# PARKING CALCULATIONS-revd

#### CALCULATIONS:

A. Existing Parking Requirements 3 buildings constitute the church parish.

#### 280 Eliot – the church:

400 fixed seats – this is prime determining factor 400÷3 seats per space = 134 spaces req'd (note: 362 "fixed seats" on sheet A-1 and and 50 "fixed" on sheet A-2 on plans assumes 1 seat / 2 foot width per person, but at maximum occupancy during festivals, functions such as funerals, and holy days such as Christmas, the capacity for 400 persons remains applicable and considered critical to the Petitioner.

#### 3 employees – 1 space

## Office space @ 1 space /250 gsf requires 1 space

Meeting & function rooms @ 1 space / 45 gsf do not count since used sequentially, not concurrently w/church sanctuary

#### **Total required 136 Spaces**

## 270 Eliot – Rectory/Office

## Dwelling – requires 2 spaces

Meeting rooms - @ 1/space /45 gsf do not count since used sequentially, not concurrently w/church sanctuary

# Office – 2 offices, in aggregate approx 675 gsf – requires 1 space/250 gsf or 2.7 rounded up to 3 spaces

#### **Total Required 5 Spaces**

# 260 Elliot – misc accessory uses as follows

Meeting, classroom and function rooms approx 2,071 gsf @ 1/45 requires 46 spaces – but not used concurrently w/church sanctuary No office use for at least 5 years!

#### **Total Required 0 spaces**

# TOTAL PARKING REQUIRED FOR EXISTING 3 FACILITIES: (136) + (5) + (0)=141 SPACES

The primary generator is the capacity for 400 persons that controls the parking required.

NOTE ALSO THAT NONE OF THE PARKING CALCULATIONS USE THE DEFAULT GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE BUILDINGS AS TO RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND PLACES OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY BECAUSE AT THIS STAGE, THERE ARE NO PROPOSED CHANGES IN USES; BUT RATHER ONLY WHAT IS REQUIRED FOR PARKING FOR THE REMAINING TWO BUILDINGS WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO BE USED FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES/PLACE OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY.

# PARKING CALCULATIONS-revd

#### B. Total parking provided:

128 spaces. Current shortfall of parking is 13 spaces.

Current parking facility is lawfully nonconforming as to number of spaces required for the 3 Parish buildings. It also is lawfully nonconforming as to the design, dimensional and layout provisions in the Zoning Ordinances.

Note that Shortfall would be greater if previous use of some portions as offices at #260 were in fact continuing to the present.

C. Impact of proposed re-subdivision of land removing #260 Elliot and 8 parking spaces

# THE PROPOSAL IS TO REMOVE 8 SPACES FROM THE PARISH'S PARKING FACILITIES SUCH THAT THE REMAINING AGGREGATE SPACES SERVING #270 AND #280 WOULD BE 120 SPACES. THE SHORTFALL WOULD INCREASE FROM 13 TO 21 SPACES. ACCORDINGLY AS SET FORTH IN THE LIST OF SPECIFIC RELIEF A PARKING WAIVER FOR THE 21 SPACE SHORTFALL IS REQUIRED.

Note that removing #260 from the overall Parish buildings and the 8 parking spaces behind that building does not decrease the shortfall! This is because for at least the last 5 years or more the use of #260 has been for public assembly/classroom/function hall purposes with no fixed seating. The parking demand generated for #260 was at times when the primary parking generator, i.e., the church at #280 Elliot, was not in use! So essentially #260 has not triggered a parking requirement as presently used. The parking calculation is for the remaining buildings in the Parish complex, and the removal of #260 from the Parish does not provide any assistance in decreasing the shortfall.

# D. Sequencing of Zoning Relief

Please Note that upon granting the special permit parking waiver, the Archdiocese would then transfer ownership of #260 to 260 Elliot LLC. At that time or at such time that 260 Elliot LLC transfers the property to a non-profit entity, a special permit application would be sought relating to the existing building, proposed uses thereof, and parking. The default scenario In order to facilitate the foregoing sequence is that the new Lot 2 on which #260 would be located together with 8 parking spaces can qualify as a by-right use of the building and land as a two-family house, but that is not the reuse which the Petitioner believes that the community and the Upper Falls Historic District Commission deem in their and the public interest.