you cannot get down the street without almost hitting another car (either moving or parked) it's so tight or a delivery truck is blocking the street and you have to BACK UP almost the entire block and turn around because you cannot get by.



(2) Not sure what the 8am - 10am No Parking Monday thru Friday sign is for on Home Ave. the time that I have lived here, I have not seen any work done during that time when I'm home other than tickets being given out.

In the two years that we have lived here, we've noticed that parking in general is a headache.

#### **Feedback on Recommendations for Parking Pilot Program**

Submitted by David Baker on Mon, 2017-11-27 17:17

Dixon Resources Unlimited defined the parking problems the Village is attempting to solve this way during the public forum on Nov. 9th

- Confusion surrounding parking guidelines and restrictions
- Inconsistent signage
- Enforcement challenges
- Commuters and employees of local business parked in residential districts
- Lack of spaces for residents

My primary interest is in the lack of spaces for residents, a problem I fear will grow worse following the October 4th mailing to some Overnight Zone Parking Permit Holders which limited renewals to 1 parking permit per household and required residents seeking a second permit to apply in person on November 2nd and in each quarter thereafter.

It is hard for me to understand why the Village concluded it is practical and fair to its tax paying residents to limit a household – which frequently consists of 2 working adults each with a vehicle - to 1 parking permit. And, as surprising, it creates a situation where residents must wait in line in the pre-dawn hours at Village Hall for the chance to gain a second parking permit with no indication – in the mailing piece - as to the remedies available if a second parking permit isn't granted. There must be a better way. The last time I waited in line like this was for concert tickets, and the year was 1988. I hope the Village will revise this practice as it seems punitive and needlessly burdensome to Oak Park residents.

Having said that, the lack of parking spaces for residents is a problem we've created through our existing parking rules and regulations. The Odd/Even and 72 Hour recommendations presented during the public forum are solutions to a problem we, collectively, as a Village, have manufactured. I argue the lack of parking spaces is not due to a shortage of inventory but instead stems from the Village's prior decisions to limit the available inventory. Simply put, the constraints placed on parking inventory are of our own making. They are artificial. The conversation we had during the public forum, in fact, confirmed the current parking guidelines and restrictions were implemented in response – at least in part - to a vocal constituency of single family homeowners. However, the argument articulated against expanding parking inventory, as shared during the public forum, included vague assertions regarding safety and reinforced the supposed importance of the Overnight Parking Ban. And this is where I get confused. Our decision-making should be based on data not just anecdotal evidence or the position advocated by the loudest voice in the room.

The purpose of the Overnight Parking Ban, as I understand it, is to keep people out of Oak Park during the overnight hours who are not residents of Oak Park or guests of residents with an overnight parking pass. The repeated reference to the Overnight Parking Ban in the context of this conversation to expand available parking for Oak Park residents who pay, at last count, \$520 annually per parking permit for the privilege of parking - on the street - distracts from the problem we, as a Village, are trying to solve.

Each recommendation looks as if it has been pulled "off the shelf". The process by which the consultant arrived at these recommendations wasn't made clear during the public forum nor was data shared to explain why these recommendations - among others that may have been considered - would lead to the best outcomes for residents. Neither recommendation meets the unique needs of our community or appears likely to fix the problems the Village seeks to solve.

The Odd/Even and 72 Hour recommendations claim to increase the inventory of available parking spaces from 1000 to 1,400 and 3,800 spaces respectively. However, many of the parking spaces included in these new inventory counts are south of Madison, far from residents of multi-unit dwellings who need them. How is either recommendation expected to benefit residents in practice? It isn't clear.

More simply, how does it benefit the residents of Oak Park who pay \$130 per quarter right now for the privilege of parking on a public street to also have to move their car every 24 or 72 hours? I argue it doesn't. Again, instead of creating benefit for residents the provisions make residential parking experiences more of a hassle. Moreover, the recommendations don't seem to have contemplated people working from home, traveling for work or leisure for a few days or those residents who may enjoy a long Thanksgiving weekend at home, thankful they don't have to drive and instead can enjoy walking around Oak Park.

Perhaps less often talked about, how do single family home owners with garage spaces and outdoor parking in alleys benefit from the expansion of street parking in Oak Park? They don't.

Many single family home owners won't benefit from such an expansion because they rent parking spaces to residents of multi-unit dwellings at a rate as much as 3x the cost of the quarterly parking permit from the Village (or more). There's an incentive problem which may explain some of the resistance to expand the inventory of available parking. The resistance by some may be more about money than safety or aesthetics.

I urge the Transportation Commission to reject each of the recommendations for the Parking Pilot Program presented during the public forum. I think many of us impacted by the proposed rules agree each recommendation fails to balance the interests of all residents of Oak Park. Please continue to engage residents until, together, we create an equitable solution that does.

### **An alternate proposal**

Submitted by Mike Stewart on Wed, 2017-11-29 00:32

I currently serve as a volunteer on the Transportation Commission for 3+ years.

I would like to thank the Parking Consultant and all of the residents that came to our parking forum and gave public and online comments. During our meeting last night I expressed opposition to the Odd/Even and the 72 Hour proposed plan as presented. I currently own a home, but I have rented here in Oak Park for about 8 years. I have used the Village system and paid for overnight parking during that time period.

After listening to the 150+ public comments and many of the online comments I expressed an alternate proposed pilot plan at our Transportation Commission Meeting last night.

Here are the details of the plan that I proposed.

A: Change the restriction to allow current metered parking to accommodate overnight permit holders after the current adjacent businesses hours. This would add approximately 130+ new overnight parking spots to the proposed pilot area.

B: The proposed area of the plan would be scaled back to include the current Y2+Y3+Y4 parking zones. I would propose to combine these three zones into one proposed zone for the study period of 6 months(2 parking quarters) This area is about 75-80% of the original proposed plan. This area would Our commission did an extensive multi-year study of this dense parking area and identified approximately 75 new overnight parking spaces, of which about 50 were added to this area in the recent past.

C: Improve signage to be clear and concise and easy to read and understand.

D: Offer consistent and comprehensive enforcement of the parking rules and regulations.

E: Keep the existing 8-10 AM restrictions to discourage commuter parking on the streets and areas adjacent to the El/Metra.

F: Reduce the weekly street sweeping parking restriction to every 2 or 3 weeks or as recommended by the street department. This would be in line with the actual need and practice of street sweeping.

G: Keep the current rules on moving cars as needed for snow and leaf removal.

H: Keep the current 24-hour off street parking lots in this area and look to identify more off-street areas to expand the number of 24-hour parking spots.

I: Increase public education to detail how the overnight and 24-hour parking system works and add technology to make it easier for consumers to reserve and pay for parking permits.

J: Work on relationships with owners of private parking spots to try to add them to the current overnight and 24-hour parking availability in the near future.

My proposal would not recommend adding the 2-hour time limit where there is not a current day-time restriction. I do not recommend adding new time restrictions on Sundays. My proposal removes a small area from the previous proposed area that is mainly residential area that is not in high demand for overnight parking. We have heard from many overnight parkers that they do not want to walk more that 1-2 blocks to park. The current Overnight and 24 hour permit holders in this proposed combined zone are also very familiar with the current Village permit system.

I believe that this proposal more than satisfies the current demand for overnight parking that is not met by the current supply in this dense area of the Village. The Village staff estimated that there are approximately 20-40 parking spots that are in need to meet the current demand/shortfall.

This is just a first draft proposal and I hope to get feedback on this plan and ideas to improve it. Thanks.

#### Overnight Parking

Submitted by James Gates on Wed, 2017-11-29 14:46

Count me as an emphatic NO to the proposed pilot. I attended and offered Public Comment at the 11/27/17 Transportation Commission meeting. I thanked the volunteer commissioners for their conscientious public service, but when the meeting adjourned around 10:00 PM, I was more convinced than ever that the required due diligence in a number of areas from logistics to technology to plus/minus revenue risks to a lack of any statistically significant data on resident input on the pilot program or "easing" parking in Oak Park has simply not been done to anything but a cursory degree. I want to be clear that I do NOT fault the Transportation Commission for this due diligence miasma. This is a rush to action without thoughtful concern for the impact on the character of the village or the efficacy of the action. I expect much more responsible stewardship from the elected officials I helped vote into office. So, add me to the residents who oppose any "easing" of the overnight parking ordinances. The actual place to look at overnight parking ordinances is to start enforcing the ones already in place. Our block has first-hand experience with the fact that there is no fidelity to enforcing these ordinances. I have no confidence that a much more complicated overnight parking process would be enforced.

#### The suspense is killing me....

Submitted by Kn on Wed, 2017-11-29 17:04

I wasn't able to attend the transportation committee meeting. It seems that the results are being kept quiet!???

#### Overnight parking

Submitted by Robert Becker on Thu, 2017-11-30 14:06

Please do NOT permit overnight parking in my block (300 block of S Grove Ave). It would harm the quality of life for neighbors and offer no benefit to anybody who lives near here.

Also please consider the parking situation on Randolph between S Grove and Harlem. When cars are parked on both sides of the street it is impossible to drive through without stopping or risking a collision. There is not enough room for parked cars on both sides and two lanes of traffic.

#### Parking

Submitted by Scott on Sun, 2017-12-03 21:36

Vote to keep parking rule status quo. I believe concerns over crime and esthetics are valid. I also do not want my street looking like a Chicago city street. People who bought or rent in multi-family dwellings knew or should have known the deal when they moved in. They are free to leave.

#### Parking Pilot and Easing

Submitted by James Gates on Mon, 2017-12-04 08:04

The Parking Commission has heard from a sector of the village, a high density apartment sector with a forum at Brooks Middle School. This forum drew 150 attendees or 0.288461538% of Oak Park's population. As there will be other forums on the topics of a pilot and easing, I assume, in the interest of objectivity and a desire to receive diverse perspectives on these topics, future forums will not be held at Brooks MS. I further assume that future forums on these topics will be hosted and moderated by the duly elected trustees of the village of Oak Park, with the citizen volunteers on the Transportation Commission in the audience. In the meantime, the trustees might want to review current village codes that allow apartment building owners and apartment / condo developers to maintain/create more rental units than they can provide 2 parking spaces for per tenant.

#### **Proposed changes**

Submitted by Jessica L. on Fri, 2017-12-08 09:42

I think both proposals (odd/even and 72 hours) are completely ludicrous and unnecessary changes. I live at Washington and Kenilworth and our parking situation is always tight. I have to worry about coming home too late and parking 2 or more blocks away, which is not fun in the winter. In terms of parking restrictions, the Tuesday/Wednesday street cleaning is enough to keep track of. I would even go so far as to propose that street cleaning be every other week but the current regulations are the maximum reasonable amount of car shuffling. In a way, it is good to make sure cars get moved periodically because sometimes we don't park very efficiently. There are 7 spots in front of my building if we are all very conscious of how we park. 90% of the time, only 6 cars fit. I would love to have some very discreet lines painted on the curbs for parking spaces but I know many people oppose that, feeling it will make our streets ugly. I still think it would help as I am often times very frustrated at people parking in such a way that useless half-spots are left at the edges or between cars. Parking can be a real headache in Oak Park and I fail to see how either of these new proposals will do anything but add to the hassle.

## **Parking Pilot Program Comments**

### **Feb. 1 – March 6, 2017**

# Comments

### **Parking Pilot Proposed Change to Time of Metered Parking**

Submitted by Robert Larson on Thu, 2018-02-01 08:30

I was at the presentation on January 29th. The presentation slide indicated that metered parking would now end at 8PM rather than 6PM. This was not indicated as a change in the presentation. I am strongly opposed to this proposal. This change would hurt both the area restaurants as well as their customers. It also looks like a cheap money grab by the Village. It also looks like the Commission tried to sneak this change through without highlighting it in their presentation.

### **Time change to metered parking**

Submitted by Beverly Forbes on Thu, 2018-02-01 11:48

I agree with Mr Larson. Changing the time to 8PM would hurt the restaurants and any one shopping in the area after work

### **Extension of metered parking to 8 PM**

Submitted by Roberta Arnold on Thu, 2018-02-01 16:10

I agree with the comments above: the restaurants and shops in our area will suffer as a result of the extension of metered parking from 6 PM to 8 PM. This is not a business-friendly change and I cannot believe it will really help Village finances in a substantial way. It's lose/lose!

### **6 pm vs 8 pm**

Submitted by Greg O'Brien on Thu, 2018-02-01 16:49

I agree with the two previous comments. Where did the 8 pm time come from. In the area municipalities or even Chicago I have always seen 6 pm. 8 pm seems odd and a point of probable misunderstanding.

I am also a bit confused as to where these areas will be. I find it hard to understand why, with our tax base, we even pay to patronize the downtown area. Do any of the business owners have any input here?

### **The commuters are going to park all day for free! :(**

Submitted by k on Thu, 2018-02-01 17:42

The commuters and downtown shoppers/festival visitors are going to park all day for free!!! Is that what we want?

Lifting the 8-10 parking ban is going to cause craziness by the commuter lines which is already crazy when the Economy Shop is open. Please lift the ban ONLY for current resident AND their visitors (with an approved pass - and don't limit the passes - that's a ridiculous rule) and not to the entire village.

This is going to be a tremendous amount of manpower to manage this.

#### Daytime Restrictions/Permits

Submitted by Bridget Maher on Thu, 2018-02-01 20:31

The presentation states permit holders are not subject to the daytime restrictions or time limits. Which type of permits are you referring to? 24 hour permits only, or does it also refer to the overnight permits for those particular zones? Thank you.

#### Daytime parking

Submitted by Carrie Hageman on Fri, 2018-02-02 13:01

My block currently is restricted 8-10AM M-F. This has been a problem for us for the 35 years I have lived here! We manipulate our lives so that workers, friends and family do not arrive before 10am. Do I understand correctly that under the proposed pilot this restriction will be continued, adding further restriction of a 3-hour limit for every weekday visit without purchasing a pass? If that is the case, I would like to know the rationale.

#### metered parking

Submitted by Marilyn Brumund on Fri, 2018-02-02 14:47

I agree that the extension of metered parking until 8 pm is not in the best interest of restaurants and their clients.

