

Parking Pilot Program Comments

Nov. 10 – Dec. 8, 2017

Parking in Oak Park

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

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

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

Parking

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

I agree with all your proposals

Parking Pilot Program

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

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

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

snow and street cleaning restrictions (and enforce the restrictions with tickets/towing) 3. 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.

Yes!

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

Excellent Idea Mr. Jung!

Overnight parking ban is ridiculous in this day and age

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

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

Residential Permit Pass

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

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

2 hour limit for residents

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

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

Parking Pilot Program

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

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

Suggestions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What a real shame...

Shame on you, Village of Oak Park!!

Parking Pilot Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Y4 parking

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Parking Pilot program

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

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

Questions

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

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

Look to other communities too

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

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

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

I hope that Oak Park's leadership won't make overnight parking more complicated than it 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). On the surface it would seem that such a plan would diminish available spaces by at least half.

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

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

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

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

Parking on Pleasant

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

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

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

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

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

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

Parking Pilot

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

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

Parking

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

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

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

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

Parking zones

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

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

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

Pilot program not a solution

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The pilot sounds worse

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

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

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

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

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

Pilot doesn't seem to solve anything

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

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

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

2 Hour Parking Restrictions

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

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

K.I.S.S.

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

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

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

Here's a thought....

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

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

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

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

Another One Bites the Dust

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

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

Do the proposers of the two new parking ideas actually park their cars in Oak Park on the street? Both ideas sound awful and very 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

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

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

Big picture and bottom line

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

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

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

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

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

Leave the parking rules alone

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

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

Absurd parking rules and regulations bordering insanity

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

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

Parking

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

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

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

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

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

Feedback on Recommendations for Parking Pilot Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

An alternate proposal

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

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

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

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

Here are the details of the plan that I proposed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overnight Parking

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

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

The suspense is killing me....

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

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

Overnight parking

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

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

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

Parking

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

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

Parking Pilot and Easing

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

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

Proposed changes

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

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