



Elizabeth Fauxpoint <efauxpoint@gmail.com>

RE: parking waiver application 14PARK1002 and related parking study

1 message

Brown, Jeffrey E <Jeffrey.Brown@louisvilleky.gov>

Mon, Jun 16, 2014 at 4:00 PM

To: Elizabeth Fauxpoint <efauxpoint@gmail.com>, Dan <daniel.fauxpoint@gmail.com>

Cc: "Markert, Tammy O" <Tammy.Markert@louisvilleky.gov>

I left you a message, please feel free to call so we can discuss in detail.

Attached is my email to the applicant's consultant detailing what was required for the parking study.

The intent of the parking study was to determine the quantity of available & occupied on-street parking spaces within the area of the proposed project. This is usually done by visually inspecting the study area in 15-minute intervals and logging the number of vacant and occupied on-street parking spaces. I required counts to be taken during the hours of the day we'd expect to see the highest occupancy rates, which for residential will be weekends and pre- & post-work hours. The 9-hour time frame within the Land Development Code is more appropriate for commercial, retail, office & restaurant uses which would not yield valuable data if applied to this block of Rosewood.

The vicinity used for this study included both sides of Rosewood Ave, between Castlewood and Baxter Ave.

Jeff Brown, PE, PTOE

From: Elizabeth Fauxpoint [mailto:efauxpoint@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 3:29 PM

To: Brown, Jeffrey E; tammy.market@louisville.gov; Dan

Subject: parking waiver application 14PARK1002 and related parking study

Hi Jeff - Jessica Wethington gave me your contact information. I just left a message on your voice mail but I also wanted to follow up with an email. Jessica suggested that I contact Tammy Market as well, so I've copied her on this email.

My questions are related to a recent parking waiver application and Parking Study submitted by Highlands Restoration Group for a development plan at 1505 Rosewood Avenue. My husband and I own a condo at the existing Rosewood building.

I have reviewed the site plan, waiver requests, parking study, and also the Land Development Code. I question the validity of the study's methodology, so I wanted to clarify the requirements for an accurate parking study in order

to understand exactly how HRG arrived at their results. If you have some time today, could you possibly review what HRG has submitted and give me a call back at your earliest convenience? If you cannot talk today, would you be available tomorrow by phone or in person?

Here are my concerns:

1. The Parking Study instructions do not specifically define "vicinity" or "area" in order to determine the appropriate perimeter of a parking study area. There is no real guideline to establish some sort of distance ratio between the the area in question and the limits of the study. To a layperson like me, "vicinity" means more or less within the immediate surrounding area.

In other words, HRG has requested a reduction of only two parking spaces, but the study itself covers a considerably large distance of 1,252 ft. on each side of Rosewood Ave. for a total of 2,504 ft. of "available" parking spaces. Logically, the more you expand a study area, the greater potential for available spaces, which would certainly skew the results and give the impression that there is much more available parking than what actually exists within the vicinity.

So my question is this: how do you establish an appropriate distance limit in a parking study in order to arrive at accurate/realistic results?

2. I'm confused as to why HRG has calculated the **total** number of garage spaces, car ports, and uncovered parking spaces within the North and South Rosewood alleys. The Code simply says that such spaces may be counted towards the required minimum that a Single Family dwelling or Multi-Family dwelling must provide. The Parking Study guidelines do not instruct a tabulation of **all** existing parking spaces within a study area.

This makes sense to me, because those spaces are privately owned and therefore not accessible to the public. Even if a certain Rosewood residence has a 6-car garage, for example, such data is completely irrelevant because none of those spaces are "available" to anyone but the owner and therefore should not be counted towards "available parking spaces."

Is my understanding correct?

3. As to the time increments, the study must determine and include the peak hour, as well as four hours before and four hours after that peak hour. The way I read it, each day should analyze a total of **9 hours**. However, HRG's study analyzes in 15 minute increments and provides only **2 hours** of relevant data for each day.

Do you know of a specific reason as to why HRG provides only 2 hours of daily data rather than the required 9 hours? If 2 hours per day of data is considered acceptable, could you explain to me the reason why such data would be considered?

That's the gist of my questions for now. I may have others. But I know that staff reports and comments are due this Wednesday, so I'd really appreciate it if you could contact me as soon as possible. Please call me at [401-580-2619](tel:401-580-2619) any time today. I am also available tomorrow by phone or I could come to your office and speak to you in person. Thanks very much for your time.

Elizabeth Fauxpoint

