

**VILLAGE OF OAK PARK
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2017 - 7:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – VILLAGE HALL**

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 Draft October 23, 2017 Transportation Commission meeting minutes
 - 4.2 Draft November 9, 2017 Transportation Commission meeting minutes
5. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED PARKING PILOT
 - 5.1 Staff Agenda Item Commentary – Review and Discussion of Proposed Parking Pilot
 - 5.2 Public Comment on Pilot from VOP Parking Pilot Webpage and E-mails
 - 5.3 Feedback Summary and Responses
 - 5.4 Parking Pilot Presentation
 - 5.5 Pilot Area Map
 - 5.6 Daytime Restrictions Map of Pilot Area
 - 5.7 Pilot Area Space Inventory
 - 5.8 History of the Overnight Parking Ban in Oak Park (Drafted for VBOT on 10.29.13)
6. OTHER ENCLOSURES
 - OE1 12 months of P&T traffic item activity summary November 2016 - October 2017
 - OE2 Village Board actions on Trans Com recommendations thru 10/16/2017
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 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 at least 48 hours before the scheduled activity.

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Monday, October 23, 2017
Council Chambers – Village Hall

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Chalabian called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: Jack Chalabian, Kyle Eichenberger, James Thompson, Robert Taylor, Michael Stewart, Roya Basirirad

Excused: None

Staff: John Youkhana, Mike Koperniak, Mary Avinger, Allison Von Ebers

Parking Consultant: Jennifer Rentz of Dixon Resources Unlimited

The floor was opened to non-agenda public testimony.

Christine Gould spoke about living in the same building as the La Bella restaurant and how she used to park in lot 115 before getting kicked out. Ms. Gould then got a permit for lot 119 by Mills Park and got kicked out of that lot. She then got a spot in lot NB 10 which she was told was close to her but it is three blocks away. Ms. Gould spoke about living in the Village for eight years and how guests seem more important than residents. In lot NB 10, the first half of the lot is for commuters then Hephzibah but what about residents who live in other buildings? Parking is getting farther and farther away. Ms. Gould stated parking in the Emerson garage is very expensive, she's very frustrated, and questioned why there is no agreement with developers for parking.

The Commission and Parking Services Manager, John Youkhana discussed what happened with lot 119.

Commissioner Eichenberger asked about YMCA providing parking spaces. John Youkhana responded how parking is accommodating displaced lot 119 permit holders.

Commissioner Stewart spoke about swapping spaces into lot 81 and John Youkhana explained what happened.

David Kelm first thanked the Commission for getting spaces back for Mills Park Tower residents. Mr. Kelm asked if the "No Parking Here to Corner" sign could be put back on Marion. Mr. Kelm mentioned that he's spoken at a previous meeting about one-way streets and about Oak Park being laid out for horse and buggies and that he doesn't think streets are designed for two-way traffic. He stated streets with parking on both sides are very narrow and spoke about North and South Boulevards should be converted to one-way streets between Oak Park and Harlem Avenues. Mr. Kelm spoke

about too many westbound cars on North Blvd. turning left onto southbound Harlow. Mr. Kelm spoke about his experience speaking at a Village Board meeting and his correspondence with the mayor which he handed out copies of to the Commissioners.

Non-agenda public testimony was closed out.

Approval of Tonight's Meeting Agenda

Commissioner Stewart motioned to approve the agenda as presented and was seconded by Commissioner Eichenberger. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

UPDATE AND ON-GOING DISCUSSION OF PARKING STUDY

Parking Services Manager, John Youkhana gave a presentation to update the Commission on what has happened since the last meeting.

Chair Chalabian asked John to give a brief overview of what has happened in the past several months. John Youkhana spoke about what has been happening with the parking study, the work that Dixon Resources Unlimited has done, an update to equipment, and revamping the parking system. John also discussed the Y2, Y3, and Y4 pilot parking study area.

Jennifer Rentz of Dixon Resources Unlimited gave a power point presentation with the proposed updates to the Oak Park parking rules. The presentation focused on what they are trying to fix, the overall recommendations for the parking pilot program, and inventory.

Commissioner Taylor asked about license plate recognition and privacy and Jennifer responded how it worked.

A discussion ensued that covered the issue of license plate recognition versus privacy, two hour versus three hour limits, progressive rates, Parking Department's five year CIP plan, visitor parking, seven day restrictions and potential issues on weekends, as well as parking lots with restrictions took place, permit holders and passes and the possibility of no more zones, and all-inclusive passes.

Chair Chalabian spoke about moving the north border of the parking pilot program to the north. A discussion followed regarding the pros and cons of moving the north boundary of the parking study up to Lake Street and the south boundary down to Harrison Street.

Jennifer Rentz continued the discussion speaking about the parking inventory of parking spaces, residences, and permits.

Chair Chalabian stated Downtown Oak Park has always been selfish. Chair Chalabian spoke about construction on Lake Street and improvements on South and North Boulevards. Chair Chalabian stated most businesses are closed by 8:00pm and then parking lots sit empty.

A discussion again occurred about expanding the zone to south as well as north to Lake Street.

Jennifer Rentz continued her presentation speaking about the options to present at the stakeholder meetings. Ms. Rentz spoke about the pros and cons of the odd/even rule and the 72 hour rule and discussed them with the Commission.

Commissioner Basirirad asked if there is parking simulation software and Jennifer Rentz responded there isn't much but prefers real time studies.

John Youkhana spoke about forums and venues and gave reasons why November 8th will not work but November 9th is available and good.

A discussion took place about participation and how to get more participation, and what boundaries to use for the parking study. The Commission voted to move the north border to Lake Street.

A brief discussion about one plan for the Village versus several plans for the Village occurred.

John Youkhana confirmed the stakeholder meeting is set for November 9th and the Commission will get feedback at the November 27th meeting.

DISCUSSION REGARDING TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL MONTHS

Mike Koperniak discussed future meetings with the Commission. There will be no meeting in December and the Commission decided to move the March 26, 2018 meeting to March 12th and to schedule the April 2018 meeting on the 23rd.

Chair Chalabian mentioned that he is staying on for one more year.

A brief discussion took place about the Village Board of Trustee's vote against the Commission's recommendation for Forest and Greenfield 5 to 2. The Commission also briefly discussed the next traffic meeting will be in January and how the Traffic Calming Toolbox will be on the November 6th Village Board of Trustee's meeting.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to adjourn the meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Basirirad.

The voice vote was unanimous to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectively submitted

Mary Avinger

Mary Avinger,
Administrative Secretary

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Thursday, November 9, 2017
Community Room – Gwendolyn Brooks Middle School

Present: Jack Chalabian, Kyle Eichenberger, James Thompson, Michael Stewart

Staff: John Youkhana, Allison Von Ebers, Tammie Grossman, Delia Tamas, Mike Koperniak, Mary Avinger

Parking Consultants: Julie Dixon and Jennifer Rentz of Dixon Resources Unlimited

PARKING PILOT PUBLIC FORUM

Transportation Commission Chair, Jack Chalabian opened the meeting at 6:00pm by thanking everyone for coming and spoke about the parking pilot forum and the importance of public participation.

Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited gave a power point presentation on the proposed Parking Pilot Program. Ms. Dixon's presentation went over the proposed updates to the Village of Oak Park's parking rules. Ms. Dixon presented the map of the proposed area, what they are trying to fix, the overall recommendations, including an inventory of parking spaces, residences and parking permits, as well as potential parking options for the proposed area.

The floor was opened to public testimony.

A resident from the 1000 block of Erie stated his concerned about on street parking limits during the day and two hour parking restrictions between 10am and 5pm because he has an in-home caregiver and nannies that require four hour parking but they have to constantly move their cars due to the two hour restrictions. He asked about allowing a person to use a sticker or license plate for extended parking. Julie responded there may be a special use permit for service workers that are providing a basic need. The resident asked if a special permit was currently available and Parking Services Division Supervisor Delia Tamas responded that there is a medical pass that he can get and she will work with him to get it.

A resident from the 400 block of S Grove spoke about her concerns when someone has workers coming to their house and they need to park for an extended time while working. Her concerns were that they shouldn't have to park several blocks away and carry equipment back and forth.

