

1989-1990

Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Public meetings

November 10, 1988

March 13, 1989

June 1, 1989

Published

October, 1989

Board of Aldermen Public Meeting

January 16, 1990

Adopted by Board of Aldermen

February 27, 1990

Planning Commission Area Wide Rezoning

Docket 9-21-90

May 17, 1990

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

- 1 Land Use
 - A Needs Assessment
 - 1 Summary of Findings
 - 2 Existing Conditions
 - a background
 - b existing land use
 - c housing characteristics
 - d commercial and industrial development
 - e community facilities
 - f zoning
 - g structural conditions
 - h historic resources
 - 3 Neighborhood Profile
 - a demographic change
 - b socio-economic profile
 - c housing occupancy characteristics
 - 4 Analysis
 - a residents perceptions
 - b land use
 - c zoning
 - d housing
 - e neighborhood commercial demand
 - f parks and recreation
 - 5 Government and non-government actions
 - 6 Summary of Problems and Issues
 - B Projection of Existing Conditions
 - C Alternatives and Recommendations
 - 1 Alternative Strategies
 - 2 Recommended Land Use Plan
 - 3 Recommended Zoning Plan/Rezoning
 - D Implementation
 - E Priorities

Land Use Figures

- 2 Transportation
 - A Needs Assessment
 - 1 Summary of Findings
 - 2 Existing Conditions
 - a pedestrian facilities
 - b existing roadways, traffic volumes
 - c unique facilities for the visually impaired
 - 3 Analysis of Existing Conditions
 - 4 Issues and Problems
 - 5 Government and non-government actions
 - B Projections
 - C Alternatives and Recommendations
 - 1 Alternative Strategies
 - 2 Recommended Transportation Plan
 - D Implementation
 - E Priorities

Transportation Figures

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Executive Summary – Land Use

a. Existing Conditions

The Clifton neighborhood plan has been prepared for an area bounded by Brownsboro Rd on the north, Ewing Ave on the east, Interstate 64 on the south and Mellwood Ave on the west. This is an area of approximately 423 acres. Figure I-A on page 59 illustrates the boundary of the neighborhood.

Existing **zoning** in the Clifton neighborhood plan area is residential (80.88%), commercial (13.45), and industrial (6.7%). In the residential areas the most common zoning classification is the **R-6** (multi-family) zone which allows 17.4 dwelling units per acre. The second most common residential zone is the **R-7** (multi-family) zone which allows 34.8 dwelling units per acre or one dwelling per 1250 square feet of lot area. Existing zoning is shown on Figure I-C, page 67. Homes in the neighborhood are generally in good condition although concentrations of **residential structures** needing major repairs are found in the western portions of the neighborhood. A slightly higher percent of the total residential units in the area were owner-occupied in 1980 than renter occupied, and this rate represented an increase in owner-occupancy since 1970.

The neighborhood **population** in 1980 was 4167 persons. Population declined 17.8% from 1970 to 1980, a rate close to the City of Louisville's rate of loss. Per capita income in the Clifton neighborhood was only 89% of the 1980 city average. Education levels, based on the percent of high school graduates, were lower in Clifton than for the city average but a slightly higher percent on Clifton residents did have four or more years of college.

Part of Clifton neighborhood is an **historic district** listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Figure I-I, page 89, shows the boundaries of this district.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Executive Summary – Land Use

b. Goals

General goals for the neighborhood are derived from the specific issues and recommendations identified by the residents of the neighborhood at the first and second public meetings. From the listing of the neighborhood's problems and positive aspects, goals statements are created that will guide decisions over the long term and be applicable to situations not addressed by the plan's specific recommendations. Goals for the Clifton neighborhood are as follows:

1. Encourage high quality commercial districts to serve residents and present a favorable impression of the neighborhood to persons passing through the area on the major arterials.
2. Stabilize the neighborhood's residential density at existing levels.
3. Provide additional social, employment, and recreational opportunities for the youth in the area.
4. Protect the architectural and historic resources of the neighborhood and its environmentally sensitive areas from adverse development.
5. Promote better maintenance of structures, yards and adjacent right-of ways.
6. Promote safety and reduce real and perceived crime problems in the neighborhood.
7. Preserve and protect the tree-lined streets and open spaces in the neighborhood.
8. Improve understanding and enforcement of building and zoning codes in the area.
9. Provide for safe pedestrian movement and the special needs of the blind and visually impaired population of the neighborhood.
10. Improve intersections that pose traffic safety problems.
11. Provide adequate parking for new developments in the area.
12. Reduce the negative impacts that through traffic has on the residential areas of the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Executive Summary – Land Use

c. Issues and Recommendations

Land use recommendations are shown on Figure I-F (page 77).

Existing residential **zoning** allows greater residential densities than currently exist in much of the neighborhood. Existing parking problems, narrow streets and concerns over the impact of possible moderate density apartment developments within the Clifton neighborhood have resulted in plan recommendations to stabilize the existing residential densities by rezoning the neighborhood to reflect its currently developed density and prevent incompatible new construction.

In many areas of the neighborhood rubbish and poorly kept yards, sidewalks, and alleys detract from safety and appearances. The plan recommends a broadly based approach to alleviating this situation that includes effort by residents, city agencies such as Operation Brightside, and the Department of Solid Waste Management and Services, as well as enforcement of existing ordinances concerning **litter**, **sidewalk maintenance**, and street and alley rights-of-way maintenance.

Somewhat higher concentrations of declining residential structures are found in the western portion of the neighborhood but scattered units exhibiting deteriorating conditions are found throughout the Clifton area. The plan recommends measures to improve the **condition of homes** in Clifton. The City's REHAB Incentive Program targeted to low income neighborhoods will provide up to \$1,000 to cover the cost of cited exterior housing code violations. Much of the expense of residential rehabilitation will be the responsibility of the individual homeowner.

