

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Monday, September 26, 2016
Council Chambers – Village Hall

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Jack Chalabian called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

Present: Jack Chalabian, Kyle Eichenberger, Michael Stewart, Mark Patzloff, Will Gillespie, Joel Schoenmeyer, Craig Chesney

Staff: Mike Koperniak, Jill Velan, John Youkhana, Dorothy Benson-Baker

There was one non-agenda public testimony by Tom Lindsey of 1235 North East Avenue. Mr. Lindsey stated he submitted a petition about a year ago and wants to know when it will be on the Transportation Commission agenda. Chair Chalabian referred Mr. Lindsey to contact Engineering staff, Mike Koperniak or Jill Juliano, direct at the Public Works Center, as they would be able to give him the appropriate response when the item would be added to the agenda.

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.

Approval of the Draft August 22, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Gillespie motioned to approve the draft August 22, 2016, Transportation Commission meeting minutes as modified and was seconded by Commissioner Patzloff. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

FINAL REVIEW OF THE Y2, Y3 AND Y4 ZONES STUDY
RECOMMENDATIONS AS DEVELOPED BY THE TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION AND INCORPORATED BY STAFF

Chair Chalabian started off by giving a background history on this item to the audience. The Chair stated the Commission has worked on this item for over a year and the Transportation Commission members know the parking problems in these areas. Chair Chalabian urged residents to continue to participate. He further explained that the Village Board of Trustees makes the final decision.

Parking Services Director Jill Velan gave a presentation of the Proposed Plan and a Recap. Jill talked more about both night and day restrictions. Jill spoke about the alternative proposed daytime restrictions Option #2 that the

Commission preferred. Jill continued discussing daytime excluded areas and reasons for their exclusion.

Next, Ms. Velan spoke about the survey results. She had a total of 616 responses from the community. Assistant Parking Services Director John Youkhana had posted signs around the Village and letters had been sent out. Jill gave a summarization of the emails received. (Note: A copy of email summary can be obtained from Parking Services).

Commissioner Chesney asked if staff had developed the survey and Jill Velan responded yes.

Commission Stewart commented on a number of information signs that were placed on streets of the Village.

Chair Chalabian asked staff what public comments were received in the past 72 hours.

Jill Velan responded that she had received a late request from Brooks Middle School for some parking changes around the school.

John Youkhana spoke about how the Village's interaction with the public was handled.

The floor was open to Public Testimony.

Lea Larsen of 1028 Randolph, #3S stated that she lives in and manages the building. She mentioned residents had lost approximately 20 spaces when the YMCA sold its lot and the YMCA users and Octoberfest patrons take up most of the parking spaces after 7pm. Ms. Larsen went on to say she parks in Lot #81 but frequently has to wait for a parking space. She is concerned with all the new condos being built and asked where everyone will park. Ms. Larsen feels more parking enforcement is needed.

Jaggen Farwell of 1023 Washington lives in a multi-unit building. Mr. Farwell questioned the frequency of street cleaning. He asked if cleaning could be spread out to biweekly instead of weekly. Mr. Farwell pointed out that the parking signs are confusing to visitors and he suggested persons should be able to log into the Oak Park parking app for night parking. Finally, he questioned why the Village is not utilizing the parking spaces in front of residential homes.

Bill Bixby of 521 South Kenilworth stated he has lived on a cul-de-sac block for 8-1/2 years but the parking has picked up on his block, lately. He especially wants to know why night parking is so hectic. He continued explaining that more residents and cars are coming into the area and many activities are happening

on Madison St. Mr. Bixby also questioned if our enforcement officers are keeping up with which vehicles have passes.

Kathleen Huttner of 948 Pleasant, #2J spoke about the confusing parking situations. She mentioned living in different locations all around the world but in her opinion, compared to other places, Oak Park is so complex when it comes to parking. Ms. Huttner does not believe that preventing parking also prevents crime issues. She stated that Oak Park is living in the past and if you are a resident, you should be able to park on the street. She added that moving cars around frequently is another issue.

Mr. Lee P. Kane stated his questions had already been answered.

Steve and Cindy Hopkins of 247 Home were present. Mr. Hopkins showed photos taken in area surrounding where he lives in Zone Y2. He spoke about how cars are constantly parked on Home between Pleasant and Randolph. He believes there is a compliance issue as there is no overnight parking allowed on his block. Mr. Hopkins also spoke about guest parking and commuter parkers in 4-hr zones and about the issues that started when the YMCA lot users lost spots.

Mike Fox of 1110 Pleasant is the owner of the Carleton Hotel and other properties in Oak Park. He spoke about losing South Blvd and Harlem lots. Mr. Fox urges Oak Park to hold off on the Y2 proposal until the South Blvd & Harlem Development is completed in 18 months. He would like to run this idea past the Pleasant District Businesses. As a business owner, he explained daytime changes appear to be very problematic.

Anna Harlan of 728 Carpenter spoke about the congested area she lives in and lots of changes that are coming. She pointed out the Y3 area is very close to public transportation. Ms. Harlan explained that we all are impacted with the loss of parking spots. She also feels the signage is very confusing.

Clarence Ward of 517 South Kenilworth spoke about the cul-de-sac block he lives on in a single family home. Mr. Ward questioned why the Village does not create parking spaces in vacant lots. He sees more cars on his block daily.

Cecil S. Barbato of 1040 Washington spoke about the hard time he had figuring out what the proposed restrictions are as on the survey. Cecil is a new resident who has lived here about 1-1/2 years. He has seen parking spaces go away but lots of new tenants are still moving into multi-unit buildings. Mr. Barbato feels the Village needs to create more parking spaces. He was concerned about the painted yellow lines being so long on the curbs by fire hydrants and why the "No Parking Here to Corner signs" is so far back.

Jill Velan spoke about the existing and proposed parking restrictions along Washington.

Erik Wise of 429 Home spoke about that the Village needs to keep track of who has parking and Oak Park has a massive amount of unused parking space on the street. Mr. Wise believes Oak Park needs to keep the community diverse and keep affordable housing.

Dan Gheorghe of 836 Washington asked why no overnight parking is allowed 2:30 to 6:00 am. He feels these rules are morally wrong because it causes people to have to break rules. He continued expressing 80 to 90 years ago these rules may have been good but not for today's Oak Park community.