A Resident from the 300 block of South Oak Park Avenue stated she rents cars and asked about parking on Randolph after 9:00pm. Julie responded how residents will be

able to create an online account and how they would obtain a pass using the license plate and can change the plate number within their account as needed.

A resident stated he is interested in residents parking in the 3800 inventoried spaces and asked how they arrived at that number. Julie responded that initially the pilot program was a smaller area and after extending the area is how they came up with the number of spaces. The resident asked if they are trying to make more parking spaces for the residents and that he doesn't understand how this pilot program will solve the problem. He thinks there are single family homes that have claimed public streets and doesn't understand how the program limiting one permit per household would work.

A resident from the 300 block of Wisconsin stated he wants to know under the new plan how someone has people over that want to stay after 11pm and is concerned about parking in alleys and how to get into driveways. Julie responded that guest passes will depend upon which option is chosen for the pilot program. She mentioned that alley parking was brought up at a previous meeting and she will bring that to the attention of engineering and enforcement for the area.

A resident from the 300 block of South Maple stated she has been a resident in the village for over 40 years. She spoke about parking being readily available before and how it isn't anymore. She is concerned about alley parking and how it hinders alley usage. She said there is no parking on Harlem which makes parking on Maple even worse and also spoke about her disabled sister that visits several times a year and was told she could park in one of the parking garages a half mile away. She stated her sister cannot walk that far and it is unfair to ask her to do so. The resident also stated her block is always full of cars and spoke about a new neighbor who recently got a car was told she has to park far away.

A resident from the 600 block of South Cuyler asked what restrictions if any are being made for Sundays. Julie responded that the proposed restrictions would be seven days a week. The resident questioned if due to churches in the area if the rules could be loosened on Sundays. He is concerned that with people coming from other areas to houses of worship they would have a difficult time parking on Sundays and mentioned even Jewish people in the synagogues may have issues parking on Saturdays.

A resident from the 1100 block of Washington stated he is shocked that an odd/even parking proposal is even an option that is being considered with only 1400 spaces. He does not support this option and gave his reasons why. He wanted to know if parking spaces are going to be painted because people do not park correctly. Julie spoke about why pavement markings could be a good idea. The resident agrees with opening up parking and stated he doesn't agree that resident permit parkers who are at home during the day should have to move their car. He asked how the 72 hour rule would be enforced because people could move their car back one space or a few feet. Julie spoke about license plate recognition (LPR) and how it works and explained what a car move is.

A resident spoke about the 72 hour rule option versus the odd/even rule option multifamily buildings and thinks the 72 hour rule option would be preferable. She also asked how residential permit passes would apply to rental cars and Julie spoke about creating an online account and how it works.

A resident stated he is aware of parking issues as a business owner in Downtown Oak Park and as a resident that lives near Austin. He spoke about putting down pavement lines so cars do not take up two spaces. He spoke about the relationship between consumers and residents and how there should be enough spaces for consumers who want to shop to be able to do so without getting a ticket. He questioned if parking rules are a revenue source or if it's a management issue. He doesn't agree that people should have to pay so much per minute to park in order to shop and that there should be free parking for shoppers with two hour limits. He said the Village has to facilitate parking because when customers get tickets, it discourages shopping. Julie spoke about the technology pilot that just finished up and spoke about restrictions in business areas and briefly spoke about the parking garages near commercial districts. She also explained that rules are also meant to help businesses when there are many residential areas around businesses and spoke about employee parking. The resident also spoke about giving tickets in the business areas and possibly giving first time offenders a break on the fine. He stated he can't see pay by plate machines across the street from his store. Julie spoke about the pay by plate pilot program and also spoke about uniform three hour restrictions in downtown areas.

The resident of the 800 block of Washington stated he's lived in the Village for 12 years and doesn't think the overnight parking issue is about safety. He thinks the Village does street cleaning excessively. He thinks the odd/even rule is a bad option and that he parks in the Y4 zone and the 72 hour rule wouldn't help him. He wants to know what the core nature of the pilot program is. Julie responded that the pilot program is to support overnight parking, leaf removal, and street cleaning.

A resident stated he's lived in the Village for 10 years and has his own garage. He is in favor of opening up parking and lifting the overnight ban. He thinks the odd/even rule is unworkable and that the one permit per household idea is a recipe for frustration.

A resident from the 1000 block of Washington stated there isn't enough parking now and questioned how taking parking away helps. He stated he can't park in front of his house and thinks this program would work in a big city and shouldn't be applied to a small town like Oak Park. Parking Manager, John Youkhana spoke about how the pilot program will increase parking spaces. The resident spoke about his space on Washington being taken away because of the new traffic signal that is going in and John explained the loss of parking spaces is due to state of Illinois standards regarding how close cars can park to an intersection with a traffic signal.

A resident that lives near Erie Street and Oak Park Avenue stated he is against the overnight parking ban and that he doesn't think it is an issue of crime and safety but thinks it's an ordinance issue. He currently parks in the Y1 area and questioned why it

should change. He feels he shouldn't have to worry about anything except moving car Tuesday and Wednesday for street cleaning and the snow ban. He stated he doesn't agree with moving the car every day and thinks people will forget to move their cars and will get tickets. He is against both options because people's plans will have to get scheduled around moving cars and believes the overnight ban is what is really driving the pilot program. Julie asked the resident how long did he think is too long to park on the street for a resident and he responded whatever length of time it takes to move the car for street sweeping, snow removal, and leaf cleaning. He feels moving the car once a week or every three weeks is fine.

A resident that lives on South Boulevard spoke about overnight parking and how he is new to the town and used to park by the meters and pay for overnight parking. He stated when he moved here and got a permit to park overnight but was given a ticket. He went to court and the ticket was thrown out and was told that he was okay and didn't have to move his car and still got another ticket that he paid because he doesn't have time to keep going to court. He stated when he goes to move his car he walks past a lot of open meters and it's frustrating that he can't park there and that with constantly paying money he feels with the new developments the residents are taking the brunt of it.

A business owner in the 800 block of South Oak Park Avenue spoke about how she would like the Village to look at what's happening across the street at VanBuren where there is a huge empty parking lot. She stated people were able to park there but it is now fenced off and is unsure if it is owned by the Village but if not she thinks they should purchase it to alleviate congestion. She also spoke about cars parking on driveways on VanBuren and how huge vehicles that park in two spaces should be charged a higher rate. The resident also feels the Village should investigate having bus service for village residents to make it easy to shop.

A resident of the 100 block of South Grove stated as a resident she doesn't want to see stripes on the street. She stated the sample parking signs are huge and Julie spoke about how signs would be placed to simplify them and reduce clutter. The resident spoke about living by the train and that she doesn't think the odd/even plan would work. She asked about passes for her employees and Julie spoke about employee parking in the garages and explained how that would also free up some on street parking.

A resident that lives on Harrison asked about the pilot program being a revenue source. Julie spoke about how the system should be sustainable and should pay for itself and that enforcement is to identify compliance and not meant to create revenue source. The resident also wanted to know why the odd/even pilot was chosen over a north/south east/west approach. He spoke about people who live across the street from his business not being able to park and asked about daytime parking restrictions as well as if there could be separate signs for permit holders and visitors. He thinks visitors are confused by parking. Julie responded another approach had not been thought of and spoke about daytime parking and how once an option is decided, they can go over signage.

A resident that lives on south Cuyler stated she doesn't live in the pilot area but is in favor of overnight parking. She spoke about living on a residential block with multifamily buildings and having a problem with leaf cleaning and during winter. She is in favor of odd/even parking so streets can get cleaned and thinks the 72 hour rule is too long. She also thinks one of the biggest problems is enforcement because when cars are not moved for snow it is not enforced.

A resident of the 800 block of Clinton stated he is looking for clarification on the odd/even rule because he thinks it wouldn't work for mothers with small children. He stated he wants to know who is benefitting from this pilot program because he doesn't think residents benefit from either approach.

A resident stated he thinks there is a severe problem north of Madison and not so much south of Madison. He spoke of being a former Parking and Traffic Commission member for the Village and that he studied the area south of Madison twice and people who testified from other communities that had overturned their overnight parking ban said that was done in part because women felt unsafe walking home at night. He thinks the overnight parking ban shouldn't be overturned because it benefits homeowners and multifamily buildings and is concerned this proposal will characteristically change Oak Park.

