

# MINUTES

---

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Capital Improvements                      DATE: February 12, 2013  
MEETING: Regular   X                        Special \_\_\_\_\_                      CALLED TO ORDER: 7:40 PM  
QUORUM: Yes                        X                        No                      \_\_\_\_\_                      ADJOURNED: 11:55 PM

## MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Chairman Colliander, Commissioners Brugh, Burton, Lane, Lindquist, Pryde and Thelen

ABSENT: Commissioners O'Carroll and Ryne

OTHERS: Trustee Liaison Hartweg, Public Works Director Julius Hansen, Professional Engineer Bob Minix, Police Chief Phil Norton

AUDIENCE: Residents providing input on the Lenox-Linden Improvements Project.

## **CALL TO ORDER:**

The February 12, 2013 meeting of the Capital Improvements Commission was called to order at 7:40 PM by Chairman Colliander. A quorum was present.

## **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

No comments were offered on topics not pertaining to the Lenox-Linden Project.

## **CONSIDERATION OF PARKING, STREET WIDTH AND SIDEWALK DESIGN ISSUES – REHABILITATION OF LENOX ROAD BETWEEN HAWTHORNE AND OAK:**

### **VILLAGE STAFF REPORT**

P.E. Minix presented the Village Staff Report. He started by noting that if a recommendation is made by the Commission, the next step will be for the Board of Trustees to consider the recommendation, usually within a month or so but dependent on the Board's future meeting load and availability. Although there is a draft revised street rehabilitation program, the 2013 plan has not changed. It includes 10 streets and an alley organized into three projects, of which the Lenox-Linden Improvements Project is one. On Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak, the entire roadway will be removed and replaced, with less extensive rehabilitation proposed on Linden. The extensive Lenox work provides the opportunity to review how the road is used. The existing 25 foot roadway footprint is narrow to currently accommodate parking on the east side and two lanes of traffic. There is no sidewalk on the east side currently.

---

Stakeholder input has been ongoing throughout the process since September. The Park District has presented to the Commission on two occasions. Based on that input, the project engineer prepared some concepts for parking and sidewalk configuration.

The first configuration option calls for parallel parking and widening the road on the Lake Ellyn Park side by three feet. This provides an 8 foot wide parking lane and two 9 foot wide driving lanes. This plan also shows a sidewalk meandering in and out of the ROW into the park to enhance access to the park from the parking area. The second and third options include angle parking, one with 60 degree angle and one with 45 degree angle spaces on the east side. There would not be a continuous row of parking, but would be in pods or bays working around trees. The goals are not to increase parking but to provide more accessible parking. The 45 degree option would provide easier access in-and-out backing into only one lane of traffic. The angle options would require going about 16 feet into the park. A mix of parallel and angle parking could be recommended. In response to audience comments, P.E. Minix said that there are advantages and disadvantages to both parallel and angle parking. Based on input from a consulting professional forester, angle parking would likely have a greater impact on trees in the park than parallel parking. It was noted that tree protection measures would be employed and any trees removed would be replaced.

The staff comments on parking configuration and width were summarized and included: (1) ease of use can be improved by widening the driving lanes, with a narrower road at non-parking locations; (2) a 21 foot back-to-back of curb roadway between Essex and Oak would allow for an adjacent sidewalk against the curb, but could result in increased problems when vehicles are parked on either side of the street; (3) there are safety trade-offs with both styles of parking; (4) previously gathered data shows that changing the road geometry will likely not result in increased speed or numbers of vehicles; (5) the input into the Park District Plan that contains various recommendations for Lenox Road was district-wide; (6) the project provides an opportunity to use pervious pavers and pavement, with angle parking options more likely candidates. In response to audience comments, P.E. Minix said that the cost of angle parking would be between \$130,000 and \$160,000, and widening the roadway approximately \$40,000 in a project with an estimated cost of \$1.9 million. Staff does not recommend lighting or burying utilities in conjunction with this project. The final staff recommendations for Lenox are for roadway improvements that improve two-way traffic flow; a sidewalk on the east side of Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak and to adhere as closely as possible to the Park District recommendations where practicable and appropriate.