Fay Perkins of 810 Pleasant pays for permit parking but explained it is still very hard for her to find parking. She has to rush home each night by 5:30pm to get a parking space. She continued sharing that the parking situation makes her feel like a prisoner in her own home. Even tonight she mentioned there will not be a parking space after the meeting. Ms. Perkins stated this is not fair to her and other residents.

Adam Veasman of 822 Washington states he loves this town and community and shares the frustration with the complicated parking permit process. He has switched from being a renter to an owner in hopes of having an easier parking situation. Adam has tried to find parking but has been unsuccessful. He discussed about the elders in the neighborhood as well as others who have difficulties finding parking in the Y4 area.

Anna Clare McDermott of 1029 Washington stated she has lived in Oak Park for over 35 years. Ms. McDermott spoke about the influx of new tenants in new multiunit buildings. She added there is inequity of people who have parking versus those who do not. Parking is a problem that needs to be shared by all. She feels there is an inequity or divisiveness in neighborhoods. Ms. McDermott expressed her added frustration with the snow coming how residents are going to survive without resolving the parking issues.

Julie Crumley of 210 South Kenilworth spoke about how post office workers and other employees fill up her block. She explained that this is dangerous with all the congestion. There are middle school kids walking around and drivers usually are going fast and do not yield at stop signs. She suggested Oak Park reaches out to businesses with lots to find employees parking.

Finally, Darin Motaka of 214 South Kenilworth spoke about the speeding cars racing for spots. He feels Oak Park should rethink the safety issues.

Public Testimony was closed out.

Commissioner Chesney inquired when the Village Board of Trustees will act on these.

Jill Velan explained the response depends on if the Commission makes recommendations tonight. Also, the VBOT want us to do another study session before they make a decision, hopefully, by December 2016 or January 2017.

Commissioner Chesney inquired about the overnight parking by Brooks Middle School.

Jill Velan explained about the no parking by the fire hydrants and the “No Parking Here to Corner” signs. She explained the role of Parking Enforcement Officers who are under the Police Department. Jill also spoke about overnight guest parking and continued explaining how parking at South Blvd. and Harlem was only a temporary parking solution as those lots were originally for development and not for private parking.

Commissioner Stewart asked what the requirements are for parking spaces when building a development in Oak Park.

Jill Velan explained the process and shared parking which includes 1 space per unit and TOD transportation ordinance requires less than one space. She also talked on future parking in developments on Lots 9 and 9T.

Commissioner Chesney spoke on TOD zoning. The Commission has worked hard to get back lost parking spaces. He also spoke about parking around Brooks Middle School.

Commissioner Schoenmeyer spoke about different parking users: renters versus owners, customers versus employees, and commuters. He added prioritization is required and shared sacrifice is needed.

Commissioner Gillespie agreed with Commissioner Schoenmeyer.

Commissioner Patzloff spoke on being a homeowner in the northeast part of Oak Park. He spoke on Daytime Option #2. He stated this is a complicated issue and he is trapped between uniformity and customization on block by block basis.

Commissioner Eichenberger asked how we can transfer tonight’s conversation into action. Fairness is an issue.

Commissioner Chesney spoke on how Washington Blvd. is a very dense area and there is a pent up parking demand. He does not like two different time restrictions on a street.

Commissioner Stewart disagreed with TOD. His work experience in helping people move into the Village is that most tenants have two cars. He believes

there will be a future parking shortage. He spoke about the Commissioners doing their survey work—like a six-month study, review and then try out Option 2.

Commissioner Eichenberger asked how we would test the sign changes.

Jill Velan suggested the Village could install temporary signage and make it work. However, there will be capital outlay.

Commissioner Gillespie wants to confirm that the recommendation for tonight is Option #2. The Commission is still working on solving the problem. Therefore, Commissioner Gillespie has a problem with making a recommendation on tonight. He also spoke about the new development and about more tenants needing to work more.

Commissioner Chesney asked about what streets would be affected by Option 2.

Jill Velan explained about Option #2 and the affected streets.

Chair Chalabian stated there are two issues—daytime and nighttime. He spoke about daytime and mentioned the areas surrounding Oak Park Avenue and Ontario. Also, he spoke about the survey results. The Chair explained that there is no parking in front of his own house. Finally, he reiterated the Commissioners want the feedback from the surveys as soon as possible.

Chair Chalabian mentioned meeting with Trustee Tucker and discussing what the trustees wanted from Parking. Also, the people don't want to use the Holley Court Garage because it is too far from their residences. The Chair spoke about shared sacrifice. Finally, he clarified that the Commission would not overturn the Overnight Parking Ban.

Commissioner Chesney stated he is not ready to make recommendation on "No Parking 8-10am" because night parking is more important and there is still lots to do.

Commissioner Schoenmeyer spoke about dealing with commuters. He also mentioned the cleaners on South Blvd has about 10 unused parking spaces at night.

Chair Chalabian stated that there is available parking in this Village of Oak Park but it is hard to get to use it for overnight parking.

Commissioner Schoenmeyer admitted he is not ready to make recommendations tonight.

Jill Velan spoke about how and why written letters were sent out. She asked residents to pay attention to what is going on and when meetings will be held.

Chair Chalabian asked what additional information does the Commission need to make the recommendations.

Commissioner Chesney asked if the signs are the problem.

Commissioner Stewart explained it would be nice to standardize the signage but each block has its own particularities. He wants to see overnight recommendations go forward but set deadline for daytime. He spoke about using Madison Street (south side only) for overnight parking.

Chair Chalabian explained there is a consensus on night parking but daytime parking is still a problem.

Commissioner Gillespie wants more public testimony from business owners. Also wants examples of solutions from other cities, and best practices on densities of this nature.

Jill Velan explained what types of data that the Village of Oak Park can provide.

Commissioner Schoenmeyer agreed he wants to hear more from businesses, he likes to simplify things, but not too simple. There needs to be an outreach to businesses such as the Pleasant District, Madison Street District, South Oak Park District, Hemingway Business District and others.

Jill Velan agreed she could contact some businesses by the next meeting.

Commissioner Patzloff spoke on the legality of using the Madison Street snow route. He added arrangements could be made with private businesses for use of their lots, and other private off street parking.

Commissioner Eichenberger would like to move night parking recommendations forward but daytime still needs more work.

Commissioner Stewart wants to make recommendation about daytime restrictions. He asked if businesses and residents have specific opinions about Option #2.