#### Overnight Parking Pilot

Submitted by James Gates on Sat, 2018-02-03 20:57

I attended the Transportation Commission meeting on January 29. While I value the service my fellow villagers perform on the commission, they have been asked to address an issue that puts at risk the character, ethos, and property values of one of the country's most successful villages. Oak Park is a village composed of residential neighborhoods. It is not a city. It is not Chicago. If the presentation by the consultant, paid for with taxpayer dollars, was intended to be informational, provide clarity, demonstrate confidence in the proposed pilot, offer any semblance of cost benefit analysis of the pilot, and allay resident concerns regarding this massive change in the way of life in Oak Park, it failed. The presentation lacked a coherent explanation of the pilot, any clarity on the process, no information on cost implementation, and no details on how the pilot / easing of parking overnight would be enforced. The explanation of the parking regulations, signage, and schedules made the 1969 moon landing child's play by comparison. This pilot is a "solution" in search of a problem and appears not to be predicated upon quality of life, villager safety, or long-term sustainability. This pilot, would if implemented, require our fine and brave local police force, whose job is to protect the people and property of Oak Park, to become parking monitors as they navigate this Rube Goldberg contraption, AKA parking pilot. Honorable Trustees, you have done several positive things for our village. This parking pilot is not now and will never be a positive. At an upcoming Village Board meeting, do right thing, do the thing that is in the best interests of our village, and include an agenda item that calls for the end of the proposed parking pilot.

#### 6pm v. 8pm benefits

Submitted by Irene on Sun, 2018-02-04 17:43



Other than the additional revenue, what benefits does the village see in extending metered parking? If taking more money from residents and patrons is the sole purpose, then I object. If financial concerns are really that big of an issue, the village could save additional \$\$\$ by giving up on the slate tiles and other unnecessary adornments that they insist on putting on the streets...

### Parking

Submitted by Mary Ann on Wed, 2018-02-07 12:27

Has ANYONE actually done a "field check" and saw what parking is really like? Come when the Economy Shop is open and look at all the cars parked all day long. Come during the day and see how many cars park on the residential streets but avoid the parking garage at North Blvd & Oak Park, or the metered spaces on South Blvd & Oak Park. Come watch while "parker's" come running to move their car to the other side of the street. Come watch while a car sits all day in a 2 hour spot and does not move until early evening. Come watch when there is a 2+ inch snowfall and everyone just parks where ever, even tho the sign says to park according to the even/odd numbered days on the street. And no surprise there, no one gets a ticket. I oppose the test parking pilot. Transportation Commission- go walk the streets and see what is happening.

### All of the above ..

Submitted by C Palermo on Wed, 2018-02-07 15:40

I was at last meeting & agree with all posted concerns as each one of us lives one of these parking scenarios/ problems daily.

Love this town as everyone else but raising crime, scary property taxes & nightmare parking might make us question whether OP can continue to be home... Sincerely,

### Oak Park

Submitted by Oak Lover and P... on Wed, 2018-02-07 16:26

Greetings,

There's nothing wrong with using whatever means needed to reap an extra reward hither and thither. More meters in Oak Park could be great for over all society. Cheminage is a medieval toll collected by lords who own forests and anyone who passed through the forest and trees would have to pay this cheminage toll, and like today anyone who wishes to park in Oak Park must pay a toll. it's ancient tradition and works very well! Just wanted to share that thought.

Thanks and Kind Regards,

Cam, tree removal expert

Contact: <https://www.nanaimotreeservices.com/contact.html>

**This will destroy SFH neighborhood character and value**

Submitted by Tom on Wed, 2018-02-07 21:11

I live in a SFH adjacent to multifamily homes on a street with no overnight parking currently allowed. Even with these current restrictions overnight parking is a common experience on our block. It also common for cars to sit for days at a time. It is quite rare that I can park in



front of my home, but at least I can park somewhere reasonably close on my block. These changes will open the flood gates for cars to park up any street adjacent to multifamily. I fully expect not to be able to park anywhere near my home and my neighborhood will become Chicago-like. If cars are allowed to sit for up to one whole week they will. Terrible idea.

I do feel for the multifamily tenants, but this will seriously devalue single family homes adjacent to multi family buildings, is that fair and equitable? Oak Park is urban, but suburban home buyers want to be able to park on the street near their homes. The daily alternating of allowing overnight parking from one side of the block to the other seemed like a reasonable compromise and should be resurrected.

As currently written this proposal sounds terrible with regard to allowing parking anywhere overnight for up to a week at a time. I would have to considering moving if it goes forward in it's current form.

#### Concerns with long term parking effect

Submitted by Jim on Thu, 2018-02-08 20:05

The newest version of the Parking Pilot Program was presented a week ago Monday.

Now, instead of even/odd or 72-hour schemes, those with a permit may park on any street, anytime, anywhere for up to six days straight. They are only required to move for the one day a week that will be reserved for cleaning.

This does not include metered or pay-by-plate spaces but does include every other street.

I agree with this comment posted to Wednesday journal 100%. I am opposed to the overnight parking regulations as currently proposed.

Residents without a permit will have none of these privileges and must abide by 2-hour time limits and no overnight parking.

I have many concerns about this program. If you have a voice to add, please come to the final Pilot Parking Program meeting on Feb. 12 at Oak Park Village Hall.

#### Burden of Parking Restrictions

Submitted by Barbara Weigand on Fri, 2018-02-09 12:34

I especially appreciate Carrie Hagemen's & James Gates' comments. I understand the challenges Oak Park is presented with regarding parking, and appreciate the need to find solutions. As a long time resident, I've dealt with this issue on many levels. After trying multiple parking situations (renting a garage, on street permit, etc), and the mass confusion trying to keep track of rules, we finally ripped out half the yard of our historic home to add a parking space for my car. We continue to deal with the ever changing rules where guests and visitors are concerned. I have to say, this doesn't sound in the least simple, and clearly homeowners in certain zones are "penalized" when it comes to living day to day. Oak Park

spends so much time trying to keep non residents out, we seem to have forgotten the cost to the people that live and have businesses here. Taxes are already forcing us to think about moving. This "plan" is just another nail in the coffin.

#### [new parking signs](#)

Submitted by Elizabeth Swan on Fri, 2018-02-09 12:57

These signs relieve drivers of having to read 4 + parking signs but cannot be easily read from the street. I have to get out of my car and study them!

They are best for people who regularly park there and do not have to re-read the signs.

#### [Zoning for Pilot Area](#)

Submitted by Joshua Reed on Sat, 2018-02-10 09:00

One of the elements I thoroughly appreciate about the current overnight parking permits is the zoning which prohibits the sale and parking of more cars on the street than there are physical spaces. After living in Chicago and regularly struggling with people parking too close, parking illegally because of a lack of spots, and struggling to find spaces myself I place a very high value on the fact that I can almost always get a space right outside my building on my way home from work.

I believe zoning could also play an important role in establishing permit parking throughout other areas of the pilot program. Many home owners are concerned about strangers parking in front of their houses for commuting purposes or as long term overnight parking; but if permits continue to be zoned then those cars wouldn't be owned by strangers, they're your neighbors! Commuter permits would only allow long term (greater than 2 hour parking) in your respective zone.

I do believe that there are and will continue to be challenges with enforcing parking rules in oak park. Has the commission ever considered some form of resident reporting? Passionate home owners, provided a secure, fair, and easy to use process could be partners in resolving the enforcement challenges as well as feeling empowered by the new rules in the pilot area.

#### [Parking Pilot](#)

Submitted by Concerned Resident on Sun, 2018-02-11 12:05

All of the proposals for pilots/changes to parking sound like they will make parking much more difficult for Oak Park residents with permits of any sort. It's difficult enough already to park in the Y2 zone, as a resident with a permit - and parking rules (time limits, overnight parking without permits) are already so infrequently enforced. How will fewer regulations help residents? We'll see a lot more park and riders and a lot more cars being left for days and days at a time. Could we not start by enforcing rules that already exist?

I agree that all proposals were created by someone in an office with no idea of the realities of trying to park in Oak Park.

#### [Parking](#)

Submitted by Mary Ann on Wed, 2018-02-14 12:44

I agree wholeheartedly.

### Village Zone Parking

Submitted by Pierre Poinsett on Tue, 2018-03-06 10:46

Reading all of the previous comments, I noticed a recurring theme -- homeowners are presented as those who own single family homes. I wish to remind everyone there is a significant number of homeowners in condos of multifamily buildings.

My wife and I have lived for over 10 years in our condo. We were part of the group of condo buyers who purchased prior to the market downturn in 2008. Before 2008, Oak Park saw a number of pre-1930 apartment buildings gutted and rehabbed for condo development. The Village encouraged developers to do business in the area and, at the time, it appeared to be an overall positive activity.

As a household with two working adults, we have had a need to get two overnight parking permits. We received quarterly renewal notices for both vehicles and had no challenges getting the permits. Last year, the Village decided to enforce a rule which we were not aware existed. Going forward, the Village would only allow one overnight parking permit per household. If a household wanted to get a second permit, they would have to wait until the second day of the new parking quarter. This means any household with two or more cars would be in a "first come, first serve" race for a limited number of additional parking permits.

The Village purposely does not have a sticker available for all of the available spaces in a given zone. Each quarter, there are some who do not get to the Village in time and therefore have to resort to using up their 30-Day Extended Overnight Parking allotment. So, they are good for only one of the three months of that quarter. Which means if a person wants to park legally for the remaining 60 days of the month, they must pay \$7 per night for a total of \$420!

Whatever the changes to the parking rules end up being, consideration must be given to the "other" homeowners in the Village.

# Parking Pilot Program

## Comments

### Time limit override

Submitted by Grove on Sat, 2018-03-10 20:43

This is going to make commuter parking ridiculous and worse by public transportation. It sounds as if all of the permitted parkers will now be able to override the time limits on streets, meaning all of the permitted parkers in the zone can Park by public transportation where there is currently a two hour limit. This is worse. No one will use the metered spots which are hardly used now. I also would like to see a guest pass that residents can provide their guests to hang by their rear view mirror which will allow guests to override the time limits as well. Why are we making it so difficult for visitors that need all day parking?

This presentation is hard to follow and the power point is unreadable full screen. Please post the .pdf.

### Parking

Submitted by Rita Shaffer on Mon, 2018-03-12 11:24

Parking on Lombard and North Ave, is a nightmare for residents that reside in the building there are many apartments and businesses all vying for adequate parking, especially overnight Why should I have to park in Chicago, when I live in Oak Park? The question for me becomes is this about race, because the building residents are 100 percent African American. There's parking provided for residents on Madison and Ridgeland, where more Caucasian residents reside. The business owners and their employees All park on Lombard Street in the day time to avoid the meters on North Ave, which has resulted in no substantial income. Why are they there? If you're asking residents who reside at 1242 N. Lombard to use nearby parking facility becomes a safety hazard, due to the increase in crime in Oak Park. I hope you will rethink your stance and allow people to park where they reside, anything less than that, shows an insensitiveness to Oak Park Residents, especially African Americans, who just want to live like normal residents and park their cars like normal residents.

### Parkin Pilot

Submitted by Chris on Mon, 2018-03-12 12:48

This doesn't simplify anything, it's so confusing! You realize that people have guests and they wouldn't be registered, where are they supposed to park? This is the most ridiculous proposal I have ever seen, not to mention it doesn't help anyone north of Lake. I live on a street with all multi units and there's no parking allowed. I'm sorry but it's not 1958 anymore. Times are changing and you need a better solution. When is your next parking meeting to address parking on that side too? It seems like this is all a scam to get more money from residents, the parking garages are forced and the fees are outrageous.

### Meter charges til 8pm!

Submitted by Maple on Thu, 2018-03-22 20:15

Now we would have to pay meters til 8pm?! Give us a break, Oak Park!

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Cory Wesley on Mon, 2018-04-02 11:16

Extending the meter rates two hours is yet another tax to live here - I'm firmly against that. I'm also against requiring residents of a block to obtain a permit to park on their own block, in front of their own home during the daytime. If we're converting the 8-10 ban into something like an 8-8(with 3hr restriction) then there should be a carve out for vehicles registered to a house on that block. Having to pay \$70/yr for that privilege doesn't seem very just.

#### **100% agree**

Submitted by RK on Mon, 2018-04-23 06:36

Having to pay an additional \$70/year if I want to park in front of my own house is robbery. It was already ridiculous that as a resident I couldn't park in front of my house from 8-10AM. But now, I'll have to pay to park. Residents should be able to register their cars and get a free pass.

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Pat Davis on Mon, 2018-04-02 20:05

I don't care anymore. The Village has made it more and more miserable to park. It is obvious that those that need to drive are not welcome, so I take my spending dollars elsewhere and I don't encourage anyone to come here to shop anymore. Between the lack of parking and the meter maids, the Village has taken the charm out of bring in Oak Park.

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Dima Ali on Mon, 2018-04-02 22:40

With all due respect but I disagree in regard of the 2 hour increase in the meter extension. Living in Oak Park has become increasingly expensive, how can we call our village "sanctuary" when the wealthy are the only ones who can afford it?

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Sara on Mon, 2018-04-02 22:48

After the vehicle sticker rates just went up significantly, I'm very concerned that the village is considering extending the paid parking hours to 8 pm. I'm strongly opposed to this.

#### **Parking proposed changes**

Submitted by Kitty C on Tue, 2018-04-03 07:46

Adding meters on Madison where they don't already exist?  
Using license plate technology to automatically up parking costs from \$1 to \$3 after 3 hrs?  
Adding meter charges after 6pm until 8pm?  
4 time blocks during each 24 hr period during which parking either is or isn't allowed?  
This is a revenue grab!!!

Unnecessary complexity. This study will definitely keep me away from the areas which are in this pilot program. Plus, spending money on this technology while sidewalks are cracked and crumbling, while carjackings and auto theft continue to occur, while we struggle to upgrade village lighting -it's not a responsible use of taxpayer funds.