The Frankfort Ave. **commercial corridor** detracts from the neighborhood due to the uncoordinated design, signage, access, landscaping and parking. Further, uneven levels of improvement are found in the corridor ranging from pristine restorations of historic structures or modern additions, to vacant structures and lots strewn with litter. A streetscape plan developed with the assistance of a professional architect or landscape architect, under the supervision of an active business association is encouraged by the neighborhood plan. Elements of the plan should include reconstruction of sidewalks and curbs, possible relocation or underground placement of **utility lines**, standardization of signage and **sidewalk furniture**, additional landscaping and joint parking facilities. Other features of the plan would strengthen the marketing of commercial properties and seek to avoid extended vacancies while allowing for some neighborhood review through the use of a historic or design overlay regulation. Commercially-zoned land currently used for residential purposes and inappropriate for conversion to commercial use, due to structural type or lot size, is recommended for **rezoning** to the appropriate residential zoning classification based on existing density.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Executive Summary – Land Use**

Existing **open space** along I-64 is suggested for retention for passive recreational purposes such as hiking and nature study and as extension/connection to Cherokee Park. Metro Parks is encouraged to seek control of this property and the rezoning plan recommends it be given an R-1 (large lot, single family) zoning designation rather than the current R-6 multi-family designation. Additional programs and facilities are also recommended by the plan for Bingham and Clifton mini-parks. The report recommends that schools, churches and the Kentucky School for the Blind allow the use of their playgrounds and building space for **recreational** and social activities.

Lighting of streets and alleys may be inadequate in some areas. The plan recommends use of the petition process, available through the City of Louisville Public Works Department, to establish areas where residents desire additional lighting.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Executive Summary – Transportation

a. Existing Conditions

Clifton neighborhood is bordered by a major arterial road and an interstate highway and bisected by a second major arterial road. Frankfort Ave, the bisecting arterial is lined with commercial establishments and is strongly tied to the neighborhood system and is a convenient location for downtown commuters. The study area is well served by bus service; sidewalks are present in most areas although many need repair.

b. Issues and Recommendations

Clifton has numerous features that could be considered transportation problems: narrow streets, at-grade railroad crossings, steep hills and, a lack of alleys in some areas. However, the residents of the neighborhood did not consider these problems as serious as a standards-based assessment would have indicated. Instead residents appreciated the traffic-slowing effect of narrow streets in residential areas and considered adapting to rail crossings “**a part of living in the Clifton area.**”

Pedestrian facility improvements, particularly those which allow for safer travel by the blind and visually impaired persons living in the neighborhood are a major transportation issue. Facilities used by the blind include the Kentucky School for the Blind, Kentucky Industries for the Blind, the American Printing House for the Blind and Recordings for the Blind. The plan encourages public construction and public and private reconstruction of **sidewalks** in the area. Figure II-H on page 155 shows the location of new construction recommended for the area. Other graphics in the plan identify **tripping hazards** on neighborhood sidewalks that need repair.

Steep north-facing streets where snow and ice persist due to a lack of direct sunlight are recommended for addition to the City of Louisville’s priority list for **snow removal**.

Hazardous **intersections**, identified through review of recent traffic accidents in the area, are recommended for specific improvements. The plan recommends installation of an “all red” condition in the traffic signal at Frankfort and Mellwood Avenues intersection to allow the intersection to clear, relocation of the stop bar for eastbound Frankfort Ave, and reduction of business **curb cuts**.

At Brownsboro Rd and Mellwood Ave the installation of two **signs** to indicate that eastbound traffic on Mellwood Ave in the right lane must turn right is recommended along with re-marking the stop bars. At Frankfort Ave and Pope St a modernization of the fire signal due for completion in 1989 should improve safety. At Ewing Ave and Brownsboro Rd new **pedestrian signals** will be installed. The plan also recommends re-marking the stop bars and adding new **crosswalks** at this location.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Executive Summary – Transportation

The plan recommends prohibiting through-**truck traffic** on residential streets and meeting with local businesses to work out problems with existing truck traffic. Two one-way designations are recommended by the plan: the alley north of CSX railroad at Pope St on the east side of the street is recommended for a **one-way** eastbound designation and North Jane St is recommended for one-way north bound travel between Sycamore Ave and the entrance to the Castle/Oxford Hill Apartments.

The plan also recommends two **narrow streets be widened**: New Main St between Frankfort and South Bellaire Ave and Bickels Lane where it currently has a twelve (12) foot pavement width. Limiting parking at the corner of Bickels Lane and Saunders Ave to allow turns is also recommended.

Brick streets have been patched with asphalt and concrete, rather than brick after utility repairs. The plan recommends that utility work requiring the removal of street bricks restore the streets to their original (brick) conditions. Residents are encouraged to report such repair work to the council so that restoration can be monitored.

c. Review Process

Citizen Participation

The Clifton plan was developed with the cooperation of the residents of the neighborhood in compliance with the requirements of applicable city ordinances. The Planning Commission staff met with the Clifton Task Force eleven times between **September, 1988 and May, 1989**. The Task Force identified issues and problems in the neighborhood, suggested alternative solutions, helped develop the plan's recommendations, reviewed the actions to implement the plan, and set priorities for those actions. Three public meetings were held on the neighborhood plan. These meetings were advertised in the newspaper, in the neighborhood newsletter and through notices posted in neighborhood businesses. Through the public meetings interested persons have been able to learn about the planning process and to have input into its development. A meeting was also held separately with businesses to receive comments on the plan, and staff persons attended two of the business association meetings during the plan's development.

Next Steps

Public agencies reviewed this draft plan and commented on its recommendations. Planning Commission staff responded to these comments and approval by the Board of Aldermen is requested. Based on this plan's recommendations, the Clifton neighborhood will be rezoned. A Planning Commission hearing on proposed zoning changes, following notification of affected property owners, is anticipated in the winter of 1989. Implementation of zoning changes requires action by the Board of Aldermen.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Land Use - Priorities

1. Develop an effective business organization and strengthen cooperation between residents and businesses in the area.
2. Prepare a market profile for attracting quality restaurants to the area and a survey of vacant commercial structures to use in attracting new businesses to the area.
3. Provide additional recreational, employment and social service opportunities for youth in the area.
4. Rezone areas currently zoned C-2 commercial to a lower intensity commercial district when the existing use activity does not require a C-2 classification to minimize the potential for future nuisance uses permitted.
5. Rezone existing single family, duplex and apartment areas to zoning districts which reflect their current developed density.
6. Enforce ordinances on weeds, anti-litter laws, structural condition and housing codes.
7. Obtain additional street lights in areas where they are needed in the neighborhood.
8. Minimize the extent of tree trimming by LG&E or replant the utility easements with trees that do not grow large enough to cause conflicts.
9. Develop a façade and streetscape improvement plan for the commercial strip along Frankfort Ave. Encourage the restoration of historic structures utilizing tax incentives available to businesses.
10. Encourage a multiple faceted approach to dealing with the problems of litter, poorly kept properties and structures, vacant lots and vacant structures in the residential areas of the neighborhood.
11. Educate the neighborhood about the building and zoning codes and work to see that they are enforced better in the neighborhood.
12. Develop a listing of drainage problem areas and work with Metropolitan Sewer District to solve those problems.
13. Work with the Air Pollution Control District and businesses in the area to reduce air pollution. Consider possible air pollution impacts of future land use.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Land Use - Priorities