Chair Chalabian clarified there will be no recommendation on tonight.

The Commissioners discussed how to get more public feedback. It was suggested to study ten (10) hot spots with existing conditions versus the proposed (do a microstudy within the study). Let us continue combing comments from residents and check with the Pleasant District and other management companies.

Mike Koperniak mentioned that we have two stop signs and toolbox to address.

Commissioner Chalabian reiterated finishing parking will be priority.

Commissioner Chesney motioned to defer the work plan to October. Commissioner Schoen seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commission's work plan is due in October. The October meeting may be on the stop sign petition received for Monroe and Wenonah. Chair Chalabian suggested following up on the toolbox at the meeting in October to get it finished this year.

An email will be sent out to all members and staff involved to have two meetings in either October or November. There will be no meetings held in December.

Commissioner Stewart motioned to adjourn the meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Chesney.

The voice vote was unanimous to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.

Respectively submitted

Dorothy Benson-Baker

Dorothy Benson-Baker
Administrative Secretary

Public testimony received prior to the meeting is included on the following pages

From: Heidi Ruehle-May [mailto:hruehlema@pleasanthome.org]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 3:58 PM
To: Velan, Jill
Cc: Youkhana, John
Subject: RE: Parking questions for Pleasant District

Thanks Jill!

Hi John,

I'm providing some feedback wearing two hats: President of the Pleasant District Association and ED at Pleasant Home. I spent some time looking over the current and proposed parking plans for area Y2. I appreciate that the Transportation Commission is working to simplify the parking regulations; however, it seems like with this new option it's getting even more confusing. I'm unsure as to why the street parking need to be closed off every day M-F for two hours per side - surely the streets aren't being cleaned that often, is there anything else I'm unaware of to necessitate this? Also, what is the reasoning/history behind the various time restrictions - meaning, why aren't all time restrictions 8am-5pm (for example) rather than 9-5, 8-4, 10-3, etc.?

Here is a scenario: I have a company renting Pleasant Home during the week for a 5-hour workshop from 8am-1pm. Their employees will need somewhere to park. They have only one side of the street to park from 8-10am. Then, at 10am, they need to move their cars to the other side of the street. Then, if they parked in a 2-hour zone, will need to move their cars again at noon. That's three parking spots within five hours!

Scenario #2: someone is attending a class at Dailey Method that starts at 9:30am. Half an hour later, they need to leave their class and move their car to the other side of the street. Some patrons will definitely move on to other gyms after a few tickets!

My biggest concern, besides the confusion, is that even more parking is being taken away when we need it most. We have some excellent new(ish) businesses like Dailey Method, Carnivore and Connolly's who have been affected by the construction throughout this year. The Pleasant District is working hard to bring more patrons to our businesses, and confusing and limited parking is detrimental to their success. For an organization like Pleasant Home Foundation, we could lose important daytime rentals that help bring in income that funds our restoration and programming efforts which are of great value to the Oak Park community. As more new businesses and residents come in over the next year or two, we need to do everything we can to encourage patronage rather than add more confusion and financial loss for these important local businesses. I would think that a community-driven town like Oak Park would do everything possible to provide more traffic to the district rather than restrictions.

A suggestion: All parking (other than NPAT or metered) is available for 4 hours from 8am-5pm M-F. Tuesdays no parking N & E sides and Wednesday no parking S & W sides between 8-10am to allow for street cleaning (or something similar). This would alleviate the potential problem of commuters taking up spaces all day, less confusion for patrons, and, hopefully, more business for the district.

Suggestion #2: No parking restrictions (other than NPAT or metered) at all except for street cleaning! To alleviate the problem of commuters taking up valuable patron spaces, provide a surface lot or garage with permits to encourage people to use public transportation while providing enough parking for others.

Oak Park is a commuter and pedestrian-friendly town, and we can't always expect to park our cars within a few spaces from our destination. This, in my opinion, is a big positive to the Oak Park lifestyle. However, we have to consider that there are plenty of business patrons not from the area that will provide much-needed income for small businesses who may not tolerate very confusing and limiting parking restrictions. Also, it will be maddening to see an entire side of the street vacant for two hours during business days when street cleaning isn't taking place.

Not on the agenda tonight is the concern over loss of parking while North Blvd construction is wrapping up (before they open parking garage) and South & Harlem begins. Where will all of those commuters park?

Also not on the agenda: Valet - a great idea to help during the South & Harlem construction - I have some thoughts as to locale of the valet stop. I've heard it through the grapevine that the businesses may be expected to contribute financially to this expense. I sincerely hope this rumor is incorrect! These businesses are doing all they can to survive and asking them to pay for a parking solution that is out of their control is unreasonable at best.

I hope you can communicate these concerns at the meeting tonight. I wanted to attend the meeting but was only alerted about it by chance on Friday and I'm not sure how many business owners will be able to attend. I know I'm not the only one who didn't notice or didn't understand the yard signs suggesting the survey either. In the future, please let me know as soon as possible when meetings, surveys, etc. arise and I will be sure to alert our businesses immediately - this will help you receive more accurate feedback from a larger pool of respondents.

Thank you for your time,

Heidi Ruehle-May
Executive Director

Pleasant Home Foundation
217 Home Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302
(708) 383-2654

pleasanthome.org
facebook.com/pleasanthomefoundation

From: Carrie Rubenking [<mailto:rubenkingcmr@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:59 AM

To: Youkhana, John

Subject: Parking - Y4 zone

Thank you for the opportunity to complete the survey.

Though if this is the only change that is coming down the pike for parking in Oak Park, it really isn't enough.

The survey would have been more helpful if there were an opportunity to express individual thoughts on the issues of parking.

Strategies for providing more space for renters would be appreciated - also the possibility of marking the parking options would at least cause people to think more - be more considerate of their neighbors who also need space to park. Sometime 5 cars are taking the space that could hold 7 cars easily just because they are not paying attention. Also - for those who do not have permits to not park in the permit zones - so that residents will have places to park when they return from work each day.

Thank you for your consideration.

Blessings,
Carrie Wilson.

From: Tree Havener [mailto:tree.havener@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2016 5:05 PM

To: Youkhana, John

Cc: Brian Havener

Subject: Data from a resident: PARKING STUDY ON THE Y2,Y3, AND Y4 PARKING ZONES

Dear Mr. Youkhana

Thank you for the letter making residents aware of the Transportation Commission's study on parking restrictions in Y2, Y3 and Y4. I am unable to attend the meeting on 9/26/16, but wanted to bring to your attention some of the logistical problems Overnight Parking Permits cause my block specifically.