#### **Parking pilot comments**

Submitted by Marcella on Tue, 2018-04-03 09:49

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to study and review parking in Oak Park. As a resident on a street with a no parking from 8-10 I really appreciate the change to a 3 hr time limit and the option for resident permits. This restriction has cost many visitors and service providers difficulties and even tickets.

One part of the proposal I disagree with is changing the meter end time from 6pm to 8pm. Although it allows a turnover I think it will deter people from visiting Oak Park businesses in the evening. At least now if you drive into town for dinner and a movie you know you can possibly park for free if you come around 6. I have to pay to park to go to so many of our local businesses when I run errands during the day. I really appreciate not having to pay a meter if I choose Oak Park as my destination in the evening. I often have family members suggest another town for lunch because they will need to pay to park here- let's not do that to the evening also.

Thank you for listening to my comments.

#### **Parking**

Submitted by Joan on Tue, 2018-04-03 09:50

After reviewing the signage I fell they're simple and understandable. However I do object to increasing the parking

#### **Parking in front of my own house**

Submitted by Kim G on Tue, 2018-04-03 14:59

I am continually frustrated and angry with the village for disallowing the right to park in front of my own residence before 10am. I recently got a ticket for being parked on the street so that repair workers could get up and down my single lane driveway. Am I supposed to sit on the bumper of my car and deflect the tickets the whole time my driveway is in use? This makes no sense. We pay enough in taxes, I don't need to pay more to use the street directly in front of my home.

#### **I can see your frustration,**

Submitted by Tom on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:51

I can see your frustration, but I have NO restrictions on parking near me and I can't park in front of my house from 6AM to 7PM because of commuters getting free parking for OUR tax dollars. The two hour restriction is supposed to help offset the free-loaders. Trust me when I say that NO restrictions lead to LESS parking, not more.

#### **Parking outside your house**

Submitted by Ngetich on Sun, 2018-04-22 10:10

No parking in front of your house on snow days, or on certain days to allow cleaning is the only thing that makes sense. The free loader thing is a myth. How about a sign that says "Residents Only" and residents get a sticker or tag for their cars? That would lock out "free loaders" while saving residents the current ridiculousness.

#### **Village: Proceed with Caution !**

Submitted by Mary P on Wed, 2018-04-04 13:27

Raising expectations, only not to deliver, is always a mistake.

As a 47 year resident of Oak Park, I've heard this call for on-street overnight parking more than once. The complaint: I want to be able to park in front of my own building.

Fundamental analysis reveals, on a block with mostly apartment buildings, say 48-60 rental units on just one side of the street, potentially there are at least 48 to 60 +/- cars that need parking on just one side of the street. On that same block, there may only be 14 parking spots available on each side of the street, even fewer on the east-west streets.

The likelihood that you will be able to park "in front of your building" 100 percent of the time is extremely low. If you work 2nd or 3rd shift, like some medical professionals do, the likelihood that you'll be able to park in front of your building on even on your own block after work is slim.

Homeowners are consistently referred to as "Stakeholders" in this project. By definition, a stakeholder is someone who has an interest or gain upon successful completion of a project. There is no deliverable listed that could possibly benefit home-owning stakeholders in this Pilot Program. In fact, there is only downside. Homeowners have pointed this out on many occasions to the Transportation Commission, the Village Board and the Village Mayor. Surely we were heard. If this pilot moves forward, apparently, they do not care.

However, I do support the automation of the permit process and enforcement (because I know it's currently a pain), though I do know more than one systems professional who questions whether the cost for implementation has been properly assessed.

#### **What it's like to park in Oak Park**

Submitted by Anne on Wed, 2018-04-04 17:18

If you need to stop by the middle school in the morning to quickly drop off a form or a forgotten lunch, it becomes a 5 minute walk for a 90 second errand. If you want to run into the library to pick up a book on reserve, a free service comes with a parking fee. If you are a minimum wage employee of an Oak Park business and have to pay for parking during your shift, your pay effectively drops below minimum wage. If you put some quarters in a meter to run into a local shop to buy a few items, but the check out line is unexpectedly long, you might come out to a \$30 parking ticket. These are only a few examples of how Oak Park parking rules and fees are frustrating to residents and their guests and are a deterrent to would-be patrons of the local businesses.

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Heinz Schuller on Wed, 2018-04-04 22:19

Increasing the meter time from 6pm to 8pm impacts folks like us who like to go downtown for dinner. That part is simply a cash grab with no logical basis in "improving" the parking situation at all. I don't support this.

That and several of the other changes are just transferring burden & expense onto the residents, who are already carrying the majority of the load for the village. If the goal is to stop being a village and just become Chicago, well then we're definitely on the fast track.



### What a mess...

Submitted by OP Resident on Thu, 2018-04-05 14:30

1. I'd recommend that the cost of the program not exceed net new revenue created by the parking changes (e.g. permit revenue from additional spots) - AND/OR - that the cost of the program should be paid for by the drivers immediately/directly benefiting from the changes.
2. In light of rising violent crimes in OP, police input should be gathered on any changes to parking and how it might impact crime and their ability to monitor the area.
3. The program should examine making more streets one-way, and have angled pull-in parking to increase the number of cars that can park on a given block.
4. Metered parking should copy Chicago's hours and rates for residential districts (\$2/hr from 8am to 10pm). For areas with a garage within a 0.2 mile radius, metered-spot rates should be \$4/hr. Garage rates should be much cheaper to encourage their use, and help with metered spot turn-over. People will complain that it's just another tax... and it is - roads are expensive, and pensions don't fund themselves.
5. Improving last mile bus connection to Green line, blue line, and Metra would reduce commuter vehicle/parking dependence. OP PACE buses run infrequently and often behind schedule. The pilot program fails to address some root causes for parking dependence.
6. The fact that there's a presentations on all these parking regulations and how to read the new sign is a strong indicator that it's too complicated. People are going to be upset when/if these changes go into effect and they get a ton of tickets because they misinterpreted the signage.

### Oak Park is known as NO PARK/Relationship Breaker

Submitted by Anonymous on Sun, 2018-04-08 22:10

Bottom line is if a home owner, or renter in Oak Park doesn't have a parking spot/garage, it's because they can't afford to rent, or purchase a home with a parking spot, or garage. No one would purposely subject themselves to the cost & frustration involved with permit parking in Oak Park. I rented for many, years & have owned a condo for 12 years, both had no parking, so I've been forced to pay for a permit, and be subjected to this nightmare of a system, with no guarantee that I'll even have a place to park when I come home. Don't even think of having social life, or company. On Harvey there are 2 different systems to allow your friend, or family to stay overnight. You have to go online to get them approved for overnight, then call in their car to allow them to park from 6am-8am. You are allowed 3 per year then they're are \$7.00 each. As a condo owner who can not afford to buy a home with parking I pay the same property taxes as condo/homeowners who can afford to own a home with parking. I do not however get the same benefits. The village needs to come up with a way that doesn't punish those of us who own, but can't afford to buy a home that includes parking. One very simple thing that would help a little is to paint lines on the street (i.e Washington Blvd.) to mark the spots, very often people take up more than one spot. Whatever you do, please remember why residents have parking permits in the first place, it's because there is no other option for



us. Make resident parking a priority & only make changes that improve our quality of life, not make it worse than it is already.

### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Robert Becker on Fri, 2018-04-13 10:15

I reside on South Grove Avenue between Randolph and Washington. I have attended three public transportation commission meetings about the parking pilot; and also attended a meeting with the mayor on this issue. I urge the transportation commission not to recommend the parking pilot to trustees. The parking pilot is a hammer looking for a nail. It will cause more problems than it can possibly solve.

### **Restricted morning parking**

Submitted by Bob on Fri, 2018-04-13 11:10

I second the comment above about not being able to park in front of my own house from 8-10 a.m. I understand the purpose of these restricted hours near public transit, but if one has a village parking sticker (as I do) and is parked in front of his/her own house for a short period of time, does that really warrant a \$40 ticket? Complete insanity, a blatant money grab, and utter disrespect to the citizens who diligently pay their property taxes and other fees. Find a way to make an exception. Be flexible and creative. I will also add that your appeal process is a joke. It was pretty clear to me that the ALJ did not even read my explanation for being inside my house for longer than the expected 30 seconds. Government at its absolute worst.

### **Do not open all residential streets to overnight parking**

Submitted by Dave Schacht on Fri, 2018-04-13 12:41

During my time in Oak Park, I have been both a condo owner who used overnight permitted street parking and a single family home owner with a garage. When in our condo, I fought for years to have the building frontage of our condo building well protected for our condo owners to use for their parking when we lived there. But even then, I was opposed to opening up all residential areas to overnight parking. This would significantly and negatively effect our community as a whole and should be thoroughly resisted by our citizens.

Reasons to maintain the overnight ban include:

1. Safety: More cars parked on the street means more accidents and more difficulty for drivers visualizing pedestrians.
2. Snow removal: Picture Chicago streets and the ridiculous mess that occurs during major snow.
3. Cleanliness, Appearance and therefore property value for single family homes.
4. Use of streets by guests.

### **Well Put**

Submitted by Tim on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:37

Do we want to look like Berwyn or Chicago? Oak Park should keep the overnight park ban. East Ave is already a mess with people parking and since the police do nothing about people speeding or running stops signs, parking on the streets will only add to the danger pedestrians have to deal with daily.

### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Kristi Sloniger on Sun, 2018-04-15 16:05

The proposal in its current Final Staff Recommendation, still does not address these primary objections:

- This program would increase available parking in our area to 1700 spaces, rather than solving for the 150 spaces that are needed for permit parkers.
- Any area close to train stations would become a commuter parking lot. Why use the meters or parking garage, when \$70 a year means on-street, anywhere parking?
- Let's not avoid the obvious, this IS overturning the Overnight Parking Ban
- The Abatement Day solution, means that cars can park for 6 days straight without moving, heavy machinery would be on the streets during the day for cleaning and leaf removal - and snow removal is expected to be done on this one day a week. This is a ridiculous proposal.

Put the new Pay-by-Plate technology in place, standardize the time limits to 3-hours, but don't take away our zones and don't allow permit parking on every street.

Please keep this environmentally, un-green initiative off the table and keep the excess cars off the streets. This plan will change the historic character of our village forever. Oak Park deserves better.

#### **NO WORKING (NORTH BLVD)**

Submitted by ALEX on Sun, 2018-04-15 17:02

I See signs of no parking in the NB10 section. where i do pay 3 month fee to park there 24hrs. so what do i suppose to do about parking>> anyone has information on thisss....

#### **Paid Parking**

Submitted by Kenya Tassin on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:28

I think there should be some reciprocity with permits. For example, if I'm an Oak Park resident that needs to park at a friends house for whatever reason after 2:30am I shouldn't have to worry about being ticketed. I don't like the extension of metered parking to 8pm. Paying more when I already pay an increase rate to park my SUV won't encourage me to patronize the businesses. It seems that each year I have to get home earlier and earlier to find a decent spot around my place. I don't like risking having to park down by the BP on Chicago Ave especially with all the crime that migrated from across Austin. I agree there should be a guest tag we can place in cars. I wouldn't be opposed to a small fee for that temporary parking.

#### **Parking becomes more complicated and expensive...**

Submitted by Kristina on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:30

The more complicated and expensive parking becomes, the less people will want to live here and visit, especially to go to the movies or a restaurant, where they have to face the dreaded task of finding a spot, especially on a weekend night. With all the high rises going up and taking our parking lots, it seems there is never a spot outside of the Holley Court garage, which with crime going up is not my favorite place to park. Extending the time we are charged to 8pm will discourage people from going to DTOP and they will likely instead hit up LaGrange or other nearby suburbs with \*gasp!\* free parking. The high rises bring more revenue in the form of property taxes and building ownership, but if it's making parking

harder and more costly, then it's not worth it in my opinion. Get ready to see many businesses close and/or move outside of OP.

#### **Parking is already a mess**

Submitted by Valencia on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:31

In the more than 30 years I've lived here both as a renter and homeowner, we've discussed and modified parking many times. Residents are always opposed to lifting the overnight parking ban, extending paid hours and needing permits to park near their own residences. So why are we doing all of these things that people have been and continue to be opposed to?

Increasing fees, I can understand. I can kind of agree to extending the paid hours to after 8. But we do not need any more restrictions or new permit requirements for the village. And we definitely don't need more changes to time limits. It's already inconvenient to purchase passes for guests, and if someone lives in an area that will require additional permits and have new time limits, it's an added inconvenience.

Implementing pay by plate technology on Madison is going to be a real annoyance. Most times we just want to go in and out, and we can do that very well now, and in Forest Park and River Forest. Why change that? Leaving that as-is is a much more friendly and welcoming policy. Seems like we keep breaking things that are working just fine.

#### **Signs and Proposals**

Submitted by Tim on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:31

I am not sure when it became the Villages responsibility to ensure landlords provide parking for their tenants. I see many rental units with garages... why not tear down the garages and create parking areas behind the houses. The parking issue should be the responsibility of the landlord as they are the ones making the money on the units. I am totally against this and believe that if the village proceeds, it will only make Oak Park look more like Berwyn than the nice quiet neighborhoods of Oak Park.

#### **Parking is already a mess**

Submitted by Valencia on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:32

Parking is already a mess

Submitted by Valencia on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:30

In the more than 30 years I've lived here both as a renter and homeowner, we've discussed and modified parking many times. Residents are always opposed to lifting the overnight parking ban, extending paid hours and needing permits to park near their own residences. So why are we doing all of these things that people have been and continue to be opposed to? Increasing fees I can understand. I can kind of agree to extending the paid hours to after 8. But we do not need any more restrictions or new permit requirements for the village. And we definitely don't need more changes to time limits. It's already inconvenient to purchase passes for guests, and if someone lives in an area that will require additional permits and have new time limits, it's an added inconvenience.

Implementing pay by plate technology on Madison is going to be a real annoyance. Most times we just want to go in and out, and we can do that very well now, and in Forest Park and River Forest. Why change that? Leaving that as-is is a much more friendly and welcoming policy. Seems like we keep breaking things that are working just fine.