14. Develop additional block watch programs and relate concerns over criminal justice to elected officials.
15. Document electrical service problems in the neighborhood and meet with LG&E to alleviate the problems.
16. Encourage residential rehabilitation through public programs, self help effort and rehabilitation training. Assistance in making loan applications, in acquiring enterprise zone benefits in eligible areas, and in utilizing existing housing rehabilitation programs should be provided to area residents.
17. Add park programs and facilities in the existing parks. Seek the use of the Kentucky School for the Blind and Franklin School facilities for recreation and improve access to Cherokee Park. Retaining the vacant land along I-64 for open space and as possible access-way to Cherokee Park is encouraged.
18. Prevent vegetation from being cleared from the slopes along Brownsboro Rd. and elsewhere.
19. Establish a local historic preservation district and/or create a design overlay district to suggest appropriate forms of renovation work or new construction in the Frankfort Ave. commercial corridor.
20. Seek underground utilities when possible.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

1. Summary of Findings

- The Clifton neighborhood is a predominantly residential area with 58.98% of its land area currently used for housing. A majority of the dwelling units (61%) are single family units.
- The number of owner occupied dwelling units in the neighborhood is increasing
- New construction of residential units since 1980 has likely reversed the population loss experienced by the neighborhood for the 1970-1980 period.
- Apartment zoning accounts for a large percentage (73.4%) of the neighborhood. These zoning districts do not reflect the current use of the areas involved and would permit substantial increases over the density of current development.
- Rental unit vacancies increased from 1970 to 1980 indicating weak demand for the units created through the conversion of older, large single-family homes.
- The Kentucky School for the Blind, Kentucky Industries for the Blind, Recordings for the Blind, American Printing House for the Blind, and the large number of blind and visually-impaired persons in the neighborhood create special demands on pedestrian facilities, transit and commercial establishments.
- Residents' demand for neighborhood-serving commercial use was compared to the existing stores in the adjacent to the neighborhood and found to be adequate in mix and quantity.
- Park facilities within the neighborhood include Bingham Park and Clifton Mini-Park. The Hilliard Scenic Easement located along the north side of Grinstead Drive adds additional open space.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, a. Background

Clifton is a moderate size neighborhood located in the near eastern portion of the City of Louisville. For purposes of this study the neighborhood boundaries are Mellwood Ave, Brownsboro Rd, Ewing Ave, Grinstead Dr and I-64. This is an area of approximately 423 acres. Figure I-A on page 59 illustrates the boundary of the neighborhood.

The skyline of the Clifton neighborhood was dominated by the five story Kentucky School for the Blind from its completion in 1855 until its demolition in 1967. The structure predated most of the residential development in the neighborhood. Today, the Kentucky School for the Blind, housed in a modern structure, still stands as a cornerstone of the neighborhood and the adjacent American Printing House for the Blind is the areas largest employer.

Residential subdivision activity in Clifton neighborhood began on the western edge along Mellwood Ave, then called Reservoir Ave, in 1850 and peaked by about 1890. Some small subdivisions were laid out after 1890, mostly filling in the vacant tracts left by previous development. In more recent decades in-fill development of the more environmentally constrained land (slopes primarily), as well as demolition of older homes and construction of apartments and nursing homes, has occurred. The recent construction of a condominium complex on previously undeveloped land south of Bickels Lane and new apartments on North Clifton represent a new phase of in-fill residential growth in the neighborhood and have raised concerns about development of other vacant parcels previously felt to be too difficult to develop,

b. Existing Land Use

Clifton is a predominantly residential area with a mix on institutional, industrial and commercial uses scattered throughout. Figure I-A shows the existing distribution of land uses in the Clifton neighborhood. Table I-1 (page 93) shows acreage and percent of the total land area in each land use category, and the acreage of the major institutional uses.

Single-family homes account for the largest single category of land use with 44.3% of the land area. Duplexes occupy about 4.8% of the land area and buildings with three or more units occupy an additional 9.8%. Two large congregate-care facilities for the elderly, Sacred Heart Home and the Brownsboro Hills Nursing Home, represent additional group-residential use activities but are classified as medical services.

Educational uses including the Kentucky School for the Blind, Ursuline-Pitt School and Franklin Elementary School make up 4.4% of the developed area of Clifton. Vacant land is the second largest category of land use in the area, 12.75%. Vacant property is the neighborhood includes an area separated by steep cliffs from the balance of Clifton along I-64. A five acre site is being developed for apartments adjacent to the Sacred Heart Home.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, c. Housing Characteristics

The 1980 **census** provides the most recent data on the Clifton neighborhood's residents and housing characteristics. Clifton had 4167 residents living in 1746 dwelling units in 1980. This averaged 2.39 persons per occupied dwelling unit. Single family (one unit at address) housing units made up 61% of the housing stock in 1980. By comparison, the city-wide ratio for single family homes was 69% of the housing stock. Appendix I Table B provides detailed information for housing characteristics by census block and tract.

The intensity of the residential development is measured by dwelling unit "density", the ratio of the number of dwelling units to land area. Overall density in the Clifton area falls in a medium density category of 5-12 dwellings per acre with an average developed density excluding rights-of-way of 10.1 units per acre in 1987. The **R-5** single-family residential zone allows 7.26 dwelling units per acre and the **R-5A** multi-family residential zone allows 12.01 units per acre. However, the predominant existing zoning in Clifton is **R-6** multi-family residential zone (60% of the land use), which allows 17.42 dwelling per acre.

Single-family units (one unit at address from the 1980 Census) numbered 1148 units and occupied 148.4 acres of land in 1988. This is a density of 7.7 units per acre. Some of the single family homes are built to substantially high densities and would require **R-5A** or possibly **R-6** zoning to be conforming.