A resident from Mills Park Tower spoke about spaces that were taken away on Pleasant Place and how residents fought to get them back and he wants to make sure that won't happen again. He thinks that the odd/even rule may hurt them again and stated that if anything changes to parking again everyone from his building will come and speak about it.

A resident that lives in the area of Madison and Kenilworth asked for an explanation of how visitor parking would work with the proposed options. Julie responded she couldn't say because they will have to determine that depending on the option chosen for the pilot program. The resident asked how soon it would happen and Julie responded in early 2018 and explained what will happen with the feedback from tonight's meetings before approval is made. The resident also asked if the Village considered purchasing lots to make parking more accessible and if someone wanted to propose changes how someone would do that and Julie responded and suggested coming to future Transportation Commission meetings and coming to community meetings.

A resident that lives on North Boulevard spoke about being disabled and recently moving to the Village and wants to know where to park her car. She said no one is available to ask about parking at night and when she was given a space it was a block and a half away and she cannot walk that far. She spoke of her daughter who brings her food and wants to visit but cannot park in front of her house. She also spoke about getting three tickets in one week including parking where she was told and still got a ticket. She stated signs don't tell you where you can park and no one tells new residents where they can or can't park.

8:00 SESSION

Chair Chalabian repeated his introduction for the audience attending the 8:00pm public forum.

Julie Dixon of Dixon Resources Unlimited repeated her power point presentation.

The floor was opened to public testimony.

A resident asked for clarification of the odd/even and the 72 hour rules and how they would apply to the area and Julie responded.

A resident stated that when he moved here he did so because there was no overnight parking and no permit parking on his street and wants to know if this program will add permits to areas that don't have any permits now. He doesn't want that to change and he opposes applying rules to all the streets.

A resident that lives on Grove asked about visitor parking from 9am to 9pm and what to do if you have a party that starts at 5pm. She also wants to know how workers could park in front of her house if someone else with the same permit is already parked there. She asked about commuter parking and stated that her block having two hour parking restrictions wouldn't help her. Julie responded what would be possible and how things would change under the pilot program.

A resident from the first session spoke about the inventory and proposed options and about the overnight parking ban and the reasons behind it. Julie responded about the intent of overnight parking and inventory and overnight parking passes and how they are not being properly managed today. The resident thinks enforcement of overnight parking ban is not enough and Julie responded enforcement consistency is an issue. He wants to know what the remedies of situations for people on vacation or long term parking will be and Julie responded.

A resident that lives near Oak Park Avenue and Erie from the first session spoke about being in favor of the overnight parking ban. He spoke about enforcing people that don't move their car for Village services by ticketing and towing. He also spoke about leaving the car on the street for as long as you want and moving it just for Village services. He thinks people who don't move their car should be applauded and that the cost of permits should be whatever it costs to sustain it. He doesn't know why the cost of an on-street parking permit should be related to parking garages. He thinks the Village should raise the cost of the registration sticker to cover everyone and not tie it to how many people park on the street or construction. Julie asked the resident about progressive vehicle sticker rates and the resident responded since he's single he can't answer but he doesn't think it's fair.

A resident that lives on Washington stated there's an inequality between parking in front of a house and in front of a multifamily building and spoke about the City of Chicago

permit parking system. He thinks that people are saying they couldn't park on residential street because of crime and they are saying that the crime is worse on Washington where condo buildings are. He said people shouldn't have to park several blocks away and wants to know when the snow ban is in effect where can people park and if the Village takes into account traffic flow. He stated with parking on both sides of Randolph there isn't enough room for two cars to pass and thinks the street should be made one way or restricted to parking on only one side of the street. He stated Oak Park has been known as "no park Oak Park". He spoke about the new developments coming in and asked with all the new people that will be coming in where will they go. He spoke about free commercial parking in other towns while the Village charges for it. He thinks the new signs are too complicated and a waste of money. He stated people are encouraged to take public transportation but during the day there is nowhere for people to park and people take a chance parking because sometimes parking is enforced and sometimes it isn't. He thinks there should be a commuter permit. He said he lives three blocks from the train and can walk but questioned where he can park. He thinks the pilot program is not a better system but more restrictive. He spoke about how he pays extra to park in a garage but has two cars and talked about how he has a place to park but if he needs to park during the day he can't. He also agreed with the previous resident that there is no crime on Grove.

A resident who lives on Carpenter asked when the program will start and Julie responded sometime in early 2018. The resident thinks that the program should start after winter. He spoke about living near the blue line and previously having a business on Harrison and didn't realize there is a commuter parking problem and questioned if that was a big issue driving the pilot. Julie responded about commuter parking being one of the problems in addition to employee parking. The resident asked if there was a study near Washington and Grove where there is a high density of people compared to the rest of the area and Julie responded the pilot program is to try to improve the overall experience of parking. He wanted to know if this program is viewed as a revenue loss or gain. Julie responded that they would like to make it revenue neutral and not a loss and that if it ends up a revenue gain it would be used to invest back into the community.

A resident who lives on Wisconsin wanted to get clarification on the two hour visitor parking and if there would be unlimited guess passes. Julie responded they would have to determine the model for the pilot program first and adapt to that. The resident asked about two hour parking for her guests when they can't re-park and what their options are. Julie responded that the program was designed to keep commuters and business employees out of residential areas and spoke about current restrictions. The resident stated she doesn't agree with two hour limits.

A resident from the 1100 block of Pleasant spoke about how when her mom comes to visit she cannot call in for her mom to park overnight in front of her house and would have to park three blocks away. She asked about visitors of people without permits and where their guests can park overnight. Julie spoke about visitor guest passes and how details haven't been worked out yet. The resident stated she has a parking space in her condo building so she doesn't count in the inventory but wants to know if they are

evaluating the actual need. She thinks the program is almost penalizing residents needing to park and would like to know information on the overnight parking ban.

A resident talked about simplification for a complex issue and is glad the Village is taking an interest in parking for residents. He doesn't think the Village was concerned about zoning when they changed the zoning in the Pleasant District. He also spoke about changes in permit hours on South Boulevard to 6am. He thinks the program will mess things up for the residents of the Village and how he thinks people will pay for the new developments through permits. He stated he lives on the 200 block of south Maple and that contractors parking there are not getting tickets. He talked about increasing supply and that demand will increase to fit the supply. He believes people base their decision on living in Oak Park on parking and spoke about enforcement being an issue. He is concerned about LPR and privacy issues and says that it is subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. He doesn't want to subsidize permits so other people can park in front of this house and that he's thinking about where to go that doesn't have these issues because this is making his life harder. He doesn't like the parking sign pilot either and stated complexity isn't a bad thing. Julie responded that LPR is not retained for marketing or public uses and explained how it works.

A resident spoke about talking to John Youkhana about the traffic signal going up at Washington and Wisconsin causing the loss of 20-30 parking spaces. He stated the pilot program doesn't address any demographics and that there are four residential structures that border that intersection and there is nowhere to park. He expressed his frustration that he cannot park in front of his condo and it took him over ten minutes to find a space last night. He spoke about his family having multiple cars and how they shouldn't up the price for a household with two cars. He also thinks the pilot program shouldn't start until after winter and asked about how the program will be enforced and Julie responded. The resident stated neither odd/even nor 72 hour rules will work at Washington and Wisconsin.

A resident from the 800 block of Washington stated the two hour parking limits are an issue and asked if the restrictions were on weekends and Julie responded restrictions are seven days a week. He said that commuter parking is a week day problem and maybe restrictions should be limited to Monday through Friday or change the restrictions to three or four hours on the weekend.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20pm due to the need to vacate the school property by 9:30pm.

Respectively submitted

Mary Avinger

Mary Avinger,
Administrative Secretary

Village Of Oak Park Transportation Commission Agenda Item

Item Title: Presentation and Community Forum on Parking Pilot Program

Review Date: November 27, 2017

Prepared By: Parking and Mobility Services

Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed):

Earlier this year the Village Board began reviewing ways to streamline the wide array of parking rules and regulations by gathering public input on various parking topics during a series of special meetings, community forums and online comments.