#### **Parking pilot program**

Submitted by Oak Park Resident on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:37

It is not necessary to charge parking on Madison Ave. There is plenty of parking that is always available during the day and evening. Charging will just make it worse on local businesses. I HIGHLY DISAGREE with extending meters to 8PM. We are a village, NOT downtown Chicago. DO NOT GOUGE our local businesses and local residents. I purposely avoid places when I am expected to always pay to park. Oak Park is losing it's beautiful. DO NOT EXTEND RESTRICTED AREAS TO SATURDAYS! This does a HUGE disservice to the community. What Oak Park has allowed to happen to the downtown area is already awful (as a resident, I now avoid that area like the plague because of the terrible traffic conditions created).

I will add more later, but I'm going to copy and paste what an above commenter posted:

The proposal in its current Final Staff Recommendation, still does not address these primary objections:

- This program would increase available parking in our area to 1700 spaces, rather than solving for the 150 spaces that are needed for permit parkers.
- Any area close to train stations would become a commuter parking lot. Why use the meters or parking garage, when \$70 a year means on-street, anywhere parking?
- Let's not avoid the obvious, this IS overturning the Overnight Parking Ban
- The Abatement Day solution, means that cars can park for 6 days straight without moving, heavy machinery would be on the streets during the day for cleaning and leaf removal - and snow removal is expected to be done on this one day a week. This is a ridiculous proposal.

This program is ridiculous and does not solve the issue that RESIDENTS have. This proposal does not fix the primary problem...RESIDENTIAL PARKING! Get it together, Oak Park. This is a terrible proposal.

#### **parking**

Submitted by John T Brennan on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:43

I am vehemently against easing the parking ban.

#### **parking pilot, add guest passes for overnight**

Submitted by nancy on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:46

It is a problem for guests to park overnight. Please add a pass to put on their car, rearview mirror, or dash that residents can give out for them. Especially on weekend nights.

I find the parking regulations too complex! Why not just have paid meters that you can access through your credit card or

the parking app? That is the easiest tool, it works well for Chicago, so you can add time whi  
away from your car.

#### Overnight Parking

Submitted by Scott Fortman on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:55

I do not support changing the overnight parking ban

#### Moving out of OP bc of Parking

Submitted by Lisa on Wed, 2018-04-18 14:55

Every year Oak Park makes it harder for its residents to enjoy living here. Parking is a hassle and unnecessarily expensive. I have been working in OP for 5 years, living for the last 3. I have gotten so many tickets because my meeting ran late and I was 10 min late to move my car. This year alone I paid over \$120 in parking tickets. When the parking pass rates went up last year, I started considering moving. I am moving out of OP in August. Love the neighborhood! But can not afford (time and money) to deal with parking. The city should think long and hard about the parking situation.

#### Parking Pilot

Submitted by Patrick Scanlan on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:02

I am against this. I vote NO!

#### Streets Near Downtown Oak Park

Submitted by Matt on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:10

I would like to know what you are doing to stop people from using our blocks near downtown as parking. Some nights when I get home from work If there is an event downtown it is nearly impossible to find a parking space and I end up parking a block away from my apartment. Then when I come out in the morning at 6 am to leave for work the street is empty. I think on streets near the downtown area night parking should start earlier.

#### Parking

Submitted by Jimmy on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:19

I pay way too much money to park on a street about 5 blocks from my apartment. I can not have over night guests more than a few times due to it not being allowed. I can't afford to park in Oak park. I can afford to live there but not to park.

#### The Animals

Submitted by Dan on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:21

One again Oak Park government raids your wallet by making simple things complicated and complicated things incomprehensible?

Creating a set of ridiculous and perplexing rules meant only to divert your attention while they pick your pocket through increased payment times, increased fees, and punishing parking tickets. Plus now they want to track your movements by tracking when and where you park by license plate. i guess Big Brother is watching.

Oak Park is becoming more unbearable every day so to paraphrase the Animals lyrics "I've gotta get out of this place If its the last thing I ever do"

### Permit Parking in Y3

Submitted by Laureen on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:26

Another user above of a Y3 parking permit also made a comment on parking on Washington Blvd between Marion & Wisconsin. With the install of the traffic light at Wisconsin and Washington the residents in the condo buildings in this area have lost at least 100 parking spaces. No alternative was provided. I implore you to paint lines on the streets to outline parking spaces as many people take up to 2 spaces. Also, the 2 day 8-10 AM ban on Tues and Wed. has made it even more difficult to find parking. It has essentially become a nightmare.

I agree with no parking on 1 side of the street 1 day per week, but not the entire day.

The parking permits go UP every year and I am not sure what the reasoning is behind this to have a 20% increase per year. Most of my friends and family will not visit me as they need to evacuate after 11pm. Well, what if they wanted to stay til 1am? NOPE!

Anyway, I don't know why this is all so difficult and tedious. the signs are ridiculous and hard to decipher, especially for people that visit and are no familiar.

### Parking

Submitted by John Houren on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:29

No overnight parking. It is a tool for additional crime. Make businesses and apartment owners solve there parking problem!

### Unfortunately this does not

Submitted by Jet on Sat, 2018-04-21 22:10

Unfortunately this does not encourage landlords and rental companies to preserve some of the gorgeous older buildings that have literally zero space available without demolishing the building AND oak park will not be so beautiful when there's no grass and landscape left because it becomes concrete.

### Extended Meter Time and 3-Hr Max

Submitted by Annette Hughes on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:29

1. It's hard enough to find parking and it was nice to be able to park after 6 without worrying about additional costs. Definitely don't agree with addition meter hours.
2. 3-hr max and then such a high increase definitely is not conducive to staying downtown for an extended time period, i.e., movie and a meal. An addition \$1 would be acceptable. Parking in the village has always been a problem; lack of spaces and so many rules and regulations! Adding all the high-rise bldgs being built so closely together has also taken even more parking spaces. I now avoid the downtown area as much as possible.

### This plan smells bad

Submitted by Mary on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:29

Sorry to say but if you are increasing meter time to 8pm, we will be dining elsewhere. This whole parking plan is confusing and to not allow some residents the right to park near their property when we all are paying such ridiculous taxes! Are you kidding me! Please do not allow overnight parking on our streets. This will ruin Oak Park.



### 700-800 blocks of S. Cuyler

Submitted by Anonymous2 on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:31

Between Longfellow school and the Arts district businesses, there are many days, except Sundays, that I can't find a spot near my own front door. People park personal and commercial vehicles for days and nights on end, yet I've received a ticket at 0530 while loading my son's car up to return to college.

### Pilot Parking

Submitted by LIsa on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:35

I understand this is a complicated issue and everyone has different wants and needs. For me, I take the train for work so I my car is parked on the street during the day and then I pay for a permit in order to park overnight. I would love to park in front of my building but that is not possible as all parking in front of my building has been eliminated. So now I'm happy if I can just park on my block on my street. I live within a few blocks of CTA/Metra so I understand having 2 or 3 hour limits on streets near the train but what are residents to do? I really like living in Oak Park except for dealing with parking. Buying a single family home with a garage or a condo unit with parking isn't in the cards for me. And, on top of that, I don't feel that I should have to move in order to park my car near where I live.

Also on the subject of increasing meter times for downtown. Why would you do that? It's just going to make people not want to go downtown where they would have to pay a meter. I found the power point hard to read and understand so I'm not sure that I'm addressing everything but overall I haven't seen a lot of good that will come out of this. And based on the other comments, I think a lot of other people feel the same way.

### Parking on Kenilworth near Unity Temple

Submitted by John (Jake) Dickens on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:36

Parking is allowed on Kenilworth near Unity Temple during daytime and it is very busy with tourists, post office customers and others competing for spaces. But my issue is overnight when parking is prohibited -- it makes no sense to prohibit because the post office is closed, there are no tours at Unity and there is no competition for spaces. Please consider dropping this overnight prohibition.

### two things

Submitted by Dave Miller on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:47

1. I saw one of the new trial signs. It was confusing. Sure, you can figure it after looking at it for awhile, but a parking sign should never have to be studied in order to understand it. Geezus, I'm just trying to park, not study for a final exam with the risk of being ticketed if I don't pass it.

2. I'm currently paying \$7 a night to park on the street overnight in front of my house as my garage is temporarily inaccessible while a roofing crew works on my house for a week. Sure, you get three overnight freebies, but then it's time to pony up more dough. I understand the concept of overnight parking restrictions, but this is yet another pure money grab. I can't get a break for a week or two while a construction crew works at my place? After already paying Oak Park \$200 for a permit? And \$14K in property taxes?

### Parking

Submitted by JRTU on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:47

Beautiful Village .. historic district .. home of Frank,.. Ernst,.. etc. Empty words. People use cars and need parking. I am sure a lot of residents are using their garages as storages, I know because I see. In this life nothing is free, even death. So give comfort to visitors or customers and ... pay for excess time.

### ok

Submitted by Tom on Wed, 2018-04-18 15:48

I'm all for updating the current situation where I am unable to park near my house at any time during the day because there are NO restrictions on the 800 block of Scoville, while parking is restricted on every other block around me. If the village would like to make some money, have the people from out of town pay for parking and littering in front of my house while I can't park at all.

And let's do this the smart way. FIRST, institute parking regulations on the side streets to limit commuters from parking in residential areas. Give us residents and tax-payers a break. After you get the the commuters to park off of the residential streets on into regulated parking areas, THEN start charging a competitive rate for parking. Don't scare people off right away.

### Wow

Submitted by Greg on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:10

Not a lot of positive responses here. I grew up in a town where you bought a city sticker and you could park where you needed throughout the town. How about we try that?

Keep the no parking from 8-10 am but, for God's sake, if the parking enforcement person or whomever is writing the tickets sees the vehicle is licensed to the residence it's in front of have some common sense and don't write the ticket. There is something going on.

Too many of the people proposing the rules and these new rules don't live here. Do we really need to hire consultants to make Oak Park more like Chicago? Save money, no consultants, no meters, less employees, more business.

### Please Don't Do This

Submitted by Maggie on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:16

Please, please do not change how Pleasant St. is already (especially from Harlem to Home). I live in a building and barely can find parking in the Y2 zone as it is. If you allow guests to park overnight on Pleasant between Harlem and Marion, that will make it impossible for residents to find parking. Also, please leave the 4-hour parking, from 9-5 as it is on Pleasant between Harlem and Maple. If you change these systems, which are already working for many of us, you're going to make it stressful and unbelievably frustrating for all the residents who live in buildings in that area. Please don't make it unaffordable or any more impossible for middle class people to be able to live in Oak Park.

### No



Submitted by Marc Anthony on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:21  
Oak Park you wild and crazy town. Nay.

#### **Parking**

Submitted by Amy on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:23

I fail to see how any of the new proposal improves parking for Oak Park residents or visitors. Back to the drawing board.

#### **Parking**

Submitted by R. Duchene on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:23

Oak Park may welcome tourists but it is not friendly to those who live within its boundaries. The overnight ban doesn't allow guests or family members to stay late and enjoy the dinner, TV show or even the holiday. I have tried to get a sticker but find it an impossible task. Why when I pay high property taxes should I also pay to have guest come visit me. As to the extension of parking times to 8:00 PM, all this does is encourage village residents to shop and dine out in other towns where parking is not as restrictive or costly. There are plenty of times I would love to stop in a shop but don't because of the difficulty of finding a parking spot or the cost. ENOUGH!!!!!!

#### **Resident Parking**

Submitted by Mary A Earle on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:27

No homeowner/condo owner should have to pay a dime in order to park in front of their own homes/condos. Talk to the village assessor. The property taxes are driving all but the most fortunate away from this once wonderful village. Services are already sub-par. Don't ask us to pay, again, for the privilege of living here

#### **Thankful that I have my own garage in Oak Park**

Submitted by Adam Freilich on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:28

I think that the current Oak Park signs are clear enough without the need for broader parking standardization. With the new proposal there will be a two hour increase in parking meter fees, which is a hassle and a deterrent to dining in town. I could not imagine being a resident who has to park on the street full time without having a personal garage in this town. The onus of moving a vehicle to avoid parking violations will surely increase when electronic license plate monitoring begins.

#### **No Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Helen Brooks on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:37

In so many words, this pilot proposal says, "You want to live in Oak Park? Then put your money where your car sits!" Chicago residents (although their parking issues may be many) do not have to contend with paying nearly \$600 per year in parking permits alone that Oak Park residents do; in addition to the rising cost of the vehicle sticker.

It is still unclear as to how this pilot "solves" any of the parking problems other than providing more revenue to the Village. Many areas in Oak Park already have parking confusion with the current signage.

Perhaps a better solution would be to invite residents of the highly affected areas to be part of the Transportation Commission and allow them to be true stakeholders of the process.

I am afraid that, with rising property taxes and rising costs just to have a vehicle in Oak Park, that only the wealthy will be able to afford to live here. Eventually, this affects the thriving diversity that Oak Park seemingly enjoys.

#### **Overnight Parking**

Submitted by Longtime South ... on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:44

Do not change the current overnight parking rules. We want our neighborhoods to remain safe, and there is no reason the current rules won't work for all residents. I would suggest some kind of exemption to the 3-night limit for residents in a situation like Dave Miller, but that kind of thing doesn't come up that often and you can easily check the validity of such a request by looking at the building permits that the Village manages.

#### **Parking is already a nightmare, thanks**

Submitted by YSemi on Wed, 2018-04-18 16:57

Parking in OP is already next to impossible. I'm paying \$540 a year to have the chance to be able to park in my permit zone... and I can't about 2 times a month. These unnecessarily complicated restrictions will only make my life worse. No thanks! Make parking easier, not harder!

#### **parking proposals**

Submitted by Bob Stigger on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:08

The fundamental reason for incomprehensible parking regulations is the insufficiency of on-street parking capacity in the Village to accommodate all the vehicles that folks desire to park there. The only mathematically valid solutions are to reduce the number of cars, build more streets, or create more off-street parking. Reducing the number of cars is the obvious solution but the voters won't stand for it because Oak Parkers are only "green" until it inconveniences them. More streets is a non-starter. More off-street parking is expensive and requires demolition of existing structures to create space, which the voters won't abide. Adjusting parking regulations and signage is just window-dressing which doesn't address the fundamental problem and therefore will create as many problems as it solves. In the absence of political will to address the underlying problem of too many cars in too little space, no stable solution is feasible.