Multi-family uses (including duplexes) occupy only 24.6% of the land use in 1988, about 49 acres. There were an estimated 852 multi-family units in 1988. This range could be accommodated with **R-6** zoning although specific locations, as in the case of single-family units, have densities exceeding the average and requiring higher zoning classification to be conforming.

The 1980 rate of **owner occupancy** in the neighborhood was 49%. This represents an increase over 1970 when only 47% of the units were owner occupied. The most recent developments in the area, the apartments along North Clifton and Crescent Springs, are multi-family uses. Crescent Springs is a condominium complex and while units may be occupied by renters, there is apparently a high rate of owner occupancy. It is likely, given the new construction and 1970 to 1980 trend, that the owner occupancy rate has continued to increase in the Clifton neighborhood since 1980.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, c. Housing Characteristics

Owner occupancy is considered beneficial to a neighborhood's long term vitality. Home owners are generally more concerned with maintaining a desirable neighborhood and protecting their investment than are absentee owners. The lower rates of owner occupancy are found on the north side of Frankfort between Haldeman and Jane, the block facing Frankfort from the south side between Mellwood and Weist Place (the alley between Waverly Ct and Haldeman Ave) and the north side of Payne St from Charlton to Bellaire.

A large portion of Clifton's **housing stock** is over 100 years old as noted in the brief historical sketch. According to the 1980 census, only 32% of the units in 1980 were constructed after 1940. Generally speaking the older units are located closer to Mellwood although more recent in-fill occurs throughout the area.

Vacancy rates in Clifton averaged 7.4% in 1980. The portion of census tract 81 in Clifton had the highest vacancy rate (10.6%) while the part of census tract 80 in the neighborhood had the lowest (4.1%) rate. Figure I-E shows census tract boundaries. At a block level, vacancy ranged from 0% to 45.5% in 1980. The two highest rates were observed for the block bounded by Frankfort Ave, State St, Arlington Ave and Pope St (45.5%) and the "L" shaped block bounded by Mellwood Ave, Stevenson St, Arlington Ave, Charlton St, Locust Ave and I-64 (30.8% vacant).

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, d. Commercial and Industrial Development

Commercial land uses (including vacant commercial structures and parking) accounted for 6.2% of the land area in Clifton in 1988, about 21 acres of land in all. This category is broken down into four subcategories: neighborhood, regional, service and office commercial. Figure I-B: Commercial classification shows the location of the various types of commercial use in the Clifton neighborhood. Twelve vacant commercial structures were found in the neighborhood at the time of the land use survey.

Neighborhood commercial uses include retail stores, bars and restaurants, and other uses that serve the shopping needs of nearby residents for personal consumption items such as food, medicine, liquor and clothing.

In 1988 thirty-one (31) of these uses were within the boundaries of Clifton. Another twenty (20) uses are immediately adjacent to the neighborhood boundaries. Concentrations of these land uses are found primarily along the north side of Brownsboro Rd between Haldeman Ave and Vernon Ave extended along the south side of Brownsboro from that point east to Mount Holly Ave, and on both sides of Brownsboro from there to east of Ewing. This linear strip is the primary market place in the neighborhood but a smaller strip exists from South Clifton to Ewing along both sides of Frankfort Ave. Melton's Food Market is the largest single use in this cluster. Other scattered neighborhood-serving uses are located throughout the area along the main roadways.

The neighborhood commercial uses along Brownsboro Rd include three named shopping centers within the area: Brownsboro Plaza, 1977 Brownsboro Rd; Cliffside Plaza at 1961 Brownsboro Rd and Cliffboro Center at 2200 Brownsboro Rd. A fourth center, Oxford Center at 225 North Clifton, is primarily office and service commercial.

A list of the neighborhood-serving commercial uses in the adjacent to the Clifton neighborhood is provided in Appendix I. The table indicates square footage and estimates annual sales based on survey data from the Urban Land Institute. Figure B: Commercial Classification shows the location of these uses. These uses are concentrated in small shopping centers along Brownsboro Rd, at the corner of Frankfort and Ewing and scattered along the rest of Frankfort Ave, Brownsboro Rd and Mellwood Ave.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, d. Commercial and Industrial Development

Regional commercial uses are retail stores that draw customers from a wide area and are not dependent on residents of a single neighborhood for support. Regional commercial uses are primarily those which sell durable goods (appliances, automobiles or furniture), luxury goods (jewelry or fur coats) and specialty items (orthopedic braces, drafting materials). Gasoline stations are included in this category as they serve a stream of traffic rather than a limited geographic area. In 1988, eight (8) regional commercial uses were found within the boundaries of the Clifton neighborhood and an additional six (6) uses were immediately adjacent to the area.

Commercial services include such uses as barber shops, beauticians, dry cleaners, Laundromats, banks and repair services. Most of these use activities are neighborhood oriented although through traffic may generate some support for these facilities. The September 1988 land use survey found 39 of these uses in the Clifton Neighborhood and an additional 12 uses adjacent to the neighborhood.

Office uses include professional offices such as lawyers, architects, engineers or accountants, real estate and rental agencies. Medical offices are not included. The land use survey found five (5) offices in Clifton and four (4) adjacent to the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, e. Community Facilities

Community facilities serving the Clifton neighborhood are shown in Table I-2. Clifton neighborhood includes two **public parks** (Bingham and Clifton) and is served by four larger facilities nearby: Cherokee Park; Crescent Hill Park and Golf Course, Eva Bandman Park; and Thruston Park. The facilities provided in each park and acreage are listed in Table I-3. There are approximately 5.5 acres of park land in the neighborhood. The four nearby major parks had a combined total of nearly 600 acres of land. A Class I **bikeway** (a separate trail for exclusive bicycle/pedestrian use) borders Clifton neighborhood along Beargrass Creek west of I-64. A Class III bikeway (Utilizing existing roadways with bicycle traffic traveling on each side of the roadway in the same direction as traffic) traverses the neighborhood along Payne St and connects with the Class I facility by going north on Spring St and east on Locust St.

The Franklin School provides **recreational facilities** for the neighborhood after normal school hours, and the Kentucky School for the Blind has extensive facilities for recreation adapted to the special needs of the visually impaired. Metro Parks provides summer recreation programs in Bingham Park.

