

October 1, 2007

Sidewalk Committee Meeting

On the issue of sidewalks where none exist:

It was decided at tonight's meeting that the committee has taken this issue as far as it can go and they are ready to turn their findings over to the village board. The following is what has been agreed upon and is being sent to those who were absent from tonight's meeting for consent or for issues that might have been overlooked. Please, read the following carefully and respond as soon as possible.

General thoughts:

We looked at expected traffic on the street and the sites where sidewalks would have to be placed to determine whether sidewalks were feasible or advisable. There were streets where there was room, but due to low foot traffic, we didn't feel it was worth mandating sidewalks. We also looked at continuity of sidewalks. Although a street might have had room for sidewalks, we advised against it if they couldn't be connected to sidewalks on the closest main street.

Sidewalks are not feasible for the entire streets:

- ▶ Bridge Street - not fair to exclude all other streets on west side of Main and expect sidewalks on Bridge. Not enough traffic.
- ▶ Silk Street - problems with no frontage, steep banks farther down the road, trees, telephone poles and hydrants. Can't be continuous.
- ▶ Rewey Ave. - Thoughts of maybe to railroad tracks, but to what purpose. People do not walk down there. Dead End. Ladder Factory. Can't be continuous.
- ▶ Mill Street - Street too narrow, problems with frontage, dead end, poles and hydrants in the way, trees too.
- ▶ Clinton Street - Dead end, no one walks down there, Ladder Factory, frontage, poles and hydrants. Can't be continuous.
- ▶ Smullen Ave. - Ditches, steep hill, no one walks up it.
- ▶ Cook Street - Off Smullen, so point is moot. If we are not putting sidewalks on Smullen, no sidewalks needed on Cook.
- ▶ East Whig Street - Too narrow, no frontage, poles, trees and hydrants a problem.
- ▶ Lawrence Street - Too out of the way of the mainstream. Sidewalks can't be continuous on Elm due to ditches, so no continuity to Lawrence.
- ▶ Wards Lane - Dead end off a little traveled street. Frontage a problem along with poles, hydrants and trees.
- ▶ Dimmock Street - no need. Too open, not really looked at as a street.

The committee feels that if there are existing sidewalks on any of these streets that need repair, they should have the option of tearing them out and growing grass in its place.

Sidewalks on part of the street:

- ▶ Rock Street - sidewalks not feasible from St. John's and up on North side as there is no frontage, trees and poles in the way.. Feasible on South side from Main to curve, no further for same reason.
- ▶ Elm Street - sidewalks should run on both sides from Spring Street to Franklin

Avenue on both sides of street. They would stop on west side at end of #58 to line with Franklin because then you run in to ditches and frontage problems. No continuity. East side - no frontage, then you run into the field that the school owns, which would have to be built up for any sidewalk access, but with no frontage prior, there would be no continuity, so point is moot.

- ▶ Franklin Street - South side feasible because sidewalks exist all the way up. North side is not feasible or advisable - too many obstacles and many do not have existing sidewalks.
- ▶ Central Ave. - Feasible on west side where sidewalks exist. Do not recommend on east side as there would be no continuity with huge church parking lot.
- ▶ Marble Street - Sidewalks should run on east side to curve at Spring. West side not feasible as there is no place to put them and there is a steep bank.
- ▶ Spring Street - Sidewalks should run on north side to Elm St. Not feasible or advisable from Elm to John St as there is a problem with frontage and space for sidewalks. Too many trees would have to be removed, poles and hydrants in the way.
- ▶ John Street - Recommend sidewalks stay as they exist now. No sidewalks needed on east side - again trees would have to be removed, problem with frontage, poles and hydrants..
- ▶ Corner of Maple and John St. - Sidewalks should continue around curve on north side of Maple to connect to west side of John for the sake of continuity.
- ▶ Brook St - not feasible on south side of street from Main due to the creek and creek walls that run the length of it.
- ▶ Park Street - advisable on south and east sides. Not advisable on west side along village green due to landscaping and lack of space.

Sidewalks on both sides of street:

- ▶ Main Street - sidewalks should run entire length of street on both sides to town line on south end and to Fortunato's on north end leaving sidewalk where it is across from Fortunato's. High traffic area.
- ▶ Whig Street - Sidewalks should run entire length to town line on both sides of street. High traffic area.
- ▶ Maple Street - both sides entire length, feasible and advisable.

Again, where sidewalks not deemed feasible, if they exist the property owner will have the option to tear them out and replace them with grass if they are in need of repair.

Questions to board:

1. Are there grants available?
2. Will the village consider incurring the cost of sidewalk installment where none exist through taxes? What would the cost be to property owner's in the way of a tax increase over a 10 year period?
3. If the village incurs the cost, would they then turn the responsibility over to the property owners? (That is the majority wish.)
4. Should we list the cost of new sidewalks by hiring a village employee as opposed to paying prevailing wage to the contractor?
5. Is the village willing to take on a new employee or two to build all these new sidewalks over the next ___ years??

6. Should we look at extending the deadline for new sidewalks?
7. If the village were to put them in, what liability does the village have even though the residents accept ownership and maintenance?