#### AUDIENCE COMMENTS AND INPUT

Chairman Colliander started this portion of the meeting by noting that the Commission is reviewing all the streets in the Village based on use for multiple decades. On any particular street, there will be conversations with or regarding the Park District, schools, public services, children's safety, etc. to see what is best for the Village on that street. The Commission only makes recommendations to the Village Board. The Board actually makes the decisions. Several

residents commented that an additional sidewalk on the east side of Lenox is not needed as pedestrians can cross over to and walk on the sidewalk on the west side of the street.

Resident Bob French of 692 Lenox asked how far down the road construction will cut and how it will affect tree root zones. P.E. Minix said that a new water main and some new storm sewer would be constructed. The storm sewer is 4-6 feet down and the water main approximately 5-6 feet. It is possible that there are tree roots in the roadway now. Generally a root pruning is done. Sanitary sewer problems will be fixed as they are found, with a lining project done after the roadway project is complete. He noted that there are system-wide problems with the sanitary sewer during severe storms.

Resident Rich Murphy of 658 Essex commented that residents agree that Lenox needs to be fixed and has terrible drainage. He said, however, that there has not been a need demonstrated for adding angle parking and a sidewalk between Linden and Essex that justifies the cost. Speed and safety have not been a problem in the past.

A resident suggested stop signs at Lenox and Linden. Police Chief Norton noted that stop signs often create accidents by interrupting the flow of traffic. Cars must yield to cross traffic at a "T" intersection now as a matter of law. In response to resident questions, Chief Norton said that there have been no traffic fatalities, nor a recollection of a serious accident on Lenox, although he noted that there are accidents on every street.

Residents Reis Kayser of 721 Lenox, Donna Jennings of 725 Lenox, Tim McKeown of 644 Essex and Christa Manion of 715 Lenox spoke against narrowing the Lenox roadway north of Essex to accommodate a sidewalk. They noted that it is already difficult to back out of driveways because of the existing relatively narrow roadway. Also, residents have heavily landscaped and installed pavers near the edge of the current roadway.

Resident Carolyn Oesterle of 645 Lake Road made a short presentation to the Commission. She noted the desire to have the park safe for children. Her research did not uncover complaints to the Village or the Park District about the current parking configuration. She observed road widths around the Village, and opined that it is good to be narrow and slow. She also provided her calculations on lost "usable open space" if an additional sidewalk is constructed along with creating parking bays.

Several residents said that they want a traffic engineer to give an opinion about the safety of the road improvements. They have not yet engaged a consultant. In responding to questions, P.E. Minix expressed doubt over the value of a traffic engineering report, noting that the consensus is that, while parallel parking may be safer, there are other considerations and tradeoffs. A traffic engineer likely will not categorically state which parking option is safer over the others.

Gary Mayo of 831 Glencoe noted he was at the meeting as a resident, not as a member of the Park District Board. He said that the consensus was that something needed to be done. There are safety and parking issues. Lenox is too narrow with parked cars and too wide without them, creating the worst of both worlds. The parallel parking option results in some lost trees. That is why the angle parking option is being considered. There is a rationale behind the proposed option, and acknowledged that it can be changed.

Dave Harris, Executive Director of the Park District, said that the District's questionnaire was not designed to be scientific, and that it went to the immediate neighborhood and stakeholders such as the Lion's Club as opposed to the entire Village population. Complaints heard by staff give the sense that accessibility and parking are not sufficient.

Audience members questioned among themselves the need for any change and some expressed opposition to all options.

Resident James Baumbich of 689 Lake Road noted that Lake has new pavement and curb, but that the high school kids drive terribly and making them slow down is a good thing.

A letter authored by Joseph Oberfranc of 654 Geneva was provided to the Commission. The letter comments on various aspects of the Park District recommendations for Lenox Road.

#### CIC DELIBERATIONS

The Commissioners introduced themselves to the audience. Chairman Colliander explained to the audience that the Commissioners start with baseline criteria when considering road reconstruction and weigh several factors: safety, financial constraints, green issues, snow plows and fire trucks to name a few, along with resident concerns as it is always "someone's" street.

The Commissioners gave overviews of their starting thoughts. Chairman Colliander thought the sidewalk through the park would be used. He was glad that angle parking was considered, but it would cause plowing issues. Previous pavement throughout would not be workable. Between Essex and Oak, it may not be a good thing to choke the roadway down to 17 feet by adding a sidewalk.