#### **Morning parking restrictions vs. 3 hour limits**

Submitted by Amy Shannon on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:35

Although the changes would improve one issue --no more fear of getting a ticket for parking in front of one's own house for a few minutes from 8-10, I fear it would create another, equally annoying problem. I am not sure why one would want to just validate all the 8-10am parking bans without review. I for one would be happy to see my street open to parking all day. I would certainly prefer that to worrying that I had over-stayed the 3 hour limit.

#### **Increasing the Time Required to Pay for Meters from 6PM to 8PM**

Submitted by Robert Larson on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:38

Increasing the required time to feed meters from 6Pm to 8PM is a terrible idea for both restaurants and consumers. This idea is very short sighted. It will add another reason for people NOT to eat in Oak Park restaurants. The piddly extra revenue will be lost in tax revenue from the restaurants.

### **Parking**

Submitted by Lilia Cruz on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:43

Madison st big problem for our business, the village doesn't care about us..

No ornaments Christmas, no plants in summer and now parking meters !!!

Please check what we need in Madison 26 years Rebozo, working so hard to bring customers.

You just paid attention to Lake Ave, Marion Ave., oak Park Ave, and this is it !!! Please no meters Now help us with the construction from the hospital !!!!

### **Parking on Randolph just west of Oak Park Ave**

Submitted by William Dieber on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:45

Currently parking on north side of Randolph from Oak Park Ave to alley is not allowed at anytime. Your map seems to suggest some parking will be allowed. Because of traffic flow and proximity of condo building to street, the no parking status must be maintained

### **Increasing the Time Required to Pay for Meters from 6PM to 8PM**

Submitted by Robert Larson on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:45

Increasing the paid meter parking from 6pm to 8pm is a bad idea and I am against it. The piddly increase in revenue will be more than offset by the lose of tax revenue when the restaurants lose business due to an additional tax imposed on people eating dinner in Oak Park.

### **Solution Still Needs Work**

Submitted by Chris C. on Wed, 2018-04-18 17:59

This feels like it adds complication to parking where it could otherwise be avoided.

Standardizing time limits helps, but those already paying for a 24 hr. permit for the city, shouldn't keep paying for parking in their own small village for non-overnight periods.

Having parking follow someone while they are in the village (pay for 3 hours, doesn't matter where you are) is beneficial to reducing the nickel dime effect some may feel when making multiple stops, similar to what Chicago did.

New signs can help reduce confusion but once we add the zone information, then what are we really reducing? A single sign? I don't see how on my street, it improves anything. Visually it assists to some degree.

Additionally, rules such as having to park in a guest spot instead of your permit area, when you have a rental when your primary car is in service, takes away from guests and lowers

parking inventory which is counter-productive to the intent of the city to properly manage available parking inventory.

#### **Don't extend parking meters to 8pm**

Submitted by Bonnie on Wed, 2018-04-18 18:23

Extending the parking meters to 8pm instead of 6pm is a terrible idea. I will no longer be interested in going to dinner in downtown Oak Park or continuing my membership at a downtown Oak Park gym if I am forced to pay the meters every time I want to take advantage of one of these facilities after work. Our taxes are already astronomically high. Figure out how to use tax dollars more wisely instead of soaking residents with yet more unreasonable costs to live here.

#### **You are making things worse!!!!**

Submitted by Allan Bernstein on Wed, 2018-04-18 18:36

Why are you doing this to OP residents. You are making things more complicated not simplifying anything. Repeated complaints to the Village about employee parking on the 500 block of North Humphrey have been largely ignored by the village. The parking on the block is being taken by businesses on Chicago Ave. Stop making things worse and preventing residents, guests, contractors etc are being inconvenienced at best. The answer to our problems are resident only parking which could be simply by sticker or guest pass. Why reinvent the wheel. Keep it simple!

#### **Say NO to the proposed parking pilot program**

Submitted by Sarah W. on Wed, 2018-04-18 19:05

There is nothing in this proposal that I actively support and MUCH that I don't like, including extending metered parking time until 8 p.m. and the other ways that this proposal increases the expense and hassle of parking around the Village. But I am most vehemently opposed to allowing commuters to park longer on residential streets and to the de-facto end to the overnight parking ban. This will fundamentally change the character of residential streets in Oak Park. The other commenters have it right-- if we wanted to live in Chicago or Berwyn, we would. Instead, we choose to live here. Listen to what the taxpayers of Oak Park are saying about this proposal's many shortcomings and do not implement a plan that will change Oak Park for the worse.

#### **Parking**

Submitted by Ann Goddeyne on Wed, 2018-04-18 19:11

It is already impossible to park in the village Every lot is taken away Now you want to make it harder for guests to park when they visit Parking is expensive We are not Chicago and live in Oak Park because we chose to live in a village not in a congested suburb where we can drive and park in our village I will shop elsewhere

#### **6-8 parking**

Submitted by Marge Greenwald on Wed, 2018-04-18 19:48

Do not increase meter parking from 6 to 8 pm. You will drive even more business away from our restaurants. As is many prefer to go elsewhere for lunch. It is essential that we do not undermine our restaurants at dinner.

#### Nonsensical

Submitted by Dave on Wed, 2018-04-18 19:50

I for one will have little interest in coming downtown upon the extension of pay for parking hours. This will result in lost business and ultimately lost revenue for the Village.

#### parking

Submitted by leesa on Wed, 2018-04-18 20:05

It is a challenge to coordinate so many different wants and needs within one village, but I for one appreciate the overnight parking bans and think the quieter night streets and ability to not deal with car alarms and closing doors etc. all night is one of the reason many choose the suburbs over the city. While I have sympathy for apartment dwellers and condo owners who lack many spaces per unit, I think it is inherent on renters or condo buyers to figure out the parking situation and whether or not it meets their needs before signing a lease or purchase contract. When I lived in Chicago, I saved money on rent by renting an apt with no parking. When i needed a car, I ponied up \$250 a month to park 6 blocks from my home. It was not the city's worry that I was a young female walking 6 blocks at night. For my next apartment, I paid more in rent to find a space with parking. Condos in the city typically command a \$30,000+ premium per parking space. No one owes people who choose to choose to own a car (or cars) free parking in another location when their building does not provide parking. Oak Park is a suburb. People move here and buy here because it is a suburb. Quit trying to make it into the city. When a new high rise or condo building goes up, there should be more than one parking space per unit.

#### Overnight Parking Ban

Submitted by Carla on Wed, 2018-04-18 21:21

Because of the overnight parking ban, I had to wait 7 months after moving to Oak Park to bring my vehicle to this village. In that 7 months, I had to wait for the privilege to pay for a lot spot to open up near my apartment. For 7 months, I had to take the L to work downtown at night, because I didn't have my car, and almost got mugged twice. All because the rules of this village, where I live and pay taxes, wouldn't let me have my car.

Why does this village, which currently has an apartment and condo boom, not let people park overnight on the street? If you pay \$70/year to register your vehicle with Oak Park, you should be able to legally park overnight on the street.

Again, this issue is a self-inflicted wound that makes it hard to have a car in a suburb.

As an aside, citizens call the quarterly fight for parking permits "The Hunger Games" because it pits neighbors against neighbors for the privilege of being able to park near their home — when they should be able to just park on the street. It's embarrassing and I have personally

talked two friends out of moving to Oak Park because of the absurdity of the overnight parking ban.

### **Parking**

Submitted by Melody Robinson on Wed, 2018-04-18 21:22

This new proposal is very confusing and I think to have to pay pass 6pm is nuts. This is way to confusing and unnecessary for lak Park residents and business owners. Moving after three hours or being charged three dollars per hour instead of the usual one dollar. Sounds like this is all about money. And not the convince of Oak Park residents at all. This proposal is way to complicated and not really far to Oak Parker's.

### **Overnight Parking Permitted Spaces-Z6**

Submitted by Meg K on Wed, 2018-04-18 22:04

No for the parking pilot!

In regards to the changes in permitted overnight parking I strongly disagree. The current restrictions in our Z6 zone is 9pm to 10am. Even with that restriction we find ourselves not able to always get a space because other people are parked in the permitted spaces. We usually get home between 9 and 10 pm (note after the current restrictions). This change will make it impossible for us to ever park near our building in the permit area that we pay for. If the proposed open parking form 8pm-2:30am on permitted spaces goes through that will have huge negative consequences for myself and most of my neighbors. There simply needs to be stricter enforcement seeing as there are the same 4-5 cars that park in this permit zone every night of the week with apparently little consequence. Those tickets alone would make up the new proposed 6-8pm revenue.

### **pilot parking plan**

Submitted by tom on Wed, 2018-04-18 22:34

Congratulations Oak Park! You've outdone yourself. I thought the parking situation couldn't possibly get worse but, it has. I know we live close to Chicago but do you have to emulate their mayor in myriad ways to not only restrict parking but, where it is allowed, to put the squeeze on its residents? We already can't park in front of our own houses without fees, stickers, passes or risk being ambushed with fines. Again , congratulations parking committee "geniuses". Your work has to be voluntary as I can't believe your getting paid for coming up with this ragtag plan.

### **Permits and Passes**

Submitted by Barb on Thu, 2018-04-19 00:47

This proposal is way too complicated and could easily be made less so as well as not making it more costly for residents who already pay plenty enough in taxes.

Residents should not have to buy a permit to park in front of their own homes and should be exempt from the 3 hour limit. The new technology should be able to identify the plate number as belonging on that block once the village sticker is purchased. Nor should there be a charge for overnight parking for residents when needed.

As for guest passes, residents should be able to purchase for a reasonable fee, a pass to be



used multiple times for persons either working or visiting. Having multiple paper passes is a waste of everyone's time. For extended stay guests those plate numbers can be registered with the village in addition to showing a guest pass.

For long term caregivers and Nannies, those plate numbers could also be temporarily registered to that address with documentation from the home owner. No fee should be over \$50 one time for any of the above passes

I disagree with extending the meter parking to 8pm. And lastly, the process for appealing a ticket in the village is a nightmare and rarely worth even trying.

### Overnight parking

Submitted by Liz on Thu, 2018-04-19 08:17

So this means that overnight, unlimited parking might come to OP? With a permit/pass, any street can be parked on?

I strongly disagree with this. It leads to crowded, dirty streets (even with the occasional street cleaning). My job takes me to various Chicago neighborhoods where cars are always parked on the street. It has a very different (and worse) feel than OP has now.

### Parking Restrictions

Submitted by Fay on Thu, 2018-04-19 08:39

Currently my neighbors and I pay \$135.00 per quarter for overnight parking passes (135 x 4 = \$540..) almost \$600.00 a year to park on the street near our homes where we pay property taxes. It is not only uncovered street parking, but it is not even designated parking, which means if we are relegated to park on the side streets we have to pay an additional \$7.00 per incident after the first 3 times we do so. This is an exorbitant, unnecessary expense for homeowners and it is an added hinderance to living in Oak Park. I discourage anyone who ask about living in Oak Park. I highlight the peacefulness and stress the ridiculous encumbrance that parking is for all who reside here.

### Parking Pilot Presentation Feedback

Submitted by Anonymous on Thu, 2018-04-19 08:59

Like

\*Permit/Passe Matrix. 30-day Free parking per plate/year.

\*Pay by plate e-pay system.

\*standardized parking times.

### Serious Concern

- Pay Dynamic Pricing parking rate increases after 3 hrs.
  - o Why would we want to limit the time somebody spends in OP?
  - o This approach is cost prohibited, low-income persons which include, seniors, single mothers, people of color, etc.
- Two senior and assistant living locations will be affected.
  - o This might have a negative impact on the amount of time people have visitors, which is crucial in reducing isolation and improving quality of life.
  - o The new cost might also affect how much and how often somebody may get visitors.
- Parking structures are not readily available nor conveniently accessible in some areas.

- o The ones I am aware of are 1 mile away on Lake & Marion north of the pilot area.
- o I would like a map with all the parking structures in the proposed area.
- Not everyone has a smartphone. How will these nice people pay by plate?
- This might deter low-income person from coming to Oak Park.

#### Need Clarification

- On-street Parking: what happens from 6 am – 8 am?
- What is the estimated revenue?
- How will revenue be allocated?
- Why are the proposed change only affect South of South Blvd. to Harrison? I believe these are the areas that have the most apartments and lower-income residents.

#### Recommendations

- Do not use Pay Dynamic Pricing
- If you want people to use public garages, consider giving them an incentive and make it truly convenient. I know there are at least three parking structures on Lake and two parking lots on Marion North of South Blvd. which are about 1 mile away, this is not convenient. I do concede that I may be unaware of other parking structures within the pilot area.
- Update PDF with a clear and legible copy.

#### Proposal Needs Work

Submitted by YR on Thu, 2018-04-19 09:06

This proposal needs some work! I have listed what I like, things I am seriously concerned about, areas that need clarification and recommendations.

#### Like

Permit/Passes Matrix

30-day Free parking per plate/year.

Pay by plate e-pay system.

standardized parking times.

#### Serious Concern

Pay Dynamic Pricing parking rate increases after 3 hrs.

Why would we want to limit the time somebody spends in OP?

This approach is cost prohibited, low-income persons which include, seniors, single mothers, people of color, etc.

Two senior and assistant living locations will be affected.

This might have a negative impact on the amount of time people have visitors, which is crucial in reducing isolation and improving quality of life.

New cost might also affect how much and how often somebody may get visitors.

Parking structures are not readily available nor conveniently accessible in some areas.

The ones I am aware of are 1 mile away on Lake & Marion north of the pilot area.

I would like a map with all the parking structures in the proposed area.



Not everyone has a smartphone. How will these nice people pay by plate?  
This might deter low income person from coming to Oak Park.

#### Need Clarification

On-street Parking: what happens from 6 am – 8 am?

What is the estimated revenue?

How will revenue be allocated?

Why are the proposed change only affect South of South Blvd. to Harrison? I believe these are the areas that have the most apartments and lower-income residents.