My family has lived on the 500 block of South Kenilworth for 8 years. We are located just south of Madison Street, on a closed-off, cul-de-sac block. We love this setup, but it presents unique challenges for us and our neighbors.

The Village issues Overnight Parking Permits to people who request to park on our block, if they are willing to pay the \$7 fee. Most of these people do not live on our block, and often permits are issued with an expiration date many weeks out. Since there are no daytime restrictions, many permit holders will leave their cars unmoved for days or even weeks. Which means our residential block is often turned into a long-term parking lot.

And that causes some problems:

Problem 1: Leaf Removal

Public Works offers a leaf removal service for residents who rake their leaves into the street. Unfortunately, we rarely get our leaves picked up because someone with an Overnight Parking Permit will park on top of them, or in a way that obstructs the "Leaf Plow" at the end of the cul-de-sac. Year after year, we not only miss the last leaf collection because of Parking Permit holders, but we're also unable to clean up the rotting mess in the street before it snows, because someone has parked (with permission from the Village) on top of them. This is unsightly, unsanitary, and frankly, unacceptable.

Problem 2: Snow Removal

Much like the leaf problem, we experience snow removal problems. After a snowfall, when long-term parkers, who don't even live on our block, finally pull away, we are left with an unplowed icy street which is unsafe and incredibly frustrating. The 500 block of S. Kenilworth should get the same snow removal services as other blocks in our neighborhood.

Problem 3: Being trapped in the cul-de-sac

As you may already know, there is a problematic house in the middle of our block. 514 S. Kenilworth is ground zero for troubled, transient, young adults in Oak Park. 911 frequently dispatches police and ambulances to this residence. Often when emergency vehicles are present, and there are an abundance of long-term parkers, our street is basically shut down. Motorists who try to leave the north end of the block are trapped between the cul-de-sac and the emergency vehicles, leaving them unable to drive away.

This is especially frustrating if you need to be somewhere. If there were fewer cars parked on the street, this would not be a problem.

These are my main concerns. Please take them into consideration when analyzing the impact of parking changes, and keep us in mind when making policy changes. Ideally, we would like to see Parking & Vehicle Services would stop issuing overnight parking permits to people who don't live on our block, because of the associated logistical and safety problems.

We love living in Oak Park, and look forward to continued growth in our community. Please feel free to call or email me if you have questions, or need further information.

Regards, Tree Havener

From: ltgowdw@aol.com [mailto:ltgowdw@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 3:12 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: parking comments

I live at 102 S. Grove and there are many challenges due to the parking on the street. I have lived here for over 30 years and the parking situation has gotten progressively worse.

My block contends with many cars parking on the 100 block of South Grove, day and night. They are here for free parking, to hop on the el, to eat at the 2 new restaurants that opened on Oak Park ave., the car and truck owners who work at Unity Temple(they have permits to park from 6am, (most of which get here by 530am) until 2 pm). It's very hard to get the street cleaned, (Oh, " just call if they don't clean the street and someone will come out". That didn't work.), the leaves picked up or snow removal, ("just call the streets department and they'll have someone come out to plow", that doesn't work either). Metered parking on South Blvd? People don't want to pay when they can park on the street for free. I watch while a car will pull into a space, the driver comes out, stares at the pay machine, gets back in their car and either leaves or turns around to park on the street. There are more empty spots at the open metered spaces than there are on the street.

Come out and take a look at various times of the day or evening.

If that's not all, cars come SPEEDING north on Grove, trying to make a right hand turn onto South Blvd. (no right turn), then either make it to Oak Park Avenue, amid honking horns, or realize they can't make the turn(amid more honking horns) and proceed to turn left (west), or worse yet, try to turn around and go back, south on Grove. An accident waiting to happen.

I've gone thru different people to get more enforcement of the rules but I keep getting excuses, ("people don't want to pay to park" "we are low on staff", " we have to go all over the village to enforce and when we do ticket, the same cars come back", "I guess they don't mind paying the tickets")

It seems to me that there are more excuses than there are solutions.

My solution?

Physically come out onto the streets in question and look!!!! Several times, not just once.

Knock on the doors of the people who actually live on these streets and ask them their opinion.

And then enforce the rules.

And make sure the police officers know the rules. ("I didn't know this was not an overnight permit parking area.")

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Kozlowski

102 S Grove

708-932-2853

From: Brett Patterson [mailto:abp1095@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 24, 2016 7:41 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Parking in Y2

To the Village

I would like to provide some feedback concerning the parking in the 100 block of Clinton Ave. I understand that there is limited parking for residence to use during the day and overnight, but the current set up of allowing people to park on both sides of the street is dangerous, especially in the winter when there is snow built up on the street. I have lived in Oak Park for 7 years and have had one accident and 3 other almost accidents due to the very narrow street with parking on both sides of the street.

In the winter the issue is even worse with snow that is not cleared and the street becomes a one lane road with parking on both sides. I do not understand why there is not more parking allowed on the 200 block? It seems that there is more than enough room to allow more parking on the 200 block and reduce the 100 block to parking on only one side on each day.

Please look into reducing parking to only one side of the 100 block, it is dangerous.

Thank you
Brett Patterson
115 Clinton Ave Unit D

From: lpkeeley@aol.com [mailto:lpkeeley@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 5:23 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Parking...

Sorry I can't make the meeting.

My husband and I live at 223 S. Kenilworth. At 10 a.m. our street is a parking lot. My husband is an invalid, and I very often have to go to Walgreen's to pick up scripts or get him to a Dr's appt. We don't have a garage on our alley, just a front driveway. It can take me, sometimes, 10 or 15 minutes to get out to the street. People seem to use our street to avoid Oak Park Ave and they speed down it!

The other day, I had to run an errand. Cars were parked both left and right of our driveway. I pulled out, backed up to make a turn into the street. Heard a horrible crunching sound. Turns out that the car parked to the right had a long, thin tow bar that was not visible in my rear-view mirror. Now I have a huge hole in the back bumper into my trunk. OY!

I called and wrote the Village a while back. I said our street was an accident(s) waiting to happen (see above). Especially since we have the middle school just down the street. At 3:30, kids are everywhere...some biking, skate boarding etc. down our street...with headsets on and not paying attention to traffic.