In order to balance need with supply, available spaces have been managed through parking regulations put in place over time, typically driven by residents petitioning the Transportation Commission in what became a near block-by-block approach. The result of this approach is a complicated web of rules spelled out in 120 parking ordinances and communicated on more than 10,000 signs throughout the Village.

Months of studying Oak Park's wide array of parking rules and regulations is evolving into a pilot program designed to test a wide range options for simplifying and standardizing the Village's residential parking system.

At the October 23 Transportation Commission meeting, Village consultant, Dixon Resources Unlimited presented the Commission with two different options for a parking pilot. These recommendations were provided to the public at a community forum on November 9 at Brooks Middle School. After the community meeting at Brooks, Village staff posted a copy of the presentation and proposed changes to www.oak-park.us/parkingpilot. The webpage allows for additional comments and allows stakeholders to post who may have been unable to attend the meetings.

The proposed pilot area is from Harlem Avenue east to Oak Park Avenue and South Boulevard south to Harrison Street. This area was chosen because it contains virtually every parking challenge in Oak Park with single-family and multi-family residences overlapping with commuter and business parking.

Overall Recommendations for the Pilot Area Include:

- Allow overnight permit/visitor parking in metered parking spaces

- 2 hour limit on residential streets for non-permit holders (9 AM-9 PM). Residents would be able to get a pass for their guests.
- Reducing the price of residential on-street permits/subsidize permits for lower income residents
- Off-street permits would come at a premium for 24HR parking
- Consolidate the Y2, Y3, and Y4 zones
- Make all paid parking in the commercial areas a 3HR limit
- Simplify the signage
- Dedicate enforcement in the area using License Plate Recognition technology (LPR)

On-Street Permit Options:

Odd/Even Rule –

- Permit holders & registered guests –
9PM-9AM odd side of street on odd dates, even side of street on even dates
9AM-9PM both sides of street
- Non-permit holders, unregistered guests, commuters, employees, & customers –
9PM-9AM no parking
9AM-9PM 2HR parking
- Snow ban, leaf pick up, and street cleaning restrictions would need to be worked into the daytime hours 9AM-9PM

72 Hour Rule –

- Permit holders & registered guests –
Parking allowed, both sides of street, for 72 hours, occupying the same space. After 72 hours, the vehicle would need to be moved.
- Non-permit holders, unregistered guests, commuters, employees, & customers –
9PM-9AM no parking
9AM-9PM 2HR parking
- Snow ban, leaf pick up, and street cleaning restrictions would need to be worked into the daytime hours 9AM-9PM

Based on community input, recommendations for a parking pilot program will be reviewed and finalized by the Transportation Commission and then presented to the Village Board to consider for implementation in 2018.

Staff Recommendation(s):

Supporting Documentation Is Attached

Parking Pilot Comments

Submitted through noon on Tuesday, Nov. 21, 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 cars 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

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.

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, their 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 Washington 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 make 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 has 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) 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 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 "residential" 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 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 street? Both ideas sound awful and very unpractical. 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 durning 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 11/9

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 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.

Parking and Vehicle Services

I have been reading about the new pilot program and have read some of the multitude of commentary from the Nov. 9th meeting. I have been in Oak Park since 1996 and have lived in a rental apartment building (no allotted parking), a rental house (without garage), a vintage condominium near Fenwick (one parking spot), and now in a single family home near the Ridgeland Green Line stop. In that time, myself and my wife have generally been able to work very well with the Oak Park street parking rules.

From my perspective, the adjustments to the overnight parking structure from a few years ago fixed the areas my family deemed problematic. When you move to Oak Park you do so for a variety of reasons, one of which is the inherent character of the city. The relatively clear streets contribute to this. To see contrast, one sees a dramatic change in streetscape character traveling from Berwyn into Oak Park. Part of this is courtesy of the parking rules. I believe it is benefit that contributes to not only aesthetic, but also safety, walkability, and property value.

I find it interesting that a city that professes to be so progressive is now looking at ADDING car density when other cities in the U.S. and abroad are reducing the same. The city has the benefit of two L lines and the Metra. These are enviable public assets that allow us to be less reliant on autos. In a time when American leadership is divorcing sensible international climate accords, Oak Park is changing municipal guidelines to encourage growth in its carbon footprint.

The parking rules have been in place for a long time and have contributed to Oak Park. If you move to Oak Park, you know the gig, typical Oak Parkers use a mix of walking, bikes, public transit, and autos. It represents an environmental and socially conscious attitude, and it makes for a better city. The parking rules do not need changed.

From: [Youkhana, John](#)
To: [Von Ebers, Allison](#)
Subject: FW: Church parking letter (Parking Pilot feedback)
Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 10:20:44 AM

From: Kyle Eichenberger
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2017 1:11 PM
To: Jack Chalabian II; Youkhana, John
Subject: Fw: Church parking letter (Parking Pilot feedback)

Emily Gage from Unity Temple wrote a letter to the WJ that I followed up on because of Alan Taylor's comments at the parking forum. I wanted to forward her more detailed list about the congregation's parking situation. I wanted to make sure it gets entered into the conversation as feedback.

Can we, as a commission, get some more details about how the pilot study will be enforced? I know the consultants said there would be extra patrols, but one question I have is "will there be a van reading plates at 10am on a Sunday morning?"

Also, do we know what, if any, changes are planned to be brought to the Nov 27 meeting?

Thanks,
Kyle

----- Forwarded Message -----

Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2017 10:58 AM
Subject: RE: Church parking letter

Thanks, Kyle. I appreciate your letter.

Honestly, I'm finding it pretty confusing to follow all the developments. It's hard to tell what is really on the table. Hoping the right information and feedback from us is getting to the right people.

We had some further discussion about parking issues at our staff meeting yesterday, some of which is reflected here.

As I mentioned in my letter, we have only about 8 off street spaces, which we keep for those who really need them. Most everyone parks as close as possible, but northward is claimed by First United and westward is Calvary and Grace (they all have lots, but more people than spaces) so mostly our people park east and south--Lake, Kenilworth, North and South Blvd--lots of which are unavailable or heavily regulated at other times during the week. Almost no one that we know of parks as far away as the Avenue garage. We have 190 members (out of 600 or so) that are 60 and older, presumably a population that would find it challenging to park further away. That doesn't include visitors. We have almost 300 kids in our program,

and those with kids don't want to park further away (or add to their stress) by having to decode parking regulations. Because we have two worship services, at 9 and 10:45 am, often have people who are there longer than a two hour block. Choir members, for example, sing at both services, so they arrive for rehearsal at 8:30 and are there at least until 11:30 if they leave after they are done singing before the second service ends. That's 60 people. We have other volunteers (teachers and other leaders) who may have meetings or classes at one service and then worship at the other. Add in any fellowship or any other Sunday afternoon activity (of which we have many because that is the one day that the building is entirely closed for tours) or any errand or meal in downtown Oak Park, and that also exceeds a three hour time limit. We have also seen a surge of visitors since our return to Unity Temple and given the current political climate, and we want to make things as easy for them as possible in terms of getting through our doors. As you might imagine, we would rather have no restrictions or fees on Sundays at all. But the impact on us as a congregation would be reduced considerably by a four hour time limit, or ones that began at 1 p.m. or afterwards.

Thanks so much. I'll coordinate with Alan about the November 27th meeting. If you have any questions or any other suggestions about disseminating our input, please feel free to be in touch.

All the best,
Emily

Rev. Emily Gage

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

From: "Kyle Eichenberger"

Subject: Church parking letter

Hi Emily,

I saw your letter to the editor in the Wednesday Journal and Alan Taylor came to the parking meeting last week to voice similar concerns. We're being asked to vote whether to send this to the village board on Nov 27. I haven't decided my full opinion yet (or seen what changes they will suggest after the feedback) and wanted to bounce a couple of ideas off you both to get your thoughts.

I think the 2 hour restriction is dead--or should be. Would the congregation be more comfortable with a 3 hour (or 4 hour--but I'd guess this is less likely) restriction for visitors? Especially if the Avenue garage continued to be free on Sundays? I know the trustees are pondering an increase in garage fees, but perhaps a few church visitors could be directed there if we could convince them to hold off on that.