#### Recommendations

Do not use Pay Dynamic Pricing

If you want people to use public garages, consider giving them an incentive and make it truly convenient. I know there are at least three parking structures on Lake and two parking lots on Marion North of South Blvd. which are about 1 mile away, this is not convenient. I do concede that I may be unaware of other parking structures within the pilot area.

Update PDF with a clear and legible copy.

#### Summarize Please

Submitted by Concerned Oak P... on Thu, 2018-04-19 09:16

Please give an executive summary of all the proposed changes in bullet point format. These changes are numerous and we need a clear explanation about each of the changes. Thank you.

#### Parking proposals

Submitted by Roger French on Thu, 2018-04-19 09:47

I cannot see how this proposed achieves any of the stated goals. It is still much too complex. We need a complete rethinking, not a list of minor tweaks. And, we need to dramatically reduce costs and fees. Thank you.

#### Parking pilot

Submitted by Lynn G on Thu, 2018-04-19 10:16

The diagrams were unreadable even on my large screen laptop; the colors of the streets could not even be deciphered. Answer me these 2 questions: I would like to have guests try to park near my condo on Oak Park ave and Washington for a dinner party. Where and for how long can they park on each evening of the week? My family member from out of town needs to park near my home for a week. What do I need to arrange to help them do this and where do they put their car and how many times a day must they move it elsewhere? It is a nightmare to decipher the answers to these 2 basic questions after listening to this presentation.

Additionally say no to extending parking fees to 8 PM in metered areas! Restaurants and businesses need out of town customers to not choose other towns to frequent and in town residents need to be given a break on the constant parking expenses to simply eat or shop locally in the evening . I am also opposed to metered parking on Madison. For heaven sake,

this new plan does nothing for me other than wring out more money from my empty pocket to simply reside here.

#### Reduce Permit Fees

Submitted by Barry Jung on Thu, 2018-04-19 11:10

Permits are a way to regulate and organize parking -- they should not be a disguised tax. The permit fees should only reflect the cost to administer the program and yet they have increased dramatically over the years -- way out of line with the inflation index. \$540/year is a tax not a fee. Reduce the fees as part of this revision and include a discount for seniors 65+ as you currently do with village car stickers.

#### Residential Street parking

Submitted by Tom CLINTON STREET on Thu, 2018-04-19 11:22

Hi,

I understood what the village wants to do to Madison street!

I couldn't read the grid very well. or was that to make a decision by the residents more difficult???

Are they going to turn our street and others like it from 8 to 8 like Madison street?

I am Strongly Against the VILLAGE SELLING OUT OUR AMENITIES (RESIDENTIAL Street PARKING).

I can't imagine why the VILLAGE feels they can change parking on residential streets that have been in place for about a 100 years or for at least the 63 yrs I have lived on them.

Is \$16,000.00 not enough for OAK PARK TAX and heading HIGHER since 1978 that I have been an owner.

The village thinks the residents are ignorant so why not!

Next they are going to charge our children to ride their bikes on the front sidewalks!

#### Parking on streets with 8-10 am no parking rules...

Submitted by Jerry Capozzoli on Thu, 2018-04-19 12:15

Hi all, I live on one of those streets and think the 8-10 rule is fine I don't want to have my mother in law have to pay every time she visits this is crazy. It's a residential street and it is already an inconvenience having to wait till 10 am to park in front of my home and what you are proposing Permitted Parking is just another way the city wants to charge its tax paying residents for parking on streets near bus/train stops. Stop reaching into our pockets!!!! If you want to fix something eliminate parking on Garfield because it's a hazard everytime I come out of my alley with cars parked up and down that street - serious blind spot. If you can't eliminate the parking on Garfield at least make it a one way street. Another big issue is all the

left hand turners from Garfield to Oak Park Ave its a serious congestion problem, Maybe if i one way then you could have both lanes to create a left hand turn lane onto Oak Park Avenue and East from Garfield. Look for ways to improve traffic flow and stop looking for ways to reach into our pockets we get enough of that from district 97 and 200

#### Agreed

Submitted by South Oak Parker on Thu, 2018-04-19 15:51

Yes! I've seen far too many accidents pulling out from the Alley onto Garfield. Also agreed with making Garfield one way (and Harrison could be one way, which frankly could open up much more parking on that street, there could be angled parking on one side vs parallel, more cars would fit).

#### Parking time shift from 6am - 8pm

Submitted by Jerry on Thu, 2018-04-19 12:18

I think this is just wrong keep it where it is at I have no issues finding parking in OP metered parking from 8-6 is perfect that is regular business hours this is only for the city to capitalize on people eating out in OP after 6pm

#### Comments say enough

Submitted by S Grove on Thu, 2018-04-19 13:17

It seems as though the comments above radically oppose the parking pilot and this is an obvious no brainer for the transportation committee not to move forward with the pilot. I agree with everything above - don't open zone parking for commuters, if you rent / buy with limited parking, know what you're getting in to before signing, don't raise the meter parking to 8 pm, give us guest passes for guests and workers (don't make this so difficult).

#### NO. Just NO

Submitted by South Oak Parker on Thu, 2018-04-19 15:48

I live south of 290 and noticed we would not be included in the "pilot" program. Thankfully. Because we actually do not have an issue with daytime parking being a problem on our street. The issue we suffer from is cars being allowed to park on Garfield blocking visibility when exiting the alley. There have been many accidents, I'm surprised that has not been addressed. But these proposed rules are not only confusing but also frankly a slap in the face to everyone in OP already being hit with massive tax increases. It's like a tax to park in front of my own home. Honestly, there's really no justification for morning parking restrictions in South OP. It's very frustrating, in fact. With our taxes and parking stickers this is ridiculous. Would we be getting meters on our street?! What we do need is a solution to problems parking near businesses (and esp those businesses near residential, such as Pleasant near Marion). You are pricing everyone out of Oak Park. I recently discovered a tax bill from three years ago that was about \$1,000 lower (for half the year, and that with winning appeals). The rate of tax increases and now the proposed parking money-grabbing is far more steep than anyone's raises, if they even are getting any...plus we all have to deal with health insurance costs rising. I suggest widening streets where possible (Madison?) and making angled parking rather than parallel, you'll double the capacity. And how about building garages. As hard as it is to park in Forest Park it's still easier and cheaper than Oak Park so that's where we shop and dine.

#### **Parking in front of my house**

Submitted by Tiffany Martinelli on Thu, 2018-04-19 15:51

I live on a block with no parking 8-10am and this already causes me enough grief with guests, caregivers and workers- now I can't have anyone visiting or my own car in front of my house for more than three hours?? That's not right- I understand the need to try to reduce commuters parking but there should be an allowance for those of us living here!! I also do not agree with increasing the meter time to 8pm- will most definitely cause a decrease in business downtown in the evening.

#### **Please don' do the Pilot**

Submitted by Desseree on Thu, 2018-04-19 17:06

This is crazy, why can't you leave the parking the way that it is? There is so many things that is wrong with the Pilot parking. Why are you extending the time from 6 to 8 pm, it doesn't make since I know more money in your pocket. Here is another outrageous plan to have cars move once a week to the south side of the street. Does anyone how the are going to get all of those cars on one side and on top of the that you extended the time. This is ridiculous, when it comes to cleaning the leaves of the street, which takes up more parking space, because it take forever before someone comes to remove them. The have already eliminate 2 blocks on both side of parking on Washington need Marion for a street light, when they could have put a four way stop sign that lights up when pedestrian need to cross, but that was to simple. Now you are going have open parking until 2 a.m. so the visitor to park. Well i guest the resident don't count. I already park two blocks away I guess I will be parking four blocks or more. I can't even park in front of my apt building any because the the new street light. Thanks Oak Park what a way to treat the residents that live in Oak Park. Yet every year the parking permits go up more and more but I can't even park in front of my apartment. WOW

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Toni on Thu, 2018-04-19 18:00

This is too confusing. This is a ridiculous proposal for residents in Oak Park. Oak Park needs to look at the parking situation and provide more parking for residents and guess without being charge extra to park in the village. Taxes are high enough. Rent is high too. Don't need to pay more money for additional restrictions. MY VOTE IS NO ON PARKING PILOT PROGRAM!

#### **Screw up the currently working system on our street**

Submitted by Stevan on Thu, 2018-04-19 20:00

The 8am-10am restriction on 700-800 S Grove works well. We have managed to avoid tickets during the past few years. Change it to 3 hr parking and we will be paying tickets yet again - and so will people visiting us. Yet again, we will be swearing at No Park, IL.

After 6pm free parking also works. Doing away with that is simply mean-spirited.

#### **Pilot Parking Proposal**

Submitted by Mark on Thu, 2018-04-19 20:10

I totally agree with the comment from S. Grove above. The parking pilot program should be scrapped given my perception of lack of community support, the many problems outlined in

comments above, and the complexity of the proposal. The presentation of the pilot I viewed had unreadable text and the map was of a really bad quality. Would like to see the video include the perceived need and how the proposal addresses the need. Save the current policies of "no on street overnight parking" for residential areas with the feature of buying affordable overnight passes for guests. The current policy works just fine for residential and it is critical for controlling overnight parking, maintenance and snow removal.

#### **Parking Pilot**

Submitted by Kathleen on Thu, 2018-04-19 21:11

I am opposed to virtually every aspect of this pilot. The terms are confusing, and make parking in this Village even more costly and inconvenient for both visitors and residents. And the fact that I, or my guests, would be restricted from parking in front of my home during the day is unacceptable. I also believe this proposal would further damage Oak Park businesses.

#### **No overnight parking**

Submitted by Cindy on Thu, 2018-04-19 23:09

RF Brookfield La Grange Riverside.....all have overnight restrictions. We are not unique, All villagers pay to park through higher rent, property taxes or parking permits. These are all cost factors that went in to our choosing our homes.

#### **Please don't do this**

Submitted by Paul on Fri, 2018-04-20 07:15

If we change the parking rules the commuters will camp out near the EL stations (both blue and green). Please leave the policy in place.

#### **Request for clarification about day permit**

Submitted by Kendra on Fri, 2018-04-20 14:03

With the day permit option, would that be zone specific or would any permit work in any area?

For instance, I would love to have a day permit to park intermittently in front of my condo building (I put the car in a paid city garage at night). But I fear that if \*any\* day permit works in any zone, that option would actually worsen the situation for those of us who live in "desirable" locations (e.g., near the train). As I see it, zone-specific day permits would allow folks to park in their own zone, but prevent their zones from becoming unparkable because of others taking up the spaces.

#### **Don't try to figure it all out now**

Submitted by kevin shalla on Fri, 2018-04-20 15:15

This is too complicated. Why not define goals, and leave details to village staff? For example, how about this: goal - set parking price to always have at least 2 open spaces in every block in the village, allowing price to fluctuate according to date, season, time, etc.. Mandate that all new road construction / parking lot construction contain technology to monitor parking usage. The village staff would then adjust pricing to ensure there's always convenient parking

everywhere. If there's no demand on a particular block at a particular time, then parking is free. If demand is heavy, it is expensive.

#### Overnight Parking

Submitted by Larry Lipps on Sun, 2018-04-22 17:34

I've lived in OP for 45 years (four as a renter & 41 as a homeowner).

My comments only apply to residential areas & not to multifamily housing areas.

Two major reasons to maintain the overnight parking ban include:

1. Safety - less cars on streets means less crime & less accidents.
2. Character/ambience of our residential neighborhoods.

I don't want my neighborhood to look like Berwyn or Chicago.

I do NOT support changing the overnight parking ban. Opening up all residential streets to overnight parking would NEGATIVELY impact OP.

#### Overnight Parking

Submitted by Larry Lipps on Sun, 2018-04-22 18:21

I've lived in OP for 45 years (four as a renter & 41 as a homeowner).

My comments only apply to strictly residential areas & not to multi-family housing areas.

Two major reasons to maintain the overnight parking ban include:

1. Safety - less cars mean less crime in our neighborhoods & less accidents on our streets.
2. Character/ambience of our residential neighborhoods.

I don't want my neighborhood to look like Berwyn or Chicago.

I do NOT support changing the overnight parking ban. Opening up all residential areas to overnight parking would NEGATIVELY change OP.

#### Parking changes pilot

Submitted by Willie Mack on Fri, 2018-04-20 17:15

I am not in favor of the proposed pilot changes. I concur with many of the reasons already given. My response is no!

#### As a decades long home owner,

Submitted by Anonymous on Fri, 2018-04-20 19:15

As a decades long home owner, the one thing I do not want to see is blanket overnight parking. The wide empty streets at night are safer and are what Oak Park has been. Drive across Norrh Avenue into Chicago, and you'll see the difference. Bumper to bumper cars, chairs on street to save spaces during snowstorms. Awful. I understand the need for some overnight parking near 100 year old apartment buildings, built when cars were only for a few. In single family home areas, though, I don't see there is any need for overnight parking.

On another note, how about driving around streets at night to see if cars are jutting into the streets, parked across sidewalks? I have seen this, and wonder how these car owners aren't ticketed or towed?

This is dangerous.

#### **Say NO to the parking pilot**

Submitted by Sarah E. on Sat, 2018-04-21 09:07

There is nothing in this pilot that I actively support and much that I don't like, including extending metered parking until 8:00 p.m. and the other ways that this pilot makes it even more expensive to live in Oak Park. But I am particularly opposed to the parts of the pilot that eliminate the overnight parking ban and allow commuters to park longer on residential streets. The other commenters have it right-- why are we making Oak Park look and feel more like Berwyn or Chicago? Heed the feedback you are getting on this forum and have gotten in others. The taxpayers of Oak Park are OPPOSED to this pilot.

#### **build a parking garage for blue line commuters**

Submitted by Jeanne Findlay on Sat, 2018-04-21 14:13

There are two OP stops close together on the Blue line at Austin & Oak Park Blvds. Why isn't there a parking garage for commuters versus using residential streets to park? My guests and/or workers literally have no place to park along Humphrey or Van Buren because those spots are taken up by commuters especially along Van Buren the closer you get to Austin.

