

Village of Lombard

*Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 3, 2009

7:00 PM

Village Hall Community Room

Transportation & Safety Committee

Trustee Dick Tross-Chairperson

Trustee Zachary Wilson-Co-Chairperson

John Schwarz, Nancy Sherretz, Jean Nolan, Robert Difino, Bob Corbino and Ken Snead

Staff Liaisons: Deputy Chief Dane Cuny - Police and Frank Kalisik and John Johnson - Public Works

1.0 Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tross at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Trustee Richard J. Tross, John Schwarz, Robert Difino, Nancy Sherretz, Jean Nolan, Ken Snead and Bob Corbino

2.0 Public Participation

*Rosa Behrendt, 120 W. Washington Blvd.
Paul Behrendt, 120 W. Washington Blvd.
Bijal Patel, 602 Aspen Dr.
Padma Patel, 602 Aspen Dr.
Don Porretto, 222 W. Washington Blvd.
Janet Stuckey, 465 S. Park Rd.
Gene Anderson, 227 W. Washington Blvd.
Kyle Leiner, 2 Lincoln Ct.*

3.0 Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Corbino, seconded by Difino, to approve the Minutes of the June 1, 2009 meeting. The motion carried by a voice vote

4.0 Unfinished Business

090425

Washington Blvd. West of Main Street, One-Way Reversal

A Staff recommendation to reverse the one-way direction to reduce vehicular line of sight issues and implementation of a right turn only onto Main Street. (DISTRICT #2)

Kalisik reviewed the item. Because of recent improvements, the east bound traffic has a visual line of sight issue. Cars have to creep up extensively to see. Staff is recommending to reverse the one-way to mitigate the issue.

Ms. Stuckey stated that it was her understanding that the Zoning Board denied the variance for the fence.

Chairperson Tross explained to the residents what the variance issue is. Because the cemetery was abandoned, the Village interceded and chose to improve it so it will be something everyone can be proud of. The Village spent the money for the fence and other items, however, the Village does not own the cemetery, it is still abandoned, so technically it is under the jurisdiction of DuPage County. When the Village installed the fence the grandfather for the sight distance was no longer in effect. In replacing the fence, it means the Village has to bring it up to code and the code allows for no obstruction within a 20' triangle of a corner. The issue is not the fence, it's the brick pillar. The Village applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. They denied it. saying that you could have put in an iron post, not a brick pillar. The Village board will take action on that recommendation on August 20th.

Ms. Stuckey commented that she thinks the posts should be changed.

Mr. Porretto said that the Village did a marvelous job and he applauds them for respecting those who have passed away. He also thinks the fence is greatly improved. He went on to say that he has complained before about the line of sight being blocked by vegetation. He almost hit a cyclist. It's a very dangerous intersection. He thinks the selection of the contractor that installed the light post and Village review may have been subpar. It's the lamp post that is the issue. However, he has no issue with reversing the flow of traffic, but would not like to be inconvenienced by a right turn only.

Mr. Behrendt stated that before the improvements at the cemetery a big wooden pole that was put in caused a problem seeing south bound traffic. Then the street light was installed which made it worse. He agrees that the improvement was well worth the effort. He further said that because of the pole and street light being in the way, he did not think there would be any improvement by doing anything to the pillars. He also does not mind reversing the flow of traffic, but he doesn't not like no left turn.

Mr. Anderson said he had the same opinion as Mr. Behrendt and Mr. Porretto.

Ms. Behrendt felt that it would be a moot point to flip the traffic. Chairperson Tross pointed out that it depends upon the driver. You will still have to inch out to see south bound traffic, but you can see it. Coming out on the south end you have to get too far out to see it.

Mr. Porretto also pointed out that when entering from the south, the Village should install No Parking for about three car lengths back. Also, because people are creatures of habit, maybe for a period of time there could be flashing lights.

Mr. Behrendt said he had the same problem with bicyclists. Whatever trees are along the front edge of the cemetery should be trimmed up so the bikes can see traffic.

Kalisik relayed comments from Ms. Marge Leiner at 2 Lincoln Ct. She feels that alternating traffic would be okay, but does not want a right turn only. She also had a concern about parked vehicles.

Kalisik relayed comments from Ms. Potus at 503 S Main. Her concern is there have been no problems, so she is not in favor of alternating traffic. She said currently for her to go south bound on Main, she backs out and goes north bound to Washington and makes a U-ey, if traffic flow is alternated she won't be able to do that.

Mr. Leiner said short of moving the street light, reversing direction is not going to solve the problem unless south bound is the only option of turning onto Main St. He is in favor of south bound turn without reversing the flow.

A resident asked why the pole couldn't be moved. Chairperson Tross explained that to move a ComEd pole it would cost in excess of \$7,000.

Corbino summarized the issue, at the southeast corner, before poles were installed or vegetation, line of sight was okay. Now the fence and pole are an issue, also the rise in elevation makes it difficult. Sometimes you'll get two cars squeezed in there trying to go south bound and north bound, but north bound can't go until south bound goes. A reversal would probably be beneficial. The elevation on the north side doesn't appear to be as hazardous as it is on the south side. Unless there are requirements for the left turn, perhaps the committee could modify the recommendation.

Chairperson Tross asked how many accidents there have been. Kalisik responded that there have been no accidents.

