

Legislation Text

File #: 18-099D, Version: 1

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

ACTION REQUESTED:

Select a funding level for City participation regarding a replacement fence along the north side of 95th Street

DEPARTMENT: Transportation, Engineering and Development

SUBMITTED BY: William J. Novack, Director of TED/City Engineer

BOARD/COMMISSION REVIEW:

N/A

BACKGROUND:

Resident Doreen Swindall presented the City Council with a proposal for a ten-foot-high wooden fence for the six residents on the north side of 95th Street from west of the Springbrook Tributary No. 2 Creek to Gateshead Drive. The cost of the proposal she obtained was \$52,260. At the May 16, 2018 City Council meeting a straw poll was taken regarding City cost participation at any level. The majority of the members of the City Council supported some level of cost participation. The purpose of this agenda item is to determine the level of City cost participation.

DISCUSSION:

Option 1: Three Way Cost Split Between the City, Will County and the Residents

Will County has been a good partner on this project, and has even been involved in the meetings with the residents requesting the noise wall and fence at this location. This option would be an even split between the three parties. As of this time, Will County still has not committed to being a funding partner on this fence replacement, so any support of this option will be contingent on Will County concurrence of being a financial partner.

Option 2: Even Cost Split Between the City and the Residents

The City installed an eight-foot-high fence when the road was widened from two to four lanes in 1995. The benefitting residents have always had to maintain/replace the fences the City put in. To provide some equity between the 95th Street residents and other residents who must maintain their fences at their sole cost, an even cost split between the City and the residents is proposed.

Option 3: Full City Participation

This is the option that was presented by Mrs. Swindall at previous City Council meetings. The full cost of replacing the fence would be paid for by the City, with no other agency or resident participation.

Factors to consider when choosing a participation level

The City has already financially participated in trying to improve this area for the residents by reimbursing them for heavy landscaping improvement they installed last year. The City reimbursed Mrs. Swindall \$4,367.45 and her neighbor \$2,350. Again, this was done entirely by the City with no resident financial contribution.

This is essentially a fence replacement request. The existing fence is eight feet high, and the replacement will be ten feet high. For those of you who have been out in the back yards, this additional height will not have any appreciable impact; it is simply replacing a 23-year old fence with a new one. In all other instances when the City has provided fences for residents, we have always made the residents maintain and replace the fences when necessary; the City has never paid for a replacement or repair to a fence. To provide some level of equity citywide, staff recommends some level of resident participation.

As a final note, the City was provided a copy of the response from the US Department of Transportation (US DOT) to the resident's letter complaining about the noise study terminating at Plainfield Naperville Road. The US DOT stated that the limits of the study performed were proper and consistent with their practice and policy. The study limits were correct in not extending west of Plainfield Naperville Road and the limits were not influenced by property values as stated by the residents.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Depending upon which option is selected the fiscal impact to the City ranges from \$17,420 to \$52,260.