#### **Ridiculous**

Submitted by Noelle T on Sat, 2018-04-21 14:27

It's bad enough that commuter parking was as expensive as it was and there's limited parking. You guys are continuing to lose good people because you're constantly increasing costs, we are not the City of Chicago but with the rising prices we all may as well move downtown. Also, what about our guests? Why are you making it more difficult for people's loved ones to come and visit? I'm disappointed in this proposal and the lack of response and consideration from Oak Park. It's already bad enough you charge people to park on the street where people are car jacked, side swiped and were told to relocate our cars on certain days during a two hour period. FYI south suburbs does not charge for street parking. Please do better by your citizens. It's like Oak Park is becoming a knock off of Hyde Park.

#### **2 hour restrictions and overnight parking**

Submitted by Kathy on Sat, 2018-04-21 14:41

The two hour parking restrictions on residential streets by Chicago Ave. west of Austin Blvd. should be strictly enforced. Employees from businesses on Chicago Ave. park all day taking away parking from residents. Perhaps making these streets residents only without making residents jump through hoops to accomplish it and making residential permits available and affordable would be a sound idea. Also, overnight parking in this area is not strictly enforced especially on weekends and motorists know it as Superior St. is filled on weekends and no tickets issued. Z4 permit parking on Austin Blvd. also is not enforced. There is heavy foot traffic at all hours in this area which is poorly lit and all these vehicles present a safety issue providing cover for individuals with mischief in mind.



### No overnight parking or new parking rules

Submitted by c on Sat, 2018-04-21 14:53

It is easier to read the comments from the presentation and understand what is happening than to watch the presentation (which I did). I agree with all the other comments. WHAT A MESS! 6 months and then review? Are you kidding me? See Greg's 4/18/18 comment, which I agree with totally. I say there are too many cars! That is the problem! Start from that point. How much is all this costing? How about all the new buildings' impact? Why wasn't that thought about before this time?

### Parking Pilot

Submitted by Len Palombi on Sat, 2018-04-21 15:16

The sad fact is that there are more cars in oak park than parking spaces. You can meter, restrict, ticket all you want and that doesn't change the fact that demand exceeds supply. All that restrictions do is penalize everyone. I would venture that if you added up all the money spent on studying, installing more signs/meters, ticketing, handling disputes, etc., you could build more parking spaces and increase the supply. Why make things more complicated? Simplify and save money by removing all restrictions, signs and meters.

### Residenti permits

Submitted by Dean Rogers on Sat, 2018-04-21 15:32

When I bought my house, I did not purchase the parking spot in front of it. The streets are public roadways for anybody's use. What entitles a homeowner to a spot in front of their house?

### Proposed Parking Restrictions

Submitted by Peter on Sat, 2018-04-21 15:47

Horrible, horrible, horrible. Are you folks on drugs? How are these steps an improvement?

Especially burdensome for me is the restriction of three hours on residential blocks with current timed restrictions during the day. This will make it difficult for me to have guests over during the daytime. The current restriction is fine, why make it narrower? And the exemption that residents receive from the three hour time limit would not apply to my guests, as I park in my own garage and hence do not have a parking permit to share with others.

The more extensive pay to park hours (through 8pm)? No, no, no. This is only going to hurt area businesses.

The premise of this pilot parking program is that the block by block ordinances that have been established are somehow confusing or inefficient or what have you, and so we must standardize things, but what is really going on here is a money grab, the establishment of more pretexts for citing motorists who park on our streets. And this phrase, "parking management tool," ugh, total bureaucrat-speak.

### Frustrating

Submitted by Anonymous on Sat, 2018-04-21 16:02



I live in a 2flat building with no garage nor space for parking. I have to purchase an overnight sticker just to be able to park away from in front of my home and walk back to it. There is also a 2 hour time limit on my street (Humphrey) which means I still cant park in front of my home nor have any guests until 3pm. The no parking in front of your own home is very outdated. I cant even relax during vacations we have to constantly move for fear of a ticket. The only time I can have ease of guests is during the holidays when Oak Park gives me special permission to have overnight family without the hassle yet in the morning we are all back moving around in a panic to find a park because of the 2 hour limit. These ridiculous bans and time limits hasnt stopped any crimes, it is just creating a parking nightmare and headache for the residents who actually live here. Does Oak Park even think or care about renters when they come up with these parking rules. It appears that they do not.

#### **Resident parking concerns**

Submitted by BC on Sat, 2018-04-21 16:51

I'm a little confused and concerned with zone permit spaces becoming open to both permits and guest passes overnight. (Am I understanding this correctly?). So, as a resident, I must continue to pay \$540 per year for on-street parking near my home when visitors could also park in the same location with a free pass? It's already challenging to find parking in the zone permit areas as a resident when coming home from work. I would ask that you please reconsider this (have separate Residential and Visitor parking zones OR significantly decrease the cost of a permit for residents).

Also...VETO on the extension of meters to 8pm.

I do appreciate the change of 8-10am no parking to a 3 hour restriction instead. As someone who does home visiting therapy, that 8-10 parking ban is extremely challenging for home healthcare and social service providers!

Thanks! I know you're trying to solve many issues and meet the needs/wants of many. I hope we are able to continue giving real-time feedback during the actual pilot process. Just curious...how will you be collecting data/feedback during the pilot time and how can we participate as residents?

#### **Discrimination**

Submitted by Wilma Fingerdo on Sat, 2018-04-21 21:30

Stop discriminating against taxpaying residents who do not own a garage. FREE overnight parking for ALL residents.

TIRED OF THIS BS

#### **I have a Masters Degree and**

Submitted by Anonymous on Sat, 2018-04-21 22:12

I have a Masters Degree and cannot understand most of the proposal. THAT is f'ed up.

#### **PARKING**

Submitted by Eddie Scanlan on Sun, 2018-04-22 00:46

Don't worry about it.

**Do Not Support Pilot**

Submitted by Susan A on Sun, 2018-04-22 05:41

If public feedback is the first criteria for success, THIS PILOT PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE IMPLEMENTED given the comments.

As a resident who has lived in both the city and the suburbs and now chooses Oak Park, parking matters.

I have lived in various neighborhoods of Chicago. Unrestricted parking in the city, whether paid or not, leads to ongoing drives around the neighborhood, sometimes up to 3-4 or more blocks away, to find a parking spot - at any time of the day or night. One thing I appreciate about Oak Park is the relative feeling of safety - a large part of that is due to the openness of the streets and visibility on the residential streets. This parking plan would take that away -- I personally would have a sense of wariness at not being able to have a clear line of vision around me due to cars, at not knowing who may be sitting in a car waiting for me to come along, alone, particularly at night or even early in the morning for that matter when anyone wants or needs to go out early in the dark. Or kids. Given that the schools are a huge draw for this community, any program that diminishes safety for anyone of any age cannot be implemented.

I have also lived in Hinsdale and Naperville and other suburbs where there is even more dependence on cars. And given a choice, businesses that have available free parking (as in Oak Brook) are highly preferred to communities where not only is there a high level of congestion, but parking is scarce and you have to pay. That's just a given. In my mind there are enough empty storefronts on an ongoing basis to create additional impediments to having people come to Oak Park businesses. The Village would do well to focus on finding ways to increase the attractiveness and ease of frequenting our local business community.

Finally, the presentation is not persuasive. Ignoring the typos, it is charts and graphs and frankly, simplistic.

Oak Park prides itself on its diversity -- the village is in fact populated by homeowners, renters, businesses, public facilities, churches and more all of which have different needs -- not to mention income and other diversities. This program does not address that.

There is no thoughtful cost benefit analysis provided either for residents, businesses, visitors, or the village. I see no real benefits for me as a resident -- and I have to believe that there is a huge income benefit for the village.

There is no attempt to address concerns -- the public meetings held to date have driven out many concerns, and there is no evidence that any of the concerns have been heard and / or addressed in the program.

In short, the village appears to be giving what an old boss of mine would call "dramatic lip service". A lot of noise and activity around this parking but very little substantive listening, responding, and actively working to come to a mutually beneficial solution.

Oak Park has high taxes as it is; this parking program is another regressive tax that has no clearly stated benefits other than one more source of revenue for the village and clear disadvantages for both residents and businesses.

I have an idea of the cost of this process -- the amount of time that has gone into developing the idea (and being sold by vendors) on the part of the village, holding the public meetings, building it into the budget to make it an easier sell to the residents, doing multiple iterations of the plan. From where I sit, it's not been well managed or executed.

Is Oak Park still the village it professes to be? Where people are collaboratively working to make this a mutually beneficial place to live for everyone?

Or are the developers and revenue generators having their way? The new high rise residential buildings are increasing congestion dramatically. There is a reason no good sized business has taken the building at Harlem and Lake -- there's a reason the Target is smaller than many Walgreens - there are reasons why we have so many empty storefronts or that small businesses come and go so quickly even at the major intersections (Lake and Oak Park Avenue).

I know multiple families who have left Oak Park. I personally do not know anyone who strongly supports the general trend of the village management.

NO ON THE NEW PARKING REGULATIONS.

#### **Extended hours M-F til 8**

Submitted by Jan on Sun, 2018-04-22 06:52

This is a terrible idea extending this until 8. Now you could not go to a restaurant or movie or a meeting without feeding a meter or getting ticket. Time cuts into anything you would want to do. Totally against this. Forest Park here I come. They know how to welcome diners and shoppers and residents.

#### **Proposed Parking Program**

Submitted by Victoria on Sun, 2018-04-22 07:03

This new parking proposal is disappointing. I want the Village of Oak Park to be a welcoming place for visitors, family, and friends. The proposed parking regulations remind me more of the parking situation in Chicago, where it is so difficult to park. Let's keep our village a village. Larger suburban communities have been able to do so, why can't we?

1. The existing parking regulations are seldom enforced. Why not spend the village's resources on enforcing them rather than spending additional money to create a new program that is more cumbersome and restrictive than the old one.
2. The new signs that are presently in place are just as confusing as the old ones, and the size and configuration of them are unattractive and distracting.
3. Metered parking on Madison Street may discourage people from patronizing of the businesses that are already struggling to stay in business. It will cause people to park on the residential side streets, which are already clogged.
4. Raising parking costs will discourage people to shop in Oak Park. Is Forest Park going to take Oak Park's commercial business once again?
5. If family and friends come to visit, must they stay only two or three hours and then leave? Have free day passes available for residents to give to their visiting friends and families.

I moved to Oak Park for many reasons, one was to get away from city life. The recent addition of high rise buildings in downtown has been disappointing and so is this new parking plan. Progress shouldn't mean changing who we are. Let's keep Oak Park a welcoming village and not turn it into a satellite of Chicago.

#### Utterly confusing

Submitted by Robin on Sun, 2018-04-22 07:22

I can't even read this map and the entire fee structure is confusing. I will echo what other folks have said. The 3 hour time limit on Saturday is nuts. I currently pay almost 300.00 per quarter in a garage 5 blocks from my home because I used to commute downtown and due to the current 2 hour restrictions on certain days would have to constantly move my vehicle. On Saturday I'd like to park on the street near my home that I own for more than 3 hours without any additional fees. Bottom line if you are an oak park resident with a vehicle sticker you should be allowed to park on any street (including overnight) without paying more money. That's how simple this could be. I'm also firmly against more meter charges.

#### Permits/Parking Pass Matrix Clarity

Submitted by Jennifer Bell on Sun, 2018-04-22 08:03

Could you please clarify the process for obtaining guest passes. According to the matrix on the powerpoint, if I own a car, I must purchase a special \$70 vehicle sticker--is this the regular village vehicle sticker that I always buy, or is this a new sticker for the pilot area? What if I own a car but have a garage and will only need passes for guests? I do not see an option for those who own a car and have their own parking space already to obtain guest passes/permits for guests who want to park overnight or extended time during the day on occasion.

Also, currently, guests are not allowed to park in permit zone areas. Will guests who want to park overnight be able to park anywhere now? Please clarify. In the past, my 79 year old

mother would have to park 4 blocks away if she wanted to stay overnight. This is unreasonable. Please clarify the guest passes policy for both daytime extension pass and overnight parking, location, and how these passes can be obtained by us residents--both for residents who own street parking permits and those residents who have their own parking space but still want to be able to obtain guest passes.

The new parking policy should prioritize the residents who own condos and rent in the areas that are affected. We are the ones who reside in the pilot area, and the new policies should consider the needs of the residents first over revenue for the city. Furthermore, the village needs to understand that this is 2018. Having such strict parking rules is unrealistic. With the growth of high rises, etc., Oak Park is more of a city than a suburb. Oak Park needs to come to grips with the reality of city life and adapt a policy more akin to bigger cities. Furthermore, not allowing parking overnight from 2:30 to 8 am on residential streets is an outdated policy. This has done nothing to "reduce crime" as we have seen a spike in crime--carjackings, robberies etc in spite of this old-fashioned policy.

#### **signage and increase in meter fees**

Submitted by ssuan on Sun, 2018-04-22 09:40

Signage is too complex. If you can't read it without getting out of your car and consulting a calendar and watch it is too complicated. I stood in front of one of those "pilot" signs after having to pull over and stand in front of it, without really knowing if it was safe to park. Also, raising meters to 1\$ an hour is crazy for our smaller commercial areas, we are not downtown chicago or wrigleyville. Remember all the trouble in Chicago when they sold their meters?

#### **signage and increase in meter fees**

Submitted by ssuan on Sun, 2018-04-22 09:40

Signage is too complex. If you can't read it without getting out of your car and consulting a calendar and watch it is too complicated. I stood in front of one of those "pilot" signs after having to pull over and stand in front of it, without really knowing if it was safe to park. Also, raising meters to 1\$ an hour is crazy for our smaller commercial areas, we are not downtown chicago or wrigleyville. Remember all the trouble in Chicago when they sold their meters?