There are seven (7) **churches** in the Clifton neighborhood. These are social centers for neighborhood residents and provide additional recreational and social services. **United Crescent Hill Ministries**, which provides community services throughout the greater Clifton and Crescent Hill neighborhoods is located at 1860 Frankfort Ave. It serves as an umbrella organization for 21 churches in the area and offers emergency assistance, senior citizen meals programs, child care, and numerous other social services.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, f. Zoning

Louisville first adopted zoning regulations in 1931. The zoning adopted for the Clifton neighborhood was substantially simpler than current zoning particularly in the area northeast of Vernon Ave. and the railroad. With the exception of industrial zoning fronting along Frankfort and Weikel between Vernon and North Clifton and a cluster of commercial zoning at Ewing and Brownsboro Rd intersection, this entire area northeast of Vernon Ave and the railroad was zoned for single family use.

Early industrial zoning explains many of the legally nonconforming uses as the uses that exist in the neighborhood predate the current (changed) zoning. Areas originally zoned industrially that have been changed include the following: areas north and east of the Haldeman-Arlington intersection now zoned R-6; the triangle bounded by South Bellaire Ave, Frankfort Ave and the railroad tracks now zoned C-2; the area north of Frankfort Ave between Vernon and North Clifton Ave now zoned C-2; and the strip of land on the south side of the railroad tracks extending east from the existing M-2 zoning district's terminus, east of South Bellaire Ave, to South Clifton Ave that is now zoned R-6 & C-2.

Another area where early zoning has subsequently been changed involves the current C-1 commercial, R-7 apartment residential and OR-3 office/apartment residential zones along Payne St west of Sturgis Ave. This area was originally zoned for duplex residential use.

Certainly much of Clifton was built before zoning came into existence. Vacant land in 1931 that was zoned for single family use has experienced some fairly intense rezoning allowing the recent commercial and apartment developments along the south side of Brownsboro Rd from Vernon Ave extended east to North Ewing Ave.

Existing Zoning. Existing zoning (July 1988) in the Clifton neighborhood is shown on Figure I-C. About 77.2% of the neighborhood was zoned for residential use only. About 3.6% of the area was zoned for office/multi-family residential use (in addition to the 77%). Table I-4 shows the extent of each zoning district. Commercial made up about 13% of the neighborhood and industrial land 7%.

Residential Zoning. R-6 multi-family residential is the predominant residential zoning district in the Clifton neighborhood with 60% of the area having this classification. The R-6 zone allows 17.4 dwelling units per acre or one dwelling for each 2,500 sqft of lot area. A little over 20% of the land area in Clifton was used as right-of-way. Removing this area from the total R-6 acreage suggests that close to 200 acres of R-6 zoned land exists in the neighborhood which would allow nearly 3,500 dwelling units if fully built. This is nearly twice the actual dwelling unit count for all of Clifton neighborhood in 1980 (1,866 units). In fact, most of the area zoned R-6 is utilized for single family homes at much lower density levels than permitted under the zoning district.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, f. Zoning

The R-7 multi-family residential district is the second largest category of zoning found in the Clifton neighborhood, 10.7% of the land use. The maximum density allowed under R-7 zoning is 35 units per acre or one dwelling for each 1,250 sqft of lot area. There are seven separate locations where R-7 zoning is found in the Clifton neighborhood. The largest tract includes the Kentucky School for the Blind (KSB), American Printing House for the Blind properties, and the block face across Frankfort Ave. The remaining six tracts are much smaller and are located on Frankfort Ave (both sides) at Waverly Ct, along the east side of Vernon Ave north of Sycamore, on the west side of North Clifton north of Weikel Ave, on the west side of North Ewing Ave north of the railroad tracks and two small areas on the north side of Payne St across from Stoll Ave. Part of one of the tracts on Payne St is undeveloped, and development potentially could occur on the vacant portions of the KSB properties.

The R-5 single family residential district is found in the northeast corner of the neighborhood as a remnant of the earliest (1931) zoning classification applied to this portion of the neighborhood, the "A" single family zoning classification. The original "A" zoning has been sharply reduced in area by the recent commercial and office/multi-family rezoning in this part of the neighborhood. The R-5 zone allows single family homes at a maximum density of 7.3 dwelling units per acre or one dwelling per 6,000 sqft of land area. Existing lots smaller than 6,000 sqft can however be developed as single family homes. The only R-1 single family zoned property in the neighborhood is Bingham minipark.

Office/multi-family residential zones, OR-2 and OR-3, are also found in the neighborhood. OR-2 allows the construction of 58 dwelling units per acre and OR-3 allows up to 435 (0 bedroom) units per acre. In addition, the OR-2 zone allows professional office uses; OR-3 allows any type office use. The OR-2 zoning in the neighborhood is currently used for apartments and a nursing home. Most of the OR-2 is found along North Clifton Ave north of Sycamore Ave. Two apartment buildings on the north side of Frankfort Ave between Coral and Haldeman also have OR-2 zoning. The OR-3 zoning is found on one side on the north side of Payne St. at Stoll Ave. This property is used as an office by Louisville Paving.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, f. Zoning

Commercial Zones. The C-1 and C-2 commercial zoning districts are found in the Clifton neighborhood. C-1 zoning allows offices and a broad range of service and retail uses. The C-2 commercial district permits all the C-1 uses and also allows wholesaling, auto repair, taverns and other uses. High density residential is also allowed in the two commercial districts. Frankfort Avenue's commercial zoning is predominantly C-2 while all of the south side of Brownsboro that is zoned for commercial use has C-1 zoning. A small C-2 zone exists behind the Kroger complex on the west side of North Jane St and a C-1 zone exists on Payne St at its intersection with I-64.

Industrial Zoning. M-2 industrial zoning is found at three locations within the Clifton neighborhood. The largest area is along the CSX rail lines from I-64 to approximately South Bellaire Ave. The frontage along Mellwood is primarily zoned M-2. The third area is along the south side of Frankfort Ave east of South Jane St.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, g. Structural Conditions

Data on the condition of residential and commercial structures in the study area was collected by means of a “windshield survey”—slowly driving each street and noting structural conditions on a map. These ratings are based on exterior conditions only. Interior conditions may require substantial improvements, such as plumbing or heating repairs, that are not detected by this methodology. Residential structures are rated on a five category classification, and a three category system is utilized for non-residential structures. The results of the survey are shown in Table I-5 and Figure I-D. Definitions of the rating classifications for structural conditions are provided in Appendix II.

