

Minor Development Plan - 1028-1030 Truman Avenue (RE # 00033280-000000)

I object to this plan in the strongest terms possible. As I see it this plan includes cutting the sidewalk curb out, which in affect would eliminate two parking spaces that have historically been used by the general public, and then giving a private owner these two spaces for his own personal use. Parking is very limited in that area, and I bought property at 1100 Truman Avenue in 1983 with the expectation that the parking spaces already there for decades would remain like they were.

Further, unknown to most everyone after a period of around 20 years, I WAS THE ONE who got DOT to change their street design when major work of both underground and complete street repaving was to be done on Truman Ave. DOT's original design ELIMINATED PARKING SPACES COMPLETELY on both sides of Truman Ave., but after I talked with DOT officials and a city representative who was present at the meetings I attended, they decided to keep the parking spaces on my side of the street.

Beginning with 1000 Truman Avenue and ending with 1127 Truman Avenue there are only 16 total parking spaces within the 3 block area surrounding and including the said property located at 1028-1030 Truman Avenue. The following are present parking spaces existing now in the 3 block area:

- (1) 1000/1010/1014/1016 Truman Avenue = 2 parking spaces - (Block #1)
- (2) 1018/1024/1026/1028/1030/1100/1102/1104/1108/1110 Truman Avenue = 10 parking spaces,
(with 1028-1030 Truman Avenue having between 2-3 parking spaces) - (Block #2)
- (3) 1114/1114B/1116/1127 Truman Avenue = 4 parking spaces - (Block #3)

Eliminating public parking spaces for the sole purpose of allowing a private individual to utilize the spaces for his property only, is against any scope of logical and acceptable thought. In addition to the glaring parking problem, I respectfully suggest and hope that the owner of the 1028-1030 Truman Avenue property could take a less ambitious approach with this proposed project.

Can you do anything to help prevent this obvious error from happening as planned?

Ben Volpian
3022 Flagler Avenue
Key West, Fl

Here is a Good Neighbor interaction with someone who is making public comment on the proposed project. I believe it is the position of the neighbor that the project should not have on-site parking because it could result in a reduction of on-street parking.

Owen

Trepanier & Associates, Inc.
Land Planners & Development Consultants
305-293-8983

From: Owen Trepanier
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 11:08 AM
To: 'BEN VOLPIAN' <bvol@bellsouth.net>
Subject: RE: 1026-1028 Truman Ave.

Sure, both are possibilities. The project, as proposed, is a significant reduction in parking demand from what was there before and what could be rebuilt based on the involuntary demolition of the previous building. The Favelli's already chose to rebuild a less ambitious project. The previous building size could be rebuilt today, but I don't think anybody wants that.

In speaking with the parking people if the location of the drive, impacts two parking spaces, and the on-street parking cannot be reorganized to recapture the spaces, then the excess space (which is not big enough for autos) will be used for scooter parking.

I couldn't agree more though, the community's insistence on auto-centric planning, i.e. eliminating on-street parking in favor of on-site parking, is a losing strategy and results in a less walkable, and therefore pleasant, community.

Owen

Trepanier & Associates, Inc.
Land Planners & Development Consultants
305-293-8983

From: BEN VOLPIAN <bvol@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2018 7:48 PM
To: Owen Trepanier <owen@owentrepanier.com>
Subject: 1026-1028 Truman Ave.

Mr. Trepanier,

I talked to you briefly about this project outside after the Planning Board meeting. The below is the last sentence of a letter I sent to a few people at City Hall. Maybe a little less of an ambitious project? Maybe this could be something to think about?

Maybe an easing of HARC's off street parking requirement could be part of a solution?

Cordially,
Ben Volpian