Commissioner Burton parked on Lenox to observe the morning traffic. It felt very close and too narrow. Pedestrians were walking in the street as opposed to on the west side of Lenox. He was leaning toward widening the street and parallel parking with a sidewalk.

Commissioner Thelen said that the road needs to be wider, but is concerned about the speed when there are not cars parallel parked to narrow the road. After consideration, he determined the angle parking is not appropriate and is of limited benefit as no additional spaces would be created. He can see a sidewalk on the east side of Lenox, but only between Linden and Essex.

Commissioner Lindquist favored parallel parking and thought that putting islands between parallel parking spaces would be a good idea. He was also in favor of a sidewalk, but not between Essex and Oak, and noted that the new sidewalk on Hawthorne is being used. He was in favor of a traffic table at Linden, but not pervious pavers in the parking lane.

Commissioner Pryde noted that it is the Commission's job to look at options. He is not in favor of angle parking, but that a slight increase in road width would make a major improvement. A meandering sidewalk would be better than a straight design, and would avoid having to remove trees. Upgraded sidewalk materials should be paid for by the Park District. He understands residents' concerns about a sidewalk from Essex to Oak and is undecided.

Commissioner Brugh expressed support for a sidewalk from Hawthorne to Oak, noting that it needs to connect on both ends. His comment expressing support for pervious pavers in the parallel parking lane and the Linden crossing generated a discussion among the Commissioners concerning pavers and stamped paving. The consultants in attendance reviewed the difference in pervious pavement and pavers and how each system works. Although the capital cost is higher, some systems are expected to last 50 years, and they are easy to repair. The Park District has recommended pervious pavers for any sidewalk as they have less impact on trees.

Commissioner Lane expressed dislike for diagonal parking, noting that clearly the residents are not in favor of it. He does not like the fact that there is currently no sidewalk on the east side of Lenox through the park; between Essex to Oak he is somewhere between ambivalent and a "No". He likes the paver idea at Linden, but not the raised crosswalk/speed table. The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of speed tables.

Melissa Creech, the Park District President, said that the District's research shows that connectivity is very important to residents. An even surface is needed for ADA accessibility. A sidewalk on the east side would be very helpful, and the District staff would keep it clear in winter. She asked that the Commission consider strategic bump outs north of Linden to protect the oaks if the road is widened. She suggested having the pavers be an alternative bid for the entire street pavement to ascertain how much more they will cost. Commissioners discussed options of bump outs or not widening the road north of Linden, a table crosswalk at Linden if there are two different road widths, and various treatments for a possible speed table at Linden.

P.E. Minix suggested deferring construction until 2014. Once the basic street footprint is established, there are other factors, particularly interaction with the Park District that will be ongoing. The Lenox-Linden project could be combined with nearby work planned for 2014 on Elm and Chidester between Lenox and Riford into one larger construction contract. It is also possible that the Board of Trustees will not consider the roadway footprint until the new Board is seated in May, which would allow little time for all the details to be settled in order for Lenox and Linden to be rebuilt in 2013.

Chairman Colliander expressed desire for a consensus at this meeting so the Commission can move forward. The following four recommendations regarding the reconstruction of Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak were moved, seconded and unanimously approved by the Commissioners:

1. **From Hawthorne to Linden, the width of the roadway be 28 feet, back-of-curb to back-of-curb with parallel parking and using an asphalt paving surface;**
2. **At the intersection with Linden, do not raise the pavement surface, but provide an alternate bid item for modular pavers in lieu of an asphalt paving surface;**
3. **From Linden to Essex, the width of the roadway be 28 feet, back-of-curb to back-of-curb, with width adjustments at existing tree locations conforming to professional arborist recommendations, and parallel parking using an asphalt paving surface;**
4. **Between Essex and Oak, no change in roadway width and no new sidewalk installed on the east side of the roadway.**

An additional recommendation regarding project timing was approved unanimously, as follows:

**The Lenox-Linden Improvements Project should be postponed to the 2014 construction season.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Commissioner Burton moved to approve the January 8, 2013 regular meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Pryde. The Motion carried unanimously.

**TRUSTEE'S REPORT:**

There was no Trustee report.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairman Colliander moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Burton, and was carried unanimously. The February 12, 2013 meeting was adjourned at 11:55 PM.

Submitted by Karen Blake, Recording Secretary  
Reviewed by R. Minix, Village of Glen Ellyn Public Works