Sherretz commented that she thinks the reversal is a good thing, however, no left turn causes issues everywhere and she is not a proponent of installing that. Initially there does need to be additional signage to warn people of the change. Johnson answered that staff will put in flashers for 30 days.

Snead added that he thought the change of direction is a good idea. East bound traffic on the north side is probably an improvement. Seeing as there have not been any accidents to this point, he would be in favor of keeping left and right hand turn.

Nolan agreed, but reiterated that the trees need to be cut back so that people can see.

Difino is in favor of reversing the traffic flow with no restriction on turning.

Schwarz commented that he heard it's dangerous, but there are no accidents to support that. He understands how the problem has developed, and questioned if anyone has thought about all traffic west bound.

Snead suggested the Village put up an electronic message board notifying of the traffic change

It was moved by Corbino, seconded by Snead, of the one-way reversal, not to impose a no left turn and to grant the Village a variance. The motion carried by a voice vote

090426

Oak Creek Drive, No Parking

Staff request to establish a No Parking zone to reduce a vehicular line of sight issue. (DISTRICT #3)

Kalisik reviewed the item.

Bijal Patel explained that she drives this way everyday, and there is a problem with people speeding. The whole area has a lot of speeders. You have to be a defensive driver when you come through here. They start parking around 7:30 a.m. and are there until 5-5:30 p.m. She further said that she finds it hard to believe two fire trucks could get through there. At the least, the Village needs to post slow down signs.

Sherretz said that she went through here and there was a car parked on Springer less than a car length from the stop sign and cars parked the wrong direction on Oak Creek.

Chairperson Tross added that he received a call from 1020 Shedron Way that it is absolutely a treacherous area.

Snead stated that he does not think that the Village should penalize them because they're business is doing good. He can't see prohibiting parking on the side with the sidewalk, then you'll have people crossing the street, isn't that more dangerous. He could see having No Parking around driveways and intersections and striping for parking. These cars have to park somewhere, they need to get to work. Bijal asked if the requirement could be made that the business should provide parking for their employees. Chairperson Tross explained that the technical use changed. Sherretz added that reducing the speed limit does not make people drive slower.

Nolan commented that she thinks the way it's proposed is a good idea, if we flip-flopped which side of the street it would probably be better for the business. One side No Parking would be safer so cars can go around and No Parking around driveways and intersections. Chairperson Tross pointed out that it's better to have the No Parking on the outside of the circle.

It was moved by Corbino, seconded by Nolan, of the modified no parking on the "outside" of the curve as diagramed by Kalisik at the meeting. The motion carried by a voice vote

090427**N. Chase Avenue, Parking Issue**

A resident request to remove No Parking restrictions. (DISTRICT #4)

Kalisik reviewed the item.

Nolan suggested that they be allowed to park next to the business, but keep the rest of it no parking so they don't park on both sides of the street. Johnson pointed out that the streets to the east have only limited no parking. The idea behind the recommendation was to open up the parking to the residents to clear up some of the neighborhood issues. General discussion ensued regarding the business's parking arrangements. Sherretz asked if residents are unhappy about the No Parking on one side. Johnson explained that one person is because his neighbor across the street parks in front of his house. Snead commented that he thought we were moving away from parking on both sides of street.

It was moved by Snead, seconded by Sherretz, of modifying the No Parking restriction on the east side of the street for the length of the business at 730 E. St. Charles Road. The motion carried by a voice vote

090428**St. Charles Rd. East of Garfield, Additional Parking**

A request from a business owner for additional parking spaces. (DISTRICT #4)

Kalisik reviewed the item. Difino commented that we could add some parking, but this is an angled intersection and he would suggest striping it back 50' rather than 30'. Chairperson Tross added that he did not know what the purpose is of providing parking in front of a parking lot.

It was moved by Sherretz, seconded by Corbino, to allow on-street parking on the north side of the 100 block of E. St. Charles Road. The motion carried by a voice vote

090429**Downtown Parking**

A request from a business owner to extend the 2-hour parking restriction to 3-hour parking. (DISTRICT #1)

Kalisik reviewed the item. Chairperson Tross said it would be addressed under New Business.

5.0 New Business

Due to the Labor Day holiday, the next meeting will be Monday, September 14th.

Chairperson Tross informed the Committee that the Board of Trustees has had discussions relative to committee structures. The structure has been changed from six members to eight members with a chairperson and an alternate chairperson. He will ask the Board to reappoint all of the current members for another two year term. There will be two new members. An issue also came up with regard to youth members to each committee. Corbino commented that the committee should have input as to who the youth member is. Chairperson Tross added that he believes the committee should have

the option to say no. Nolan pointed out that these meetings are open to the public, if a young person is interested, they are welcome to come.

Chairperson Tross also informed the committee that he intends to ask the Village President to change the Circulator Committee to a sub-committee of Transportation & Safety. This committee is already responsible for the taxi program, so it makes sense.

Chairperson Tross addressed the downtown parking issue. He would like to appoint a separate sub-committee to address downtown commuter parking, downtown shopper parking and parking along the railroad. They could then present it to Transportation & Safety as a whole package.

6.0 Other Business

7.0 Information Only

8.0 Adjournment

It was moved by Nolan, seconded by Difino, to adjourn at 8:37 p.m. The motion carried by a voice vote