Residential Structures. Most of the homes (76.2%) in Clifton are sound but in need of minor repairs such as painting, gutter replacement or surface masonry work. However, the existence of a large number of homes, sound but in need of major repair (22.2%) are troublesome indicators for the area. The older area of the neighborhood, west of Haldeman Ave, exhibited the most serious concentrations of homes in need of major repairs, 32.7% of the units in that portion of the neighborhood and nearly 50% of the neighborhood’s units in this category. Only two units were rated deteriorated and one structure was classified as dilapidated. Conversely, only 2% of the units received the highest rating (sound, no repairs needed.)

Non-Residential Structures. Nearly all the non-residential structures (95%) in the area were given standard ratings (the highest category) and only four units were considered to be in depreciating condition by the field survey crew. There were no substandard commercial structures in the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

2. Existing Conditions, h. Historic Resources

The Clifton neighborhood National Register Historic District includes most of the neighborhood north of the CSX railroad. Figure I-1: Clifton National Register District shows the extent of the designated area. The residential units include a variety of frame and brick homes ranging from small Italianate and vernacular shotgun working-class homes and Queen Anne cottages to large brick and frame structures in Classical Revival and Italianate styles.

The non-residential structures include several fine churches, heavily altered commercial structures and, until recently demolished, a large pre-prohibition distillery complex. The Kentucky School for the Blind lost is most significant structure in 1967 with the demolition of the domed five-story Greek Revival School that was constructed in the 1850's.

Recent commercial revitalization includes the Investment Tax Credit rehabilitation of the structure located on the northeast corner of North Bellaire Ave and Frankfort Ave called Art Space. It houses art galleries, a restaurant and a dance studio. Another renovation on the south side of Frankfort Ave houses an art studio and residence.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

3. Clifton Neighborhood Profile, a. Demographic Change

Clifton neighborhood had a population of 4,167 persons in 1980. This represents a decline of 17.8% or 905 persons since 1970. This was not a result of dwelling unit loss, rather a decrease in household size and a higher vacancy rate. Occupied dwelling units declined from 1,786 to 1,746 units from 1970 to 1980 while household size in those occupied units declined from 2.84 persons per unit in 1970 to 2.39 persons in 1980.

A positive aspect of the shifts occurring between 1970 and 1980 involves a 5.3 percent (47 unit) increase in the number of owner occupied units in the area. Fewer rental units were occupied and the 87 unit loss in occupied rental units generated the 1980 increase in vacancy (7.4%) over the 1970 rate (5.1%). Furthermore, while any population loss in an area is cause for concern, Clifton's rate of loss (17.8%) approximated the rate experienced by the City of Louisville as a whole during the decade (17.4%).

The population in Clifton has probably grown slightly since 1980 due to the construction of the Crescent Spring complex and the apartments on North Clifton Ave. The total population is probably close to 4,300 persons. The total dwelling unit count in the neighborhood is probably close to 1,960 units today, allowing for losses elsewhere in the neighborhood.

In tandem with the drops in household size experienced in the Clifton neighborhood from 1970 to 1980, there has been a sharp drop in the number and percent of persons under age 18 living there. In 1970 there were 1,440 persons (28.4% of the population) under age 18 in Clifton. In 1980 this number had dropped to 876 persons (21% of the population). The percent of persons age 62 and over in 1970 (20.5%) and age 65 and over in 1980 (19.1%) was relatively constant by contrast. (The block data used to generate these numbers used differing age categories in 1970 and 1980). About 62% of the population loss in the Clifton neighborhood for the 1970 to 1980 period can be attributed to losses of persons under age 18.

The 1970 to 1980 losses in population due to decreases in the number of persons under age 18 are not unique to the Clifton neighborhood nor are they cause for alarm. The "baby boom" generation moved out of their parent's households during the decade, resulting in household size declines throughout the nation. Louisville experienced a 35.4% decline in the number of persons under age 18 from 1970 to 1980 and Clifton's decline was slightly higher at 39%. This can be explained in part by the low number of blacks in the neighborhood (3.7% in 1970 and 4.7% in 1980 versus 24% in 1970 and 28.2% in 1980 in the City of Louisville) who collectively have higher birth rates than whites.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

3. Clifton Neighborhood Profile, b. Socio-Economic Profile

The percent of the population age 25 and over that had graduated from high school in the Clifton neighborhood was lower than the average for all of Louisville (51.6% and 55.5% respectively) but Clifton had a slightly higher percent of persons with four or more years of college (13.8% versus 13.2% for the city overall).

Unemployment rate for Clifton neighborhood was 9.9% in 1980, the same as the City of Louisville's average rate. The 1980 work force was predominantly employed in white collar jobs (50%) followed by blue collar (29.3%) and service jobs (20.7%). This ratio of employment types did not differ strongly from the averages for Louisville as a whole. Two or more workers were present in nearly 49% of the families in the neighborhood, slightly higher than the city's average of 47% for 1979.

Per capita income for Clifton neighborhood was \$5,611 in 1979, only 89% of the average for all of Louisville. Average family and household incomes in Clifton were also lower than the City of Louisville averages in 1979. Clifton families had an average income of \$14,941, which was 78% of the city's average (\$19,061). Households in Clifton averaged \$13,244 in 1979, which was nearly 84% of the city's average (\$15,784). Only Clifton's unrelated individuals* had average incomes higher than the City of Louisville's average (\$8,272 and \$7,820 respectively). The low overall incomes in the neighborhood are also related in the percent of persons who had incomes below poverty level in 1979. Clifton had 17.3% of its population, 704 persons, living below poverty level. This was a lower rate than existed city-wide in Louisville (19.3%).

* An unrelated individual is (1) a householder living alone or with non-relatives only, (2) a household member who is not related to the householder or (3) a person living in group quarters who is not an inmate of an institution.