I asked if maybe the Village could restrict parking to just one side of our block. The block up from us does??? The lady I spoke to said, "Not possible, as parking is at such a premium." I rent 5 parking spaces out back. Best deal in town at only \$40 a month. Going rate is \$100...I get it....

But our block has two huge condos and lots of 2-flats. More populated than the block to the north of us. Don't get that; why parking is restricted there!

As an aside, my neighbors next door had a lemonade stand last month. I was sitting with the Mom when Dad went across the street to talk with another neighbor. The youngest kid (3) started to take out after Dad. I tackled him to the ground at the curb. I saved his life...and his Dad told me so. It was a close run thing with a car racing down our street. Too bad I am too old for the Bears to recruit me!

And, all these over-priced condos going up... Maybe they could sell them to people that just rode bikes?

Thanks for your consideration. Best, Lesley Keeley

From: David Kelm [mailto:david1945@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 2:23 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Oak Park Parking, another option

The village board seems to be considering a change in the parking regulations in our fair town. As I see it, the new proposal of side of the street shifting for a few hours each morning is a strategy addressing only one issue. I do not believe street cleaning is our most urgent issue. If there is going to be a change, I believe creating smoother, more efficient traffic flow and bicycle safety are of greater concern. The most radical strategy would be to make all streets ONE WAY and only allow cross traffic left turns at intersections wide enough for a left, right and through lane.

The other approach would be side shift parking even side even days and odd side odd days every day all day. I believe this would improve traffic flow by eliminating our current pattern of dodge that on coming car and give more space for bicyclists.

The third approach would combine both of the above strategies. This would take care of flow, safety, street cleaning and make snow removal more efficient. You may voice you opinion at www.surveymonkey.com/r/f6w5c7y .

David Kelm
1025 Pleasant Pl
Oak Park IL
60302
708-975-9300

From: Anonymous
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Parking Study

Dear Sir,

I received notice of a transportation commission public meeting September 26th. I will not be able to attend, however would like to offer comment. At the risk of being labeled an old curmudgeon I have to state I am displeased with the continued relaxing of overnight parking restrictions over the past several years. I'll try to be brief and non-specific as it has been my experience that the village often pits neighbor against neighbor in issues like these. I will sign my name, but ask for anonymity as I don't want to get into a snit with my neighbors. I have always appreciated and respected the restrictions on overnight parking. I've only had two instances where I parked on the street overnight, once when my roof was being replaced and once when my neighbor's roof was being replaced. Having cars off the street improves government services, such as snow removal, street cleaning, leaf pickup and garbage pickup. I live in the 700 block of South Grove and we do not have an alley on the west side of the street. West side of the street residents have driveways onto the street. When cars are often parked on both sides of the street it makes it difficult to get in and out of the driveway. Snow removal is the major issue for me. In the past the snowplow could plow from curb to curb overnight. Now the plow has to go around the cars and dumps the snow across my driveway. I can shovel out the mouth of my driveway but not the street as well. Several Winters ago I literally had a sheet of ice and snow extending 4-5 feet from the curb into the street. This was caused by the plow having to go around parked cars. Even after subsequent snowfalls the plow never got close to the curb again. This sheet of ice lasted into Spring.

I looked at the village website and noted the limits of 10 overnight passes per month and a fee of \$7 after the first three. There are people who routinely park overnight well in excess of the stated limit. Over the past year I have noted a series of people from the next block south parking overnight for extended periods, 3-6 months. Why are they being sent to our block to park instead of being required to rent a space somewhere? Who is keeping track of this? Are they really paying to park? I just want the snow plowed in the winter, the street sweeper to be able to sweep the entire street rather than just patches, leaves to be picked up in the fall and the garbage man to be able to access my cans which I have to bring to the curb as I already noted we don't have an alley. There are probably areas of the village that are worse than what I've described, I just hope that in looking at the parking situation and making recommendations the needs of all residents are considered and not just those who clamor for more on-street privileges.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Anonymous

From: soapermr@aol.com [<mailto:soapermr@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 1:35 PM

To: Parking Services

Subject: Residential Parking for Paying Permit Holders

Dear Village of Oak Park,

You must know Oak Park's reputation for it's horrific parking "No Park" is one of it's nicknames. While commercial parking needs to be addressed. I am asking that you focus on your **residential parking problems**. We are the neighbors and fellow taxpayers who can not afford a home or apartment with parking and who have no other choice than to purchase a parking permit. And for those of us who do own, we pay the same property taxes as those who can afford to buy a home with parking. The difference being that although we pay the same property tax but we pay an additional \$500.00 per year for Oak Park to graciously allow us to fight over a limited number of spots on the street. Sometimes when we come home from a hard day of work and there are no spots available in our zone. Why?

1. Some car owners take more than 1 spot-**Possible solution line the spots, so these thoughtless individuals won't be able to take 2 spots.**

2. Street Cleaning-What a racket!!! I am paying my tax dollars to pay someone to drive around a piece of equipment that pushes the trash, glass and garbage further up the road! Meanwhile because all of us who have a permit have to park on the same side of the street, twice per week there are only 1/2 the number of spots available. It's like duck duck goose, if you get home and all of the spots are taken you have to take a spot on the wrong side of the street. If you forget, oversleep or there is no spot available on the correct side by 8am, well that'll cost you an additional \$40.00!

Possible solution, stop "cleaning (pushing the dirt around)" 2 times per week. Maybe if you didn't do that to us so frequently we could pretend that your really "cleaning" the streets, wink, wink) Or really CLEAN THE STREETS, PICK UP THE TRASH AND BOTTLES, SINCE THAT'S WHAT YOUR CLAIMING TO DO & THAT'S WHAT WE'RE PAYING FOR. BY THE WAY WE HAVE TO CONTINUE MOVING OUR CARS FROM SIDE TO SIDE FOR STREET CLEANING 365 DAYS PER YEAR, EVEN THOUGH THE STREET CLEANERS DO NOT OPERATE 365 DAYS PER YEAR.