If you or Alan can make it on Nov 27 to hear any updates, great. If not I'll do my best to convey your concerns to staff and my fellow commission members.

Thanks,

Kyle Eichenberger
Transportation Commissioner

1117-2
5.2
20/20

Summary of Feedback from Community Forum & Parking Pilot Webpage:

- The 2 hour limit on residential street will be an issue for caregivers. They stay for 3-4 hours.
- 2 hour limit on residential street will be an issue for service workers. Collecting their license plates will be a challenge.
- A 2 hour limit is unreasonable for residential streets. It should be 3-4 hours.
- The 2 hour limit is difficult for party guests. What if the party begins at 5PM? Guests should be able to park longer and/or receive a special visitor pass.
- The 2 hour parking limit feels “punitive.”
- Residents cannot move cars every 2 hours.

For the proposed pilot, permit holders, and guests, would not be subject to 2 hour parking restriction.

- **Unable, or unwilling, to move vehicle every day or every 72 hours**

In current Y2, Y3, Y4 zones, over 75% of streets have a current daytime restriction which is not overridden by zone permit. Due to size of Oak Park, current technology deficits, and decreased number of dedicated enforcement officers, some residents have become accustomed to not being ticketed regularly when parking in violation of the daytime restrictions. With proposed pilot, permit holders would not be subject to 2 hour daytime parking restriction.

- **Both new recommendations reduce spaces**

There are currently 752 on-street overnight permits sold within the Y2, Y3, Y4 zones. The Odd/Even option nearly doubles the number of on-street spaces available to permit holders. The 72 Hour option adds nearly 3 ½ times the number of current Y2, Y3, Y4 permit spaces.

- **There is a negative environmental impact with both pilot options**

With current daytime restrictions, a permit holder parked on a street that has No Parking 8am-10am would have to move their vehicle twice a day. If parked on a 2HR 9am-5pm block, they would have to move up to 4 times in a single day. With the proposed Odd/Even option, vehicles would have to move daily. With the 72 Hour proposal, vehicles would have to move every 3 days. (These do not take into account street cleaning, and snow or leaf removal)

- **The same vehicles will be jostling for the same spaces**

This area is densely populated with a lot of multi-family buildings. The Odd/Even option nearly doubles the number of on-street spaces available to permit holders. The 72 Hour option adds nearly 3 ½ times the number of current Y2, Y3, Y4 permit spaces.

- **Weekly street cleaning is excessive**

For Odd/Even, street cleaning would be done from 9PM-9AM when vehicles are parked on only one side of the street. For the 72 Hour option, street cleaning restrictions will need to be built into the pilot. This will be done with the assistance of the Public Works Department who determines the

schedule for street maintenance. With the pilot options, a reduction of weekly restrictions to bi-monthly could be considered.

- **The Village should consider loosening the time restrictions on Sundays and other days of worship.**

It should be discussed with the Transportation Commission whether parking rules should be suspended or relaxed on Saturdays and Sundays.

- **Guests should not be able to park in permit spaces**

The number of guest passes will be limited, after permit sales and based on space inventory

- **Multiple vehicles per household needing parking**

With the pilot program, additional permits should be available within the pilot area based on the increase in number of available spaces. It may be possible to allow for multiple residential permits per household.

- **Selfish parkers are taking up 2 spaces every night/paint parking spaces**

Historically the Village does not stripe parking lanes/spaces on residential streets. In fact, striping would reduce the maximum number of spaces per block due to space/size requirements.

- **Oversized vehicles should be required to pay for 2 permits**

Administrative policy already states (from zone guidelines), "The Village may revoke or cancel any permit issued for a vehicle that is too large to park within a single parking space without parking on the curb or protruding into the driving lane."

- **There is a lack of inconsistent enforcement**

With proposed pilot, there will be dedicated enforcement to the area. LPR (License Plate Recognition technology) will assist in the efficiency of enforcement.

- **Signs should be smaller and less confusing**

Sample signs for the pilot program are smaller, less confusing, and follow standard regulatory designs

- **Permit costs should be lowered and revenue only used for sustainability of the permit program.**

With the pilot program the permit price for some could be lowered and subsidized pricing available for lower-income residents and employees of downtown businesses. The price of permits is to maintain sustainability, not as a revenue source.

- **Options for residents going on vacations**

With the pilot program, permit holders would be offered reduced rate for longer term parking in one of the municipal garages.

- **Some streets are too narrow for parking on both sides**

This issue would be addressed with the ODD/EVEN rule. However, certain streets might be considered for one-side parking only, upon review by Engineering staff, even with the 72-hour rule.

- **The Village should invest in empty lots**

This has already been attempted. Some owners are not interested in selling or renting their lots. Parking Services will continue to look for additional options to increase off-street parking however; in most cases existing rates would not justify this type of purchase.

- **Downtown parking should be free to encourage shopping. Parking pay stations are confusing.**

The 3 hour paid parking in lots and at meters will allow more customer turnover. Moving employees into garages will free up parking for customers.

- **New developments bring in more cars needing parking**

New developments go through the Plan Commission. In most, if not all, recent developments, the buildings provide parking for their tenants.

- **The Village has eliminated permit parking over the years**

Very few overnight zone spaces have been lost due to development. In fact, the Village has actually expanded overnight on-street parking zones in the recent past.

- **There is a lack of information provided by landlords/real estate agents prior to signing lease**

Village ordinance requires a landlord to include the following in all lease agreements, "Night parking is prohibited on all Village streets from two thirty o'clock (2:30) A.M. to six o'clock (6:00) A.M. and the lessee is responsible for providing off street parking for the lessee's vehicle

during those hours to the extent such parking is not provided by the lessor.” Additional outreach be researched.

- **Vehicles parked illegally in alleys**

This issue is not directly impacted by the pilot program and has been addressed with the Police Department. However, use of LPR and dedicated enforcement as recommended for the pilot program will facilitate and streamline enforcement.

- **Confusion over the loss of parking spaces on Washington/Wisconsin**

Due to the installation of the new traffic light at Washington/Wisconsin and because Washington is an unmarked state highway, IDOT requires the installation of left turn bays. Although the Village was unable to fight this design standard, we were successfully able to minimize the loss of parking to only between the two alleys east and west of Wisconsin on Washington.



PROPOSED UPDATES TO OAK PARK PARKING RULES

2018 PARKING PILOT AREA



- South Blvd, Harlem, Oak Park Blvd, Harrison (SHOH)
- Pilot Project to revamp parking regulations
- Considerations
 - Area of high density
 - Multiple zones and issues
 - Signage concerns
 - High complaint area
- Including
 - Residential
 - Multi-family dwelling
 - Commercial
 - Overnight permits



WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO FIX?



ADDRESS THE ISSUES

- Confusion of residents, employees and visitors
- Inconsistent signage
- Enforcement challenges
- Commuters and employees parking in residential districts
- Lack of spaces for residents



OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PILOT PROGRAM

- Allow overnight permit / visitor parking in metered spaces.
- 2 hour parking on residential streets for non-permit holders (9AM-9PM)
- Reduce the price of residential permits/subsidize for lower income residents.
- 24 hour premium permits in City-owned lots.
- 72-hour Parking or Odd/Even Parking.
- Consolidate permit zones.
- 3 hour limit for paid parking in commercial areas.
- Simplify signage.
- Dedicated enforcement utilizing License Plate Recognition (LPR).

Simplify

INVENTORY

SHOH DISTRICT

- **Parking spaces:**
 - 3,800
- **Residences:**
 - 4,583 single and multi family
- **Permits:**
 - Residential overnight: 752
 - Other permits: 199

OPTION 1: ODD/EVEN RULE

Pros

- Snow removal rule already in effect
- Easier street sweeping and leaf removal

Cons

- Even days, 1,400 spaces for residential permits
- Residents must move cars daily

PERMIT HOLDERS- WHERE TO PARK?