Income levels for 1987 are estimated at \$8,500 per capita, \$22,500 for average family income and \$19,900 for average household income based on shifts in average annual income for employees covered by unemployment insurance in Jefferson County.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

3. Clifton Neighborhood Profile, c. Housing Occupancy Characteristics

There was only a light gain in dwelling units in Clifton from 1970 to 1980, four units to 1,886 units. From 1960 to 1970 there was a 158 unit increase and for the 1950 to 1960 period a 39 unit increase. Owner occupied units decreased as a percent of all units between 1950 and 1970 from 56% to 46.8% but this trend reversed during the 1970 to 1980 period climbing to 49.2% of the units. Renter occupied units peaked at 48.1% in 1970 and decreased to 43.4% of the units in 1980. The shift to owner occupancy is a positive sign for the neighborhood. A negative factor, however, is the growth in vacancy rates in the neighborhood from .9% in 1950, 2.6% in 1960, 5.1% in 1970 to 7.4% in 1980.

The average value of owner occupied dwelling units was \$22,925 in 1980 and the median value was \$19,900. Louisville had an average value of owner occupied units of \$33,100 and median value of \$27,200 in 1980. Rents in Clifton averaged \$151 in 1980 and had a median value of \$155. The average rent in the City of Louisville was lower in 1980 (\$143), as was the median (\$140). A combination of higher than average rents and lower than average unit values may be contributing to the trend for increased rates of owner occupancy as rental units are purchased and converted to single homes.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, a. Residents' Perceptions

The residents of a neighborhood serve as an important source of information about the problems and positive features of their area. The daily routine of their lives brings them into contact with features of the neighborhood, concerns and opinions of their neighbors, and a feel for the attitude that the area has about its future.

In addition to the ongoing input of the task force, a group identification session held at the November 10, 1988 public meeting for the Clifton neighborhood generated broad listings of the neighborhood residents' perception about the area. Approximately 60 persons were in attendance, including Planning Commission and Neighborhood Services staff. An explanation of the "nominal group" survey process is included in Appendix III. Three groups were formed and asked to generate responses to the following questions:

What are the positive features of the Clifton Neighborhood that are most important to you?

What are the negative features of the Clifton Neighborhood?

The responses are detailed in Tables A through D of Appendix III for each of the three groups. A brief discussion of the results follows. Specific areas of concern identified in this process are noted in the appropriate section of this plan.

The three groups had three separate opinions about the most important group of **positive features in the neighborhood**.

Group 1 identified most strongly with the positive elements of the physical environment (self contained neighborhood, architecture, older area with beautiful trees) in the neighborhood and its accessibility.

Group 2 identified most strongly with the positive elements of the social environment (good demographic mix, population density) and the transportation system.

Group 3 felt most strongly about the positive aspects of commercial land use (new businesses opening, art galleries) in the area and the physical environment.

The listings of negative features also generated separate opinions among the groups about the most important **negative aspects of the neighborhood**.

Group 1 identified elements of the physical environment (including deteriorated dwellings and vacant businesses) as having the greatest negative impact on the neighborhood followed by the negative impacts of commercial land use (a lack of restaurants, undesirable businesses).

Group 2 identified the negative elements of the physical environment (litter, air pollution, poorly maintained property) as most important to them as well, followed by negative elements of the social environment (their first choice for positive aspects) including a lack of neighborhood identity and block watch groups.

The response of **Group 3** was that negative aspects of the transportation system (speeding and a lack of sidewalks) were most important to them followed by problems with residential land use (abandoned and under maintained homes).

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, b. Land Use

The Clifton neighborhood is a predominantly residential, mixed use area. Single-family homes occupy 44% of the land area, duplexes about 5% and apartments about 10%. Apartment and condominium complexes represent some of the more recent developments within the neighborhood. There are substantial amounts of vacant land (nearly 13% of the total area of the neighborhood) but the development potential of much of this land is strongly constrained by access limitations and bedrock

As a mixed use neighborhood there are several areas where land use conflicts occur. The mix of small lot commercial uses along Frankfort Avenue, industrial operations on the south side of Frankfort Avenue and a car repair operation at Frankfort Avenue and Pope Street, all in close proximity to residential uses, create conflicts involving traffic, noise, odor and visual nuisances. Shopping areas along Frankfort Avenue are in need of improvement and the eight vacant storefronts (at the time of the land use survey) and other noncommercial structures along Frankfort detract from the neighborhood character. Physical improvements, rear lot to frontage areas-and parking area landscaping could improve the appearances of the occupied stores.

The commercial areas along Brownsboro Road are more modern and incorporate parking within the developments. However, little provision has been made for pedestrians either within the developments or in the approaches from the neighborhood. This is a serious shortcoming given the large numbers of blind and visually impaired persons living in the area and dependent on walking to reach the facilities. Furthermore, the Brownsboro Road commercial area lacks cohesive screening of adjacent residential uses and uniform landscaping.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, c. Zoning

Existing zoning in the Clifton neighborhood was compared with existing land use to identify conflicts and inconsistencies.

Non-conforming Uses. Nonconforming uses are land use activities of a type or intensity that are not currently permitted in the zoning district where they are located. Nonconforming uses are uses that were in existence prior to the establishment of zoning, or prior to a zoning change or a change of permitted uses allowed under the zoning district classification. Although not in accordance with zoning regulations, nonconforming uses may legally continue. The expansion of such use activities is not permitted.

Five separate types of nonconforming use activities existed in the Clifton neighborhood at the time of this plan's preparation. No evidence of illegality is indicated by this assessment as the activities in question appear to have existed before zoning was established in 1931, resulted from shifts in the uses permitted within a zoning district, or were created by area-wide rezonings.

Commercial uses in residential zones are one type of nonconforming use that occurs in the study area. There were six uses of this type scattered throughout the study area. Most are apparently uses that existed prior to the zoning ordinance.

A second type of commercial nonconforming use is retail commercial in an industrial zone. only one of these exists in Clifton. Residential use in an industrial zone is similarly prohibited (5 examples in Clifton). Both of these instances of nonconforming use are a result of shifts that occurred in the mid-1960's from a pyramidal zoning classification system (where higher intensity zoning classifications allow all lower intensity uses) to use-exclusive zones.