3. In the fall the VOP graciously allows everyone to push their piles of leaves in to the street. This practice goes on for 6 weeks! No charge to the homeowners!!! What's the problem with that? Multiple spots on the street are taken up with piles of leaves, once again leaving those of us who are being charged to park on the street less spots.-**Possible solution could not be more simple. Stop allowing people to dump piles of leaves in to the street.**

4. SNOW Those of us who need to and pay to park on the street dutifully move our cars from side to side supposedly to allow the streets to be plowed. Well in reality sometime the streets plowed and sometimes it's not. With the exception of the couple of times when the VOP moved our cars to plow the entire street, it's never completely plowed. What's the problem? Again we lose multiple spots and there is no where to park when we come home.-**Possible solution, do you job! Make sure these streets are completely plowed, so that all of the spots are available. WE PERMIT HOLDERS PAY FOR THESE SPOTS AND THEY SHOULD BE COMPLETELY AND THOROUGHLY PLOWED, SO WE CAN PARK OUR CARS.**

5. **DON'T EVEN** THINK ABOUT HAVING ANY FRIENDS, FAMILY, OR GOD FORBID A SIGNIFICANT OTHER! -

Possible solution-OVERALL PERMIT HOLDERS WHO PAY COLLECTIVELY ARE PAYING THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS TO THE VOP, AND WE ARE GETTING ABSOLUTELY NOTHING FOR THE WHAT WE ARE PAYING! THE VOP NEEDS TO TAKE CARE OF ALL OF IT'S RESIDENTS, NOT JUST THE ONES WITH MONEY! HAVE MORE STREETS THAT ALLOW OVERNIGHT PARKING FOR PERMIT HOLDERS & GUESTS. I UNDERSTAND THE PEOPLE WHO OWN HOMES DON'T WANT CARS ON THEIR STREETS OVERNIGHT, WELL TOO BAD! I'M AN OWNER AND THERE ARE CARS

IN FRONT OF MY HOUSE, I PAY THE SAME PROPERTY TAXES THAT YOU DO. I'VE ALSO HEARD IT'S FOR SAFETY REASONS. OK, WELL HERE'S OUR REALITY WE HAVE PEOPLE LIVING IN HOMES WITHOUT PARKING SPOTS. ALL OF OUR OAK PARK STREETS NEED TO ALLOW RESIDENTS WITH PERMITS PARKING. WE DO NOT HAVE TO BAN OVERNIGHT PARKING FOR RESIDENTS WITH PERMITS, THAT'S RIDICULOUS!

6. This one is not the VOP's problem (with the exception of the snow not being cleared which damages the underside of your vehicle) but just a reality of street parking. My car is a sacrificial car, it has been hit so many times over the years it looks like it's been through a battle.

Here's the thing those of us who pay to park, should be getting some services for the money we pay!!!

I love Oak Park, or I wouldn't lived here for all of these years. I watch, and support as my tax dollars go to new public buildings, and million dollar swimming pools, employee salaries etc., and of course that's important. Generally speaking you get what you pay for in life. Here's the problem for street parking permit holders, we get nothing, absolutely zero services for what we pay quarterly.

I absolutely love and appreciate our hardworking police force and our fire department. We in Oak Park like many communities do not have the luxury of being complacent when it comes to crime. My experiences with the Oak Park Police have been excellent! If they weren't on top of things and did not respond to the crime that's happening we could be in big trouble. Of course the community as a whole has to be invested as well. Mostly I love our community, my neighbors, the diversity.

I have spent time in Oak Park all of my life because my grandpa was a resident most of his life until he died, and I have lived 22 here for years. For 11 years I rented and for the last 11 years and currently as a condo owner. All 22 years I have paid for the privilege of parking on the street. I had accepted that there is a huge disparity when it comes to residential parking if you have money or you don't have money (as is the case with many things in life). Homeowners, condo owners and renters who can afford a place with parking spot(s) would never pay \$500.00 per year to park on the street. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! I received **nothing absolutely zero** about this parking survey. I happened to see one tiny sign on someones lawn and had to call around to find out what this was all about. THAT IS EITHER COMPLETE OVER SITE OR IT WAS DONE INTENTIONALLY TO KEEP A PORTION OF PARKING PERMIT HOLDERS IN THE DARK.

Lastly the survey (which I only found out about on Saturday, quite by accident, I saw nothing in the newsletter, nor did I receive any notification). WOW! The parking problem in Oak Park is so bad, and has been going on for decades and this is the survey? It lumps five of the most contested and debated questions in to one. These are the main questions/issues that need to be addressed, individually, they can not be combined.

Since I just found out about this on Saturday and couldn't confirm until today, I don't thin this e-mail will get to the VOP in time for the discussion. Also I am not going to submit the survey as is because giving one response to 5 very important parking issues is not good. I also can't believe your considering more odd even side of the street options. As if Oak Park's (No Park) multiple parking restrictions are not confusing & complicated enough! I'm going to respond to the survey in this e-mail.

As I have thoroughly explained I've been dealing with the parking problem in Oak Park for 22 years. I would be happy to be a part of a solution. Please feel free to contact me if there is something I can do to help resolve these problems.

I know that both are a problem, but I hope you will GIVE PRIORITY TO THE RESIDENTS PARKING PROBLEMS VS THE COMMERCIAL

Thank you.

Lissa Rausch
247 Washington Blvd., 1B
Oak Park, IL 60302
708-218-0758
Parking Zone Y7

On-Street Parking Rules Survey

By taking this brief survey, you can help the citizen volunteers on the Village of Oak Park Transportation Commission develop recommendations for changes to on-street permit parking zone rules and regulations.

Top of Form

* 1. Please rate how you feel about the following *current* rules and regulations:

- No Parking 8 a.m. to 10 a.m., Monday thru Friday-**THAT'S FINE AS LONG AS PERMIT HOLDERS CAN PARK, IT DISCOURAGES COMMUTERS FROM TAKING OUR PERMIT SPOTS**
- 2-Hour Parking, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday thru Friday-**THAT'S FINE AS LONG AS IT DOESN'T AFFECT PERMIT HOLDERS**
- 3-Hour Parking, 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., Monday thru Friday-**THAT'S FINE AS LONG AS IT DOESN'T AFFECT PERMIT HOLDERS**
- 1-Hour Parking, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.-**THAT'S FINE AS LONG AS IT DOESN'T AFFECT PERMIT HOLDERS**
- Adjust parking location as required for street sweeping-**FIRST LET'S ADDRESS THE REALITY THAT THE "STREET CLEANING" JUST PUSHES THE GARBAGE AROUND. IF THE VOP IS REALLY GOING TO PICK UP THE TRASH THAT'S FINE. JUST MAKE SURE THE RESIDENTS WHO PAY FOR A PERMIT HAVE A PLACE TO MOVE THEIR CAR TO**

() () () () ()

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, how easy is it to understand the *current* regulations?