ODD/EVEN RULE

- DATE: 1ST, 3RD, 5TH, 7TH, 9TH
- 11TH, 13TH, 15TH, 17TH,
- ETC. OF EACH MONTH

- ODD NUMBERED ADDRESSES
- 101, 103, 105 RESIDENTIAL STREETS

- DATE: 2ND, 4TH, 6TH, 8TH,
- 10TH, 12TH, 14TH, 16TH,
- ETC. OF EACH MONTH

- EVEN NUMBERED ADDRESSES
- 102, 104, 106 RESIDENTIAL STREETS

OPTION 2: 72 HOUR RULE


Pros

- 3,800 spaces for residents
- Residents can park for 3 days and nights


Cons

- Requires consolidated hours for street sweeping and leaf removal
- Snow removal might be impacted


ODD/EVEN RULE



72 HOUR RULE



SAMPLE SINGAGE




DESCRIPTION OF OPTIONS

| | CURRENT | ODD / EVEN | 72-HOUR | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| COMMUTERS | No Parking 8AM - 10AM No time restrictions Areas close to transit / business On-street | 9AM - 9PM 2-hour parking All areas Garage parking | 9AM - 9PM 2-hour parking All areas Garage parking | |
| SNOW / LEAF / STREET CLEANING | Permits exempt 8AM - 10AM, various days 1PM - 3PM, various days | Odd parking, odd days Even parking, even days | Assigned days per month Odd: 3rd Monday Even: 3rd Tuesday | |
| EMPLOYEES | Residential St / Meters / Garage | Garage only Subsidized permit price | Garage only Subsidized permit price | |
| RESIDENTS | On-street "lots" 24/7 Overnight on-street | 1,400 spaces 1 permit per household | 3,800 spaces Need to determine multi-family | |
| VISITORS | 10 overnight per month per plate | Remainder of available (after residential) Includes 190 meter spaces | Remainder of available (after residential) Includes 190 meter spaces | |
| METERS | 8AM - 6PM, M-Sat No time limits | 8AM - 6PM, M-Sat Pay-by-plate After 6pm, no charge until 9pm After 9pm, permit only 3-hour limit | 8AM - 6PM, M-Sat Pay-by-plate After 6pm, no charge until 9pm After 9pm, permit only 3-hour limit | <div> 1117-2 5.4 12/12 12 </div> |

1117-2

5.5

1/1



On-Street Space Inventory

| | On-Street (no meters) | On-Street Metered |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|
| East Spaces | 973 | 20 |
| West Spaces | 1017 | 53 |
| North Spaces | 390 | 19 |
| South Spaces | 331 | 25 |
| | | |
| ODD Side Spaces | 1348 | 78 |
| EVEN Side Spaces | 1363 | 39 |
| | | |
| Total On-Street Space Inventory | 2711 | 117 |

Off-Street Space Inventory

| Lot # | Location | Total # of spaces | Meters/ Pay By Space | 24-Hour Permit | Day Permit | Night Permit |
|--|--|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| 59* (lot) | Kenilworth S. of South Blvd | 22 | | 20 | | |
| 85* (lot) | Kenilworth S. of Randolph (Brooks Middle School) | 38 | | | | 15 |
| 94 (enclave) | Wisconsin S. of Madison | 7 | 7 | | | 7 |
| 98 (enclave) | Harrison E. of Maple | 23 | | 23 | | |
| 100 (enclave) | Clinton N. of Madison | 13 | | | | 10 |
| SB7 (enclave) | South Blvd W. of Oak Park | 42 | 30 | 6 | 13 | 14 |
| SB8 (enclave) | South Blvd W. of Kenilworth | 16 | | 10 | 8 | 4 |
| SB9 (enclave) | South Blvd W. of Clinton | 21 | 18 | 4 | | 10 |
| SB10 (enclave) | South Blvd W. of Home | 37 | 21 | | 13 | |
| SB11 (enclave) | South Blvd W. of Maple | 12 | 12 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Total Off-Street Space Inventory: | | 231 | 88 | 63 | 34 | 60 |

*Leased lot

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.

In order to provide additional off street parking, the Village also owns or leases 38 off street parking lots where overnight parking is available by permit.

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 the 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 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 monthly 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 the 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 (1st 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 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.

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. Courts have also held that it is reasonable for a municipality to allow parking for residents but not for non-residents, *County Board v. Richards*, 434 U.S. 5 (1977).

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 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

| 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 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

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

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

| 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 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

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

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

| 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 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

| 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 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

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

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

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

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

| 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 | Survey Count |
|--|---------------------|
| Strongly Support | 156 |
| Somewhat Support | 385 |
| Somewhat Oppose | 376 |
| Strongly Oppose | 790 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

| 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 | Survey Count |
|---|---------------------|
| Strongly Support | 227 |
| Somewhat Support | 455 |
| Somewhat Oppose | 346 |
| Strongly Oppose | 679 |
| Grand Total | 1707 |

| Parking and Traffic Action Item Activity Summary | | | | | | | | Grayed out row indicates the item has been completed and closed |
|--|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Project No. | Date Opened | Opened By | Date Closed | Petition mailed out on | Petition received on | Action Item Description | Name Address Phone Number | Commission Recommendation Village Board Action Final Disposition |
| 1398 | 11/02/16 | JAJ | 11/10/16 | | | Request for NO LEFT TURN sign for NB Maple St at Chicago Ave during holiday season | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1399 | 11/04/16 | JAJ | | 11/04/16 | | Request for all-way STOP signs at Wesley & Fillmore | | |
| 1400 | 11/04/16 | JAJ | 02/11/17 | | | Request for all-way STOP signs at Erie & Marion | | TWO 12528 & 12532 written on 02/11/2017 |
| 1401 | 11/09/16 | JAJ | | 11/09/16 | 10/06/17 | Petition for STOP signs at the intersection of Cuyler & Iowa | | |
| 1402 | 11/28/16 | JAJ | | 11/29/16 | | Request for KKAD25 banners on block | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1403 | 11/29/16 | JAJ | | 11/29/16 | | Request for alley speed bumps in adjacent north-south alley | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1404 | 12/01/16 | MJK | | 12/01/16 | 01/30/17 | request traffic calming device on 1200 Linden block | | VBOT to review on 11/06/2017 |
| 1405 | 12/01/16 | JAJ | 12/02/16 | | | Request for NO OUTLET sign on North Ave at Fair Oaks | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1406 | 12/15/16 | JAJ | 12/19/16 | | | Resident complaint of back up of traffic on Chicago Ave at Ridgeland Ave intersection | | TWO #12507 written on 12/02/2016 |
| 1407 | 12/29/16 | JAJ | | | | Request for signage to prohibit blocking of walkway | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1408 | 12/30/16 | JAJ | | | | Concern about North Blvd & Forest Ave intersection | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1409 | 12/30/16 | JAJ | 01/05/17 | | | Request for warning signage for 1200 Woodbine speed table | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1410 | 01/17/17 | JAJ | 02/08/17 | | | Vehicle & pedestrian traffic data collection for the intersection of Jackson Blvd & Wesley Ave | | TWO # 12514 written on 01/05/2017 |
| 1411 | 01/25/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for crosswalk markings on Chicago Ave at Grove Ave | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1412 | 02/01/17 | JAJ | 02/13/17 | | | Issues with traffic in alley Marion to Forest 1 block N of Lake St | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1413 | 02/03/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for in-street pedestrian crossing signs / crosswalk markings on Oak Park Ave at Erie St | | TWO #12534 was written on 02/13/2017 |
| 1414 | 02/06/17 | JAJ | 03/27/17 | | | Request for BLIND PERSON warning signage | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1415 | 01/30/17 | JAJ | 03/20/17 | | | Chicago/Ridgeland traffic signal timing is off since construction ended | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1416 | 02/06/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for crosswalk sign on Jackson Blvd between Oak Park Ave & Carpenter Ave | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1417 | 02/06/17 | MJK | | | | Request for sign to prohibit NB OPA traffic from blocking parking lot entrance at North Ave traffic signal | | TWO #12560 written on 05-15-2017 |
| 1418 | 02/09/17 | JAJ | | | | Crash at Erie Street & Grove Ave, request for all-way STOP signs at intersection | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1419 | 02/09/17 | JAJ | 09/15/17 | | | Crosswalk markings on Randolph St west of Maple St | | Part of RB 2017 resurfacing project |
| 1420 | 02/13/17 | JAJ | 02/17/17 | | | Request for various petitions for the 500 block of N Taylor Ave | | .com |