There are also seven industrial uses in commercial zones and five in residential zones including the Printing House for the Blind. Recent rezonings account for the nonconforming status of all these uses, except for the Printing House for the Blind and Hoerter and Son's (meat packers), both of which predate zoning. Many of the other industrial uses, nonconforming as a result of downzoning, also predate original zoning.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, c. Zoning

Residential Uses in Commercial Zones. Under the Zoning District Regulations, residential uses are permitted in commercial zones as long as they conform to the density and floor area limits. About 13% of the land area in Clifton is zoned for commercial use with 4% C-1 and 9% C-2. Only about 6% of the land area was used commercially indicating the magnitude of residential and institutional use within the commercial zones. Frankfort Avenue and Brownsboro Road from Mellwood east to the alley between Pope and State Streets are the locations where most of the residential use in commercial zones occurs. The potential for commercial use is a destabilizing influence for residential uses in a commercial zone. Neither residential nor commercial use is spared the negative effects of vacancy, dilapidation or abandonment that sometimes occur in these areas.

Residential Density. The two single family residential zoning districts (R-1 and R-5), three multi-family residential zones (R-5A, R-6 and R-7) and three office/residential districts (OR-2, OR-3 and OTF) found in Clifton neighborhood permit different residential densities. A summary of the permitted density within these zones is provided with the map of existing zoning.

A more detailed block face analysis of zoning district permitted and developed densities was developed for the proposed zoning change recommendations map, Figure I-G. The recommendations, aside from areas recommended for R-1 Single Family Residential, reflect the lowest intensity residential zoning district that the existing developed density conforms under.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, d. Housing

The housing supply was essentially stable in Clifton during the 1970-1980 decade. The total number of dwelling units in Clifton grew only by four units between 1970 and 1980. Since 1980 the construction of a condominium complex (Crescent Springs) and an apartment complex along the west side of North Clifton Avenue across from the Oxford Center has boosted the total number of units in the area by about 100 units to an estimated 1,960 total units in the neighborhood. New construction of multi-family units has offset unit losses elsewhere through conversions of apartment units to single family homes or fewer units. Relatively small amounts of land are easily available for development. The construction of an apartment complex on Payne Street and reconstruction of a house that burned on Coral Avenue are the only pending projects.

A shift to higher rates of owner occupancy was experienced in the 1970 to 1980 period reversing a trend evident for the 1950 to 1970 period. This is a positive factor for revitalizing the area. At the same time (1970 to 1980) dwelling unit vacancy rates have also increased in the neighborhood, primarily in apartment units, but still a troublesome sign for the area.

Exterior structural conditions are moderate to good in the Clifton neighborhood. Only a very small number of units were in serious states of decline as the summary of structural conditions in Table I-3 shows. Generally the western portion of the neighborhood from Haldeman Avenue to Mellwood Avenue exhibited the highest percentage of units, that while sound, needed major repairs. The large number of homes in this area needing major repair is reason for concern. If corrective actions can be taken they may prevent a trend of housing decline and disinvestment. The area east of Haldeman Avenue includes some of the oldest housing in the neighborhood. Individual efforts at housing rehabilitation have improved conditions in several areas.

The Clifton neighborhood is well served by schools, churches, bus service and neighborhood shopping facilities. The area's close proximity to the Central Business District and easy access via expressway system provide strong incentives for persons working downtown to locate there. The mix of affordable housing in the area is diverse and while often times needing major repairs, is lower priced than comparable homes in nearby neighborhoods such as Crescent Hill or the Highlands. While predominantly single family residential, a wide range of housing types, including duplexes,, converted unit multi-family, apartment complexes and elderly housing units are in the area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, e. Neighborhood Commercial Demand

Neighborhood retail commercial uses serve a limited geographic area. This allows an evaluation of the adequacy of neighborhood serving commercial uses based on the socioeconomic characteristics of the residents making use of the facilities. Neighborhood commercial uses provide goods that are needed on a weekly or even daily basis. Generally speaking residents of an area will purchase such goods in local stores if the goods are available at the appropriate price and quality. Good commercial areas can form a sound core for a neighborhood and enhance the desirability of residential stock.

The 1988 survey found fifty-one neighborhood serving commercial uses with approximately 125,400 square feet of floor area. Using data on average sales volume per square foot of retail space for the various categories of use found in the neighborhood (stated in 1979 dollars), an estimate of \$17.8 million in annual sales was generated for the businesses in the neighborhood.

Demand for neighborhood commercial use is based on estimates of total personal consumption expenditure for non-durable goods, (other than gasoline) particularly food. The total personal consumption expenditure for non-durable goods other than gasoline for the entire 1980 population of the three Census Tracts that make up Clifton neighborhood (includes approximately 3,881 persons outside the neighborhood boundaries) was only \$9.2 million. However, more populous and affluent Census Tracts adjacent to the neighborhood also use its shopping areas. An estimate of personal consumption expenditures for an eight Census Tract area bounded roughly by the Ohio River, Zorn Avenue, Grinstead Drive, Beargrass Creek and including parts of Irish Hill and Butchertown neighborhoods, generates an estimated \$32.4 million in non-durable expenditures other than gasoline. While some of this area overlaps with additional neighborhood commercial areas so that residents are likely to shop elsewhere, a substantial portion probably finds the commercial areas in Clifton (particularly along Brownsboro Road) the most convenient area to shop.

The analysis does not show a shortfall in the amount of neighborhood commercial serving Clifton but rather that the commercial uses serve a larger area than the neighborhood. Furthermore, because this portion of the City of Louisville is not likely to exhibit strong population growth over the next couple of decades, (based on projections in the 1986 Comprehensive Plan: Background Information) it is unlikely that major expansions of neighborhood commercial use will occur in the area. A strong continued support population and income base will exist in the area and the commercial districts should face a very viable future.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Needs Assessment**

4. Analysis, e. Neighborhood Commercial Demand

The primary complaint from residents during the issue identification session involving neighborhood commercial uses related to the lack of good restaurants in the neighborhoods. There are 14 restaurants in the immediate area. Many of the restaurants in the area are of the fast food or short order type but a few are traditional restaurant facilities. A high rate of turnover in restaurant ownership has been exhibited in the area.

Other negative features mentioned in the issue identification sessions that relate to the neighborhood commercial areas include weak/unfocused commercial on Brownsboro Road and Frankfort Avenue, a lack of competing groceries, the unappealing appearance of the Kroger complex, and undesirable businesses, primarily bars.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, f. Parks and Recreation

The Clifton neighborhood contains two parks