Very difficult

() () () () ()

* 3. Please rate your impression of the following *proposed* changes, which would apply only to streets with existing regulations:

- No Parking 8 to 10 a.m., Monday thru Friday in front of odd-numbered addresses (south and west sides of streets)-**EVEN ODD RESTRICTIONS ARE RIDICULOUS ALLOW OR DON'T ALLOW IT, THE EVEN ODD JUST COMPLICATES IT EVEN MORE-AND UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE IT AFFECT RESIDENTS WITH PERMITS**
- No Parking 10 a.m. to Noon, Monday thru Friday in front of even-numbered addresses (north and east sides of streets)-**WOW! AGAIN WHY ON EARTH WOULD YOU WANT TO COMPLICATE AND MAKE PARKING EVEN MORE CONFUSING? ARE YOU HOPING PEOPLE GET CONFUSED SO YOU CAN WRITE MORE TICKETS? ABSOLUTELY UNNECESSARY - DO NOT HAVE IT AFFECT PAYING PERMIT HOLDERS**

- Street sweeping incorporated into odd/even parking schedule-**ABSOLUTELY NOT! WHAT'S THE POINT? KEEP IT SIMPLE NO PARKING ON A PARTICULAR DAY**

4. On a scale of 1 to 5, how easy is it to understand the *proposed* regulations?

Very easy- TO UNDERSTAND ON PAPER BUT GOOD LUCK SORTING OUT ALL OFF THESE RESTRICTIONS IF YOUR TRYING TO PARK ON AN OAK PARK STREET

* 5. What statement best describes your opinion regarding the proposed parking changes:

I want change, but this set of rules will make things worse

* 6. What type of property best characterizes your Oak Park residence?- **CONDO OWNER**

* 7. Do you own or rent your Oak Park residence?-**OWN (FORMER RENTER)**

* 8. How long have your lived in Oak Park?-**22 YEARS**

From: Barry Kamin [mailto:bkamin320@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 2:47 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Parking study

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. I am a property owner with an address of 320 S. Maple Ave., Unit A. This corresponds to parking zone Y3.

The block is designated and has signs limiting parking to 4 hours duration. It is commonplace for those utilizing public transportation to park on the street all day. Enforcement of the hours restriction for a week or two, in my opinion, would free up a significant number of parking spaces. The commuters do not have Y3 stickers on their vehicles.

Respectfully,

Barry Kamin

Sent from Xfinity Mobile App

Barry Kamin

From: Steve Hempel [mailto:steve_hempel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 12:58 PM
To: Youkhana, John
Cc: Monali Shah
Subject: Parking Survey

Mr. Youkhana,

I have found it very difficult to access and understand the recent parking regulation proposals.

Other than a few signs up around our neighborhood, there has been little information made easily available to affected residents. Furthermore, I've typed in the URL exactly as written on the signs in the neighborhood, but have been unable to locate the survey. I finally saw the survey after a neighbor provided a direct link. I'm sure the responses are limited based on how hard it has been to find.

Why is there not a link to the survey on the Oak Park website parking page (<http://www.oak-park.us/village-services/parking-vehicle-services>)? That would be a logical place for people to search. It doesn't even seem to be searchable within the Village of Oak Park website at all.

That said, I did take the survey, but I found that it was not able to accurately capture our thoughts about current and proposed parking regulations. All current and proposed rules were lumped together in the survey and we were only asked if we like the rules as a group or not (and whether the rules were clear). We were not able to comment on individual rules within the group, or suggest alternate options from the proposal. I did not see a portion within the survey that addressed any changes to overnight parking rules. Is that also being considered? If so, what is the process for commenting on that?

Kind Regards,
Stephen Hempel
312 S. Grove Ave.

From: joseph cahill [mailto:j-cahill@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:13 AM
To: Youkhana, John
Subject: Parking in Y2 Zone

Dear Mr. Youkhana,

Thank you for trying to resolve the parking problems/issues in our neighborhood. My concern is that any study may miss some issues that may not be easily observable or quantifiable over a short period of time. Such as the true vehicle population in an area vs available parking spaces. Many households own two cars and many people have a designated parking space. However, that space may not be designed for two cars. Also, many people may have spaces that are tight, and not always accessible (e.g. abutting Harlem Avenue.). This means that when people pull out of their space (in the AM), they may not always want to return to their space until they are parking their car for the night. In other words, even though people have a parking space, more often than not they will park on the street. I have lived in the Zone Y2 area for over 24 years, and have seen the number of cars vs. available spaces becoming more and more of a problem. This is a very densely populated and congested area, and will be even more crowded in the years to come. Perhaps some combination of permits (including daytime) and restrictions would work, like in some neighborhoods in the city of Chicago.

Joe Cahill
217 C South Maple

From: jelmiger@comcast.net [mailto:jelmiger@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 10:55 AM

To: Youkhana, John

Subject: Resident concerns regarding parking restrictions in zones Y2, Y3 and Y4.

Dear Mr. Youkhana

Thank you for the announcement regarding the Transportation Commission's study on parking restrictions in Y2, Y3 and Y4. I am unable to attend the meeting on 9/26/16, but wanted to comment on some of the logistical problems and my concerns regarding the currently issued extended Overnight Parking Permits have caused my block.

My family chose Oak Park and specifically the quiet cul-de-sac block of 500 South Kenilworth 15 years ago. In recent years, the village has begun to granting vehicles permits for extended overnight parking. These vehicles have caused several concerns for myself and the other homeowners on the north end of our block.

Concern 1: Noise, Trash and Unattended vehicles

The past few years, Village regularly has been issuing Overnight Parking Permits to people to overnight park on the 500 S. Kenilworth block. It is my understanding, from speaking to our Resident Beat Officer, there is an option to purchase extended permits for up to 15 days/nights in one spot and because there are no daytime restrictions, many permit holders will leave their vehicles unattended for days, even weeks at a time. In affect our street has become a parking lot. In addition to the unattended long term vehicles, owners of vehicles who do come and go disrespectfully do so loudly and very late at night. Frequently, well past midnight, vehicles with loud radios, loud occupants or loud rattling noises are parked, the owner sets an alarm, which they will beep several times as they walk away, which then triggers the animals at 514 S. Kenilworth to bark unstopped outdoors for an unacceptable amount of time. There are also instances of loud extended conversation, and occasionally profane arguments, take place in front of my home where myself and 3 students are attempting to sleep.