| Parking and Traffic Action Item Activity Summary | | | | | | | | Grayed out row indicates the item has been completed and closed |
|--|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| Project No. | Date Opened | Opened By | Date Closed | Petition mailed out on | Petition received on | Action Item Description | Name Address Phone Number | Commission Recommendation Village Board Action Final Disposition |
| | | | | | | | | Item referred to Police Dept |
| 1421 | 03/07/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for NPBS at alley access 300 block of S Maple (both Washington & Randolph) | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1422 | 03/27/17 | JAJ | | | | Request to modify turn restrictions or timing on Harvard at Ridgeland Ave | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1423 | 04/03/17 | JAJ | 04/14/17 | | | Request for signage to have turning vehicles yield to pedestrians at Madison/Wisconsin. | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12540 written on 04/14/2017 |
| 1424 | 04/07/17 | JAJ | | 04/07/17 | | Request for alley speed bump petition | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1425 | 04/10/17 | JAJ | | 04/13/17 | | Request for KKAD25 banners for 500 block fo Lyman | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1426 | 04/17/17 | JAJ | | | | Modify Lake/Harvey signal timing as students from Oak Park Academy cannot cross in the allotted time | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1427 | 05/01/17 | JAJ | 05/01/17 | | | Replace signage on Hayes at North Ave cul-de-sac | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12554 written on 05/01/2017 |
| 1428 | 04/20/17 | JAJ | 09/14/17 | 05/02/17 | 07/28/17 | Request for alley speed bump petition on the 1100 block of Clinton Ave | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12610 written on 09/14/2017 |
| 1429 | 05/02/17 | JAJ | | | | Traffic safety issues at intersection of east-west alley north of Chicago west of Austin and Austin Blvd. | | |
| 1430 | 05/01/17 | JAJ | 06/21/17 | | | Concern of doubleparked vehicles on Harvey at Lake that affects traffic safety | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12600 written on 06-18-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12602 written on 06-29-2017 |
| 1431 | 05/05/17 | JAJ | | | 05/08/17 | Petition for traffic calming device on 1200 block of Columbian | | VBOT to review on 11/06/2017 |
| 1432 | 04/28/17 | JAJ | | 05/04/17 | | Petition for ONE WAY street or traffic calming on 822 Cuyler Ave | | |
| 1433 | 05/09/17 | JAJ | 05/15/17 | | | Request for CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP signage at Taylor & Ontario intersection | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12561 was written on 05/15/2017 |
| 1434 | 05/17/17 | JAJ | 05/19/17 | | | Request for in-street pedestrian crossing signs in Forest/Ontario curve by Austin Gardens | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12562 was written on 05/18/2017 |
| 1435 | 05/24/17 | MJK | | | | Request for convex mirror in their alley | | |
| 1436 | 05/22/17 | JAJ | | 05/24/17 | | Request for STOP signs at the intersection of Lexington & Clinton | | |
| 1437 | 05/23/17 | JAJ | | 05/24/17 | | Request for STOP signs at the intersection of Lombard & Iowa | | |
| 1438 | 05/25/17 | JAJ | | 05/25/17 | | Regeust for speed bumps in alley 600 S Grove | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1439 | 06/06/17 | JAJ | 06/08/17 | | | Request for CROSS TRAFFIC DOES NOT STOP plaques for Harvard STOP signs at Wisconsin | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12563 was written on 06/08/2017 |
| 1440 | 06/12/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for cul-de-sac petition for 500 block of S Harvey | | |
| 1441 | 06/16/17 | JAJ | 07/10/17 | 06/21/17 | 06/29/17 | Request for speed bumps in east-west alley | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | | | TWO #12572 was written on 07/10/2017 |
| 1442 | 06/21/17 | JAJ | | 06/26/17 | | Request for Child at Play (KKAD25) signs on 1000 block of Wenonah | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| | | | | | | STOP Sign Petition at Kenilworth & | | Awating additional signatures |

| Parking and Traffic Action Item Activity Summary | | | | | | | | Grayed out row indicates the item has been completed and closed |
|--|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| Project No. | Date Opened | Opened By | Date Closed | Petition mailed out on | Petition received on | Action Item Description | Name Address Phone Number | Commission Recommendation Village Board Action Final Disposition |
| 1443 | 06/21/17 | JAJ | | 06/22/17 | 06/26/17 | Adams intersection & KKAD25 signs on 700 block of S Kenilworth Ave. | | TWO 12595 written on 08-03-2017 |
| 1444 | 06/26/17 | JAJ | | | | Traffic concerns about traffic on the 400 block of Forest Ave | | |
| 1445 | 07/11/17 | MJK | | 07/11/17 | | request for petition for stop signs at Home and Lexington intersection | | this is an item for the Trans Com |
| 1446 | 07/14/17 | JAJ | 08/25/17 | | | Rush Hospital Plan Development | | Trans Com recommendations to Plan Com 08-25-2017 |
| 1447 | 07/20/17 | JAJ | | | 09/01/17 | Request for alley speed bump petition (300 blocks of S Ridgeland & Cuyler) | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1448 | 07/24/17 | MJK | 08/08/17 | | | request for better NO OUTLET signage on the 1150 S Lombard block | | TWO # 12598 was written on 08/08/2017 |
| 1449 | 07/19/17 | MJK | 08/07/17 | | | request for improved pedestrian crossing safety across Madison St at Humphrey Ave. | | TWO # 12594 written on 08/07/2017 |
| 1450 | 07/24/17 | MJK | | | | report of driving on sidewalk in cul-de-sac by main public library | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1451 | 07/18/17 | JAJ | 08/10/17 | | | Request for 4 barricades for St Giles School operations | | TWO #12599 was written on 08/10/2017 |
| 1452 | 07/31/17 | JAJ | | | | Request of pavement markings on Garfield St at Oak Park Ave, ADA ramps on Garfield, west side of Oak Park Ave | | Pavement markings done, ADA ramp in 2018 |
| 1453 | 08/03/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for alley speed bumps in NS alley 400 N Humphrey/700 N Austin | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1454 | 08/10/17 | MJK | | | | inquiry about pedestrian safety at Jackson and Euclid | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1455 | 08/18/17 | JAJ | | | | Guardrail adjacent to alley by 1193 S Grove Ave | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1456 | 08/18/17 | JAJ | 10/23/17 | | | request to prohibit Chicago Ave traffic from turning onto Maple Ave | | TWO #12623 written on 10/23/2017 |
| 1457 | 08/24/17 | JAJ | | | | Resident request for HAWK signal on Ridgeland Ave at Erie St | | |
| 1458 | 08/24/17 | MJK | | | | Resident request for traffic signal at Oak Park Ave & Randolph St | | |
| 1459 | 08/28/17 | JAJ | | | | Review Jackson/Grove crash history to see if any patterns or possibly what could be enhanced (BMCK) | | |
| 1460 | 08/29/17 | JAJ | | | | Issues with traffic control devices | | |
| 1461 | 08/09/17 | JAJ | | | 09/05/17 | Petition for traffic calming on the 1200 block of N Taylor Ave | | |
| 1462 | 09/12/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for review of crash data for Lombard/Division intersection to see what could be done | | TWO 12607 written on 09-12-2017 |
| 1463 | 09/12/17 | JAJ | 10/23/17 | | | Questions regarding bicycling accidents and process for stop signs etc. | | Completed |
| 1464 | 09/13/17 | JAJ | 10/06/17 | | | crosswalk markings on Greenfield St at Kenilworth Ave (one block north of Mann School) | | TWO # 12616 written on 10/06/2017 |
| 1465 | 09/22/17 | MJK | | 09/25/17 | | wants Keep Kids Alive Drive 25 banners | | no Trans Com involvement necessary at this time |