#### **No need for meters on Madison or for extension to 8 pm**

Submitted by Alan on Sun, 2018-04-22 11:48

I fail to see the need for the proposed meters on Madison -- there is not a great demand for parking there during business hours and this will only serve to make it harder for the few viable businesses there. This appears to be simply an attempt to generate more revenue for the village, and it would be more transparent if the presentation admitted this. The same can be said for the extension of meter hours from 6 pm to 8 pm - defensible only as a revenue generator. It certainly will not "create an additional shift for restaurants." Just the opposite -- it will deter patronage of the restaurants. Like too many other decisions the village makes, this one ignores the long-term effects -- similar to jacking up parking rates near the Green Line,

which deters the use of public transportation and encourages people to drive downtown instead of taking the el.

#### Unacceptable parking changes

Submitted by Barbara Rush on Sun, 2018-04-22 17:50

New trial signs are confusing and writing is far too small to read while in the car. I shouldn't have to get out of the car and study the sign to figure out if I am able to park in the spot.

Changing meter parking from 6pm to 8 pm will discourage me from using the restaurants downtown. Just another added cost and concern to a night out.

#### Parking meter rate

Submitted by A.F. Koster vva... on Sun, 2018-04-22 21:33

I was shocked to see the large increase of hourly parking meter fee from 25 cents to a dollar/hour at May 1. Remember that it was a nickel/hour some 20 years ago. So now it increases by a factor of 20. Retail businesses will be further hurt while they are already in trouble. For a restaurant visit, these rates are highly tolerable, for a retail store, they may be prohibitive. Say I want to buy a \$4.00 item, and browse a bit. Where will I go. Guess what. I will go to Forest Park. Parking is free on Madison, and I can visit and browse various stores at leisure. On Oak Park Ave, or Chicago Ave, I have to watch my time and risk a \$30+ ticket. Why would I do that. And the financial gains for OP are trivial while the damage to our already depleted number of retail shops will be significant.

#### Parking near the Brooks

Submitted by Todd on Sun, 2018-04-22 23:03

\* Thank you for the presentation. The PDF is somewhat more viewable than the video, but I still can't read the maps, so I won't be able to comment on what I wasn't able to read.

\* I'm gathering that what's proposed is open overnight parking to permitted residents in their permit areas. This would be on one side of the street only for fire/safety reasons, if the street is 30ft or narrower.

\* This is currently what we have in Y4 near Brooks Middle School. The number of permitted spaces is inadequate, however, because there are so many multi-unit buildings along Washington, Grove, Kenilworth, Clinton, Home. Also, because day parking (after 6 am school days) around Brooks (all sides of the lot) is already dedicated to staff parking.

\* I don't see this plan, as I understand it, to be workable in adding additional permitted space for residents in multi-unit buildings in our area.

\* It would not be possible to have one-side only parking for residents on the streets that border Brooks, because those streets are dedicated to staff parking.

\* On the one day-per week abatement period, similarly, there would be no place for residents to park around the school, if the Brooks staff parking remains. They would have to park blocks away where there is already very limited parking because of the number of multi-unit buildings.

\* I don't see this plan as a solution, from what I understand, which unfortunately is not as much as I would like.

Thank you very much for your effort, however. Please keep trying. Don't give up.

God bless you!

#### **Elimination of overnight parking ban**

Submitted by Alan on Mon, 2018-04-23 08:17

I was surprised that the proposal is not more upfront about the single most significant change -- the elimination of the overnight parking ban. Because the map is blurry and unreadable in the video presentation, the fact that overnight parking will be permitted on all streets in the pilot project area is obscured. While I recognize the need for additional parking for apartment and condo dwellers, I don't think the presentation makes a sufficient case for complete elimination of the overnight parking ban throughout the area.

#### **Around Oak Park Hospital**

Submitted by Steven Miller on Mon, 2018-04-23 09:00

As a long time resident of the 600 block of home ave I have seen a significant increase in Oak Park hospital employees parking in the surrounding neighborhood instead of their parking garage. There are times when I can't park by my house. Please make sure that you allow as much legal on street parking immediately adjacent to the hospital property. Allowing on street parking along the entire block of the 500 block of south Wenonah and the 600 block of Wisconsin (northern half) on the west sides of both streets might reduce on street parking further east.

Please design new parking rules in the neighborhood around the OP hospital which increase on street parking immediately adjacent to the hospital land and make it more difficult for hospital employees to park all day further away from the hospital in the residential neighborhood.

#### **Parking In-put**

Submitted by Diane on Mon, 2018-04-23 10:11

There are far too many parking restrictions for residents. We currently have night parking. We have had two occasions, once when home sick with the flu and another away on a vacation, where we called in, emailed AND spoke face-to-face with a village employee and were given a pass but STILL received violations. Communication within the department needs improvement.

The signs on Pleasant Street are ridiculous! There is NO way to distinguish where one sign ends and the other begins.

Three new high rise condos have been built but has consideration been given to the increase in parking needs that these buildings will create?

I am a librarian and would LOVE to work at one of the Oak Park Libraries but they have no vacancies which means that yes, I HAVE to own a car in order to commute to work. So your suggested solution of using alternate transportation does not apply to many residents.



One day a week my husband works from home and still has to move his car repeatedly throughout the day.

Listening to your current proposal does not address any of these issues. We have resided in Oak Park for six years and parking is ABSOLUTELY the bane of our residency. We try to abide by all these restrictions yet whenever I approach my vehicle my breath catches until I see that there is no orange card on my windshield.

I know this email provides no suggestions or solutions, but please consider these scenarios as you make your decisions.

#### **Less is More**

Submitted by Aaron on Mon, 2018-04-23 11:06

God forbid, we just stop building so many multifamily structures. The more people, the more cars. Let's convert some multifamily buildings into single family buildings. Less people, less cars, more parking. Less... is More.

#### **Parking meters**

Submitted by Sandra on Mon, 2018-04-23 11:08

Merchants are a healthy tax base, but they're not a given. Why do you 'quarter' chase them out of business? Having free parking beginning at 6P and on Sundays is our last bastion to keep merchants and their patrons in our village. That you increased cost of meter parking is bad enough, DO NOT EXTEND METER TIME by 2 hours. The rest of your proposed regulations are not presented in a coherent format. DO NOT EXTEND PARKING METER HOURS.

#### **Parking shopping district should be free and evenings visitors**

Submitted by cynthia ross on Mon, 2018-04-23 11:47

To encourage shopping and dining we should allow at least 2 hours Free in some spaces near each business district.

Additionally We should provide for the boxes and meters that allow for a quick stop. Therefore, less than an hour amount.

I do not agree with charging beyond the 6 pm time anywhere. And especially near residential for evening visitors. Why not move it to 6 am to 6 pm if you want consistent time window.

#### **Neighborhood Greenways & Bike Pedestrian Conflicts**

Submitted by Jeff McMahon on Mon, 2018-04-23 11:57

It looks from the maps as if this Parking Plan was developed without consideration of the Neighborhood Greenways Plan that was adopted by the Village Board in 2015, and which prescribes street design on streets that are designated as greenways: in the pilot area, those include Kenilworth and Pleasant.

<https://www.oak-park.us/sites/default/files/public-works/2015-07-20-gree...>

It's hard to say for sure because the street names are illegible on the maps provided for the Parking Plan, both in the pdf and the video.



I hope the Commission and Village Board will also consider that increased parallel parking poses increased risk to bicyclists, from dooring in particular, and to children and pedestrians from decreased visibility.

I hope the Commission and Village Board will also consider that increased parking availability encourages automobile use and carbon pollution, contributing to global warming. We should be going in the other direction.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

#### **Overnight parking ban should be maintained**

Submitted by cynthia ross on Mon, 2018-04-23 12:00

I agree with many villagers that is very important to maintain the overnight parking ban on our residential streets. It much safer environment to be able to walk home when you can see the street from curb to curb with vehicles for approaching activities that may not be well intended. Easier to identify one car without many other around it. The only on street parking should be for old vintage buildings that were built before auto were in common use and no parking lot is provided on pro or very limited spaces which cannot accommodate the many cars of today.



We should also continue the restriction that have been in place by ordinance one bedroom requires properties to have one space.

#### **Parking**

Submitted by Faith Qualls on Mon, 2018-04-23 12:03

I'm on the north end of Oak Park on Lombard and parking is definitely needed. There is a parking lot going towards Austin for this area, however It's an inconvenience to Residence. We can't view our vehicles in parking lot near Austin is just not good. Too much is going on with carjackings or theft. I don't feel safe walking to Austin early in the morning or late at night, the my guest and the tenants in my building are forced to park on the Chicago side. I don't it's Fair we should be able to park in front of our residence .



## Lots - Combined



|       | New Issue    | Renewed      | Total Revenue | Online       | In-Office    |
|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 19-Q2 | \$138,953.81 | \$0.00       | \$138,953.81  | \$9,027.76   | \$129,926.05 |
| 19-Q3 | \$250,957.34 | \$411,509.34 | \$662,466.68  | \$260,311.62 | \$402,155.06 |
| 19-Q4 | \$203,494.75 | \$317,990.56 | \$521,485.31  | \$254,597.64 | \$266,887.67 |
| 20-Q1 | \$224,690.46 | \$402,467.98 | \$627,158.44  | \$359,668.90 | \$267,489.54 |
| 20-Q2 | -\$51,865.35 | \$244,954.22 | \$193,088.87  | \$159,849.37 | \$33,239.50  |
| 20-Q3 | \$65,059.96  | \$104,347.00 | \$169,406.96  | \$136,874.63 | \$32,532.33  |
| 20-Q4 | \$0.00       | \$4,582.30   | \$4,582.30    | \$4,066.75   | \$515.55     |

\*\* Q2 Refunds for Price Reduction



## Garages - Combined



|       | New Issue    | Renewed      | Total Revenue | Online       | In-Office    |
|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 19-Q2 | \$69,565.00  | \$0.00       | \$69,565.00   | \$5,687.00   | \$63,878.00  |
| 19-Q3 | \$146,840.70 | \$238,501.00 | \$385,341.70  | \$142,859.00 | \$242,482.70 |
| 19-Q4 | \$115,927.71 | \$180,826.00 | \$296,753.71  | \$144,385.00 | \$152,368.71 |
| 20-Q1 | \$97,520.00  | \$245,129.00 | \$342,649.00  | \$195,367.00 | \$147,282.00 |
| 20-Q2 | -\$20,268.00 | \$126,200.00 | \$105,932.00  | \$84,718.00  | \$21,214.00  |
| 20-Q3 | \$26,652.00  | \$58,335.00  | \$84,987.00   | \$68,719.45  | \$16,267.55  |
| 20-Q4 | \$0.00       | \$1,905.41   | \$1,905.41    | \$1,513.58   | \$391.83     |

\*\* Q2 Refunds for Price Reduction

## On Street - Night Permits



|       | New Issue    | Renewed      | Total Revenue | Online       | In-Office    |
|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| 19-Q2 | \$104,683.00 | \$0.00       | \$104,683.00  | \$11,209.00  | \$93,474.00  |
| 19-Q3 | \$141,376.93 | \$173,204.00 | \$314,580.93  | \$144,741.00 | \$169,839.93 |
| 19-Q4 | \$142,070.93 | \$140,621.00 | \$282,691.93  | \$154,477.00 | \$128,214.93 |
| 20-Q1 | \$102,205.50 | \$145,115.00 | \$247,320.50  | \$160,653.50 | \$86,667.00  |
| 20-Q2 | \$27,303.50  | \$80,116.00  | \$107,419.50  | \$96,904.00  | \$10,515.50  |
| 20-Q3 | \$13,210.50  | \$41,952.00  | \$55,162.50   | \$44,514.00  | \$10,648.50  |
| 20-Q4 | \$0.00       | \$24,825.50  | \$24,825.50   | \$22,305.50  | \$2,520.00   |

| Village of Oak Park                 |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Projected Outstanding Debt Balances |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
| Parking                             |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
| 1/1/20 - 12/31/20                   |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     |                  |                 | 2020 New Issues        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |
|                                     | 1/1/20 Balance   |                 | New Debt or Refundings |                 | 2020 Debt Payments |                 | 12/31/20 Balance |                 |
| <u>DEBT</u>                         | <u>Principal</u> | <u>Interest</u> | <u>Principal</u>       | <u>Interest</u> | <u>Principal</u>   | <u>Interest</u> | <u>Principal</u> | <u>Interest</u> |
| 2010C                               | 1,438,745        | 112,696         | -                      | -               | (760,025)          | (57,550)        | 678,720          | 55,146          |
| 2016B (Proceeds Escrowed)           | 3,885,000        | 1,330,856       | -                      | -               | (195,000)          | (132,955)       | 3,690,000        | 1,197,901       |
| 2016E (L&F Garage)                  | 9,565,000        | 3,468,737       | -                      | -               | (435,000)          | (334,231)       | 9,130,000        | 3,134,506       |
| 2020A (New CIP)                     | -                | -               | 851,000                | -               | -                  | -               | 851,000          | -               |
|                                     | 14,888,745       | 4,912,289       | 851,000                | -               | (1,390,025)        | (524,736)       | 14,349,720       | 4,387,553       |
|                                     |                  |                 |                        |                 |                    |                 |                  |                 |

## Memorandum

**To:** Transportation Commission.  
**From:** Tammie Grossman, Director of Development Customer Services  
**Date:** 10/22/2020  
**Re:**

---

Village maps displaying the extended overnight zones will be shown during the meeting on October 28, 2020.

---

# MEMORANDUM

1020-2  
OE1  
1/1

Date: October 28, 2020

To: Transportation Commission

From: Mike Koperniak, Staff Liaison  
Parking and Traffic Commission M.K.

Re: Slow Streets Website Survey and Public Comment Report

---

The Slow Streets Pilot Program ended on Friday, October 16, 2020, and the barricades and signs were removed. The Village's Slow Streets Pilot Program website online survey and public comments have been closed. Staff is currently preparing a report on the results of the survey and public comment. This report is scheduled to be presented to the Village Board of Trustees, presumably at its October 26th public meeting. This report will be made available to the Transportation Commission after it has first been presented to the Village Board.

Depending on the size of the digital report file, it will either be emailed to the Commission members or a URL link to where it can be reviewed and downloaded will be provided to the Commission members.

The report will not be available in time to include in the October 28th Transportation Commission meeting agenda packet which will be uploaded to the Village's public website by 5:00 PM on Thursday, October 22nd.