Concern 2: Leaf Removal and Street Cleaning

For the past several years, we have rarely had our leaves picked up because a vehicle will park or in a way that obstructs the "Leaf Plow" at the end of the cup-de-sac or directly on top of the leaves we have put for collection. Year after year, we miss the last leaf collection because of unattended parked cars and are unable to clean up the rotting mess in the street before it snows, leaving an unsightly, unsanitary, and frankly, unacceptable mess in the street. Trash is repeatedly found in my yard or the street because the street cleaner also cannot maneuver properly with unattended vehicles blocking their route.

Problem 3: Snow Removal

Much like the situation with leaf removal and street cleaners, we experience difficulties with proper snow removal. After a snowfall, we are frequently left with an unplowed icy street, which is unsafe and incredibly frustrating, due to the unattended vehicles. The north end of the 500 block of S. Kenilworth is rarely cleared properly leaving the thoroughfare unsafe. I have shoveled the street in front of my residence before just to clear some snow for safer passage.

Problem 4: Blocked Thoroughfare

You may be aware of some issues at 514 S. Kenilworth. It is frequented by troubled, transient, young adults. 911 routinely dispatches police and ambulances to this residence. Often when emergency vehicles are present there is an abundance of long-term parkers making the thoroughfare unpassable. Homeowners who have parked at their residence at the north end of the block are trapped between the cul-de-sac and the emergency vehicles, making it impossible to leave for an appointment or work. This is especially frustrating when I need to pick up a child from an after school event at night. If there were fewer unattended vehicles on the street, this could help alleviate this problem.

Please take these concerns into consideration when analyzing the impact of a parking change to this area. Please, keep us in mind when making policy changes. Ideally, we would like to see Parking & Vehicle Services stop issuing overnight parking permits to people who don't live on our block, because of these associated logistical and safety concerns.

We have enjoyed our first 15 years in Oak Park and hope to continue to do so. Please feel free to call or email me if you have questions, or need further information.

Best Regards,

Julie Elmiger
511 S. Kenilworth Ave.
708-660-9985

From: Kathy Halfpenny [<mailto:tkuppence@comcast.net>]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 9:55 AM
To: Parking Services
Subject: Parking opinion

I understand that there will be a meeting tonight about changing the parking regulations which will affect the 300 block of South Grove Avenue allowing overnight parking on opposite sides of the street. I wish to express my opinion that the regulations in effect right now should remain. We already have a glut of parkers who must have permits who live in the apartments on Washington and park on Grove. As it is, there is, more often than not, no parking for my visitors or family on my block. Allowing more cars to park here would be a disaster.

Thank you.

Kathleen Halfpenny
332 S. Grove
Oak Park, IL 60302

From: Luke Casson [mailto:lcasson@icloud.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 8:19 AM
To: Youkhana, John
Cc: steve_hempel@yahoo.com; Cason Amie
Subject: Grove Ave parking

Mr. Youkhana

Regarding the proposed parking regulations, we could not be any more against this proposal. First, the village committed to keeping the overnight ban in the wake of the parking variances permitted for the Comcast building. Second, removing the ban is flawed for the same reasons it was prior to the granting of the variances--it improves safety in the neighborhood, allows our block to enjoy block parties and outdoor gatherings, and reduces congestion caused by brooks during performances and parents nights. We already live on a street where drivers speed and endanger all of us. It is a constant worry that one of our neighborhood children is struck by a car.

The proposed regulation changes are bad policy, bad for the community and bad for our kids.

Luke Casson
315 S. Grove

Luke A. Casson

From: terrymueller@creativechangesoakpark.com [mailto:terrymueller@creativechangesoakpark.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2016 12:29 PM
To: Youkhana, John; Velan, Jill
Cc: Glenn Brewer
Subject: Proposed Parking Changes

I spoke with Village Board Member Glenn Brewer at the Farmer's Market yesterday and he suggested that I contact you with my feedback.

I own a home in the 800 block of Carpenter Avenue, which is a very narrow street. A lot of commuters park on our block, and this has posed a problem for years. During the winter months, it has been such a problem that emergency vehicles and garbage trucks have not been able to drive down our block. We've had to call the Village and have someone come out to clear the street for safety reasons.

I submitted a petition to restrict commuter parking several years ago to No Parking 8-10 am, except by permit and received the support of over 85% of the neighbors. This would have alleviated the commuter parking issues and allowed residents the freedom to park as needed.

The petition was approved by the Parking Commission and sent to the Village Board. However, because one apartment owner on the street had ties to the Board, the petition was voted down. I lost faith in the Village after that.

The problem continues, but the new proposed regulations would not resolve the problems and only make things worse, in my opinion. Restricting parking midday would pose a real inconvenience to those who live on that particular side of the street. I find the new proposals to be confusing, east, west, odd, even, 8-10, 10-12 ... WAY too many details.

Fortunately, our block has no current restrictions and would not be affected. I feel, however, for those in the next block where parking is restricted from 8-10, Monday-Friday. I would be very upset if I could not park in front of my home between 10-12 ... a time when I may often return from errands and may need to unload my car.

There's got to be a better way. I sincerely believe that no parking 8-10 am, except by permit is a very viable solution, which would honor residents' needs and restrict commuter parking.

Unfortunately, I will be working during your meeting on September 26, or I would attend in person. I'm hoping that my husband will be able to get to the meeting (sometimes he also works late).

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like additional feedback.

Sincerely,

Terry Mueller, CLP, LMT

A number of residents called and emailed with concerns regarding the survey, existing parking regulations, proposed restrictions, and other overall parking concerns. Of the emails the following issues and concerns were received and the number of times they were brought up is as follows.

do not want to see changes made	2
safety concerns with overnight parking	1
want more freedom in the survey	2
want to address visitor parking	2
want more overnight parking spaces	2
want parking line markings	2
existing overnight parking concerns	5
leaf removal concerns	5
street cleaning concerns	5
snow removal concerns	6
unable to maneuver around parked cars	3
restrictions shouldn't apply to permit holders	3
proposed time frames don't work	1
no restrictions at all	2
add more restrictions	3
enforce more	3
want to see 1 side parking only	4