| Parking and Traffic Action Item Activity Summary | | | | | | | | Grayed out row indicates the item has been completed and closed |
|--|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Project No. | Date Opened | Opened By | Date Closed | Petition mailed out on | Petition received on | Action Item Description | Name Address Phone Number | Commission Recommendation Village Board Action Final Disposition |
| 1466 | 09/27/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for ONE WAY on 100 block of South Harvey Ave | | |
| 1467 | 09/27/17 | JAJ | | | | Retime pedestrian signals at Forest/Lake, modify signal heads at intersection | | TWO #12618 written on 10-13-2017 |
| 1468 | 09/28/17 | JAJ | 10/01/17 | | | Parking and traffic issues on Maple Ave adjacent to Rush Hospital | | Forwarded to DCS (Parking and Planning) |
| 1469 | 09/29/17 | JAJ | | | | Crash/hear crash issues at Kenilworth & North Blvd | | |
| 1470 | 10/09/17 | JAJ | 10/19/17 | | | Issue with Washington/Wisconsin signal and loss of parking | | Responded to resident / forwarded to Parking |
| 1471 | 10/02/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for STOP sign or go slow sign on 100 S Euclid alley | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1472 | 10/02/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for review/improvement of Washington/Euclid intersection | | |
| 1473 | 10/05/17 | JAJ | | | | Issues with non-Village alley traffic | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1474 | 10/09/17 | JAJ | 10/23/17 | | | Safety issue as vehicles driving wrong way on 400 block of N Marion, also vehicles parking up to corner | | TWO #12621 (10-16-2017) & #12622 (10-23-2017) |
| 1475 | 10/09/17 | JAJ | 10/18/17 | | | Traffic/safety issues in Holley Court & Trader Joes parking lot. | | Responded to resident/forwarded to DCS |
| 1476 | 10/09/17 | MJK | | | | request to install RRFB lights on Washington at Kenilworth | | |
| 1477 | 10/10/17 | JAJ | | | 10/10/17 | Petition for alley speed humps in 300 block of N Humphrey | | no Trans Com involvement necessary |
| 1478 | 10/13/17 | JAJ | | | | Vehicles not stopping on Division St @ Kenilworth Ave for children - requests additional warning signage | | |
| 1479 | 10/13/17 | JAJ | 10/16/17 | | | Request to install RTO restriction on Maple Ave at Madison St | | Contacted resident, Village in process of installing sign |
| 1480 | 10/18/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for a traffic study | | |
| 1481 | 10/18/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for cul-de-sac on 800 block of Home Ave | | |
| 1482 | 10/31/17 | JAJ | | | | Request for NO LEFT TURN sign on NB Scoville at Lake St during OPRFHS arrival and dismissal times. | | |



Village of Oak Park

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

1117-2
OE2
1/3

Meeting Minutes

President and Board of Trustees

Monday, October 16, 2017

7:30 PM

Village Hall

I. Call to Order

Village President Abu-Taleb called the Meeting to order at 7:32 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. Agenda Approval

Village Manager Pavlicek stated that there was a request to move Item M up in the Agenda.

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

IV. Minutes

- A. [MOT 17-240](#) **Motion to Approve Minutes from October 2, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Village Board.**

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

V. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Bonita Robinson. Ms. Robinson discussed inconveniences caused by her neighbor's outdoor lighting and steps taken to resolve the issue.

VI. Proclamations

- X. [ID 17-662](#) **Motion to Approve Proclamation for A Day of Remembrance in Honor of Barbara Furlong**

Village President Abu-Taleb read the Proclamation aloud.

It was moved by Village Trustee Andrews, seconded by Village Trustee Boutet, that this Proclamation be adopted. A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved.

VII. Village Manager Reports

Village Manager Pavlicek commented that the following two Items are reports that will be discussed at the next Regular Meeting. She gave a brief overview and noted that there is additional information in the Board packets.

- B.** [ID 17-656](#) **Receipt of the 2017 Illinois Project for Local Assessment of Needs (IPLAN) Five Year Community Health Plan as recommended by the Board of Health and Director of Public Health and scheduling its discussion for November 6, 2017.**

- C.** [ID 17-661](#) **Receipt of the Traffic Calming Toolbox as Recommended by the Transportation Commission and Scheduling its Discussion for November 6, 2017.**

- M.** [RES 17-603](#) **A Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with The Lakota Group, Inc., for Phase 2 Landscape Design and Planning Services for the Lake Street Streetscape and Infrastructure Improvement Project in an Amount not to Exceed \$131,370 and Authorizing its Execution**

Village Manager Pavlicek stated that the FY 2017 budget included funds for design and planning services for Lake Street. Staff would like to proceed with this work and anticipate bringing recommendations back to the Board in January 2018. This will include final plans for lighting, irrigation, hardscape materials, trees and landscaping.

Village Engineer Bill McKenna discussed the contract with Lakota to finish Lake Street improvements.

Village Trustee Moroney expressed concern regarding the cost of bluestone versus concrete. Village Trustee Button agreed and wanted to see a cost analysis of potential options. Mr. McKenna stated that he could provide that for the Board to review. Village Trustee Tucker would like to see other options as well. He was in favor of using some bluestone to carry over similar elements in the design, but did not support using bluestone throughout.

Village Trustee Boutet was concerned that the Board would be approving the design before the actual project. She preferred to approve the CIP first. Village Manager Pavlicek clarified that the project has already been vetted and approved by a previous board. Village Trustee Andrews asked what the implications would be if this contract was held back. He commented that Lakota's bid was not the lowest. Mr. McKenna explained that Lakota's proposal contained competitive pricing as well as evidence that they could perform the work within the allotted time frame. In addition, he was concerned that the lower proposals lacked the ability to complete the work to the standards provided.

Village President Abu-Taleb asked for clarification on what the Board will be voting on tonight. Village Manager Pavlicek stated that it is for professional services to develop a design on items that are ready to go to bid. Village President Abu-Taleb asked what the impacts would be if this decision is delayed. Chris Dillion, President of Campbell Coyle Real Estate and partners with Ranquist Development on the District House project, stated from a timing perspective, they are far into construction and are anticipating their first deliveries early next year. It is critical that the streetscape move forward as soon as possible.

- S. [RES 17-671](#) A Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with Speer Financial, Inc. as the Village's Municipal Bond Advisor for Bond Issuances and Other Related Services and Authorizing its Execution

This Resolution was adopted.

- T. [RES 17-674](#) A Resolution Authorizing the Execution of a Settlement Agreement in Workers' Compensation Case Number 2016 WC 15644

This Resolution was adopted.

XIII. Regular Agenda

- U. [MOT 17-236](#) A Motion to Concur with the Transportation Commission's Recommendation to Install a STOP Sign on Forest Avenue for Northbound Traffic at Greenfield Street and Direct Staff to Prepare the Necessary Ordinance and to Install a Temporary Bump-Out on Greenfield Street at Forest Avenue

Village Manager Pavlicek stated that this is a combination of traffic calming measures recommended by the Transportation Commission. Staff is not supportive of the installation of a STOP sign but are supportive of installing a bump out.

Village Engineer Bill McKenna stated that a petition from residents on the 1000 block of Forest Avenue was received regarding safety and visibility of pedestrians as well as confusion regarding right of way, etc. at the intersection. Staff discussed concerns with residents and collected data this past spring, which was given to the Transportation Commission. Mr. McKenna stated that the data does not support a STOP sign. Forest Avenue is a calm residential street; there have been no accidents at that intersection in the past three years. Greenfield has slightly higher speeds. The Commission shared their concerns regarding Greenfield and recommended several options. Staff is in favor of all recommendations except for the STOP sign. He discussed the historical data and noted that STOP signs are not used to control speed.

Transportation Commission Chair Jack Chalabian discussed a similar situation in which the Transportation Commission did not recommend a STOP sign. Subsequently, a child got hit and a STOP sign was installed. He believes that is the rationale behind the commission's recommendation. He acknowledged that Mr. McKenna is right; the data does not warrant a sign, but there is a distance that exists between traffic control devices which encourages people to drive faster. He noted that there is an issue with east-west traffic. Mr. Chalabian and Mr. McKenna answered questions from the Board. There was a discussion regarding bump outs.

The motion was amended to exclude the bump outs.

It was moved by Village Trustee Button, seconded by Village Trustee Boutet, that this Motion be approved as amended. The motion failed The roll call on the vote was as follows:

AYES: 2 - Village Trustee Button, and Village Trustee Boutet

NAYS: 5 - Village Trustee Taglia, Village President Abu-Taleb, Village Trustee Tucker, Village Trustee Moroney, and Village Trustee Andrews

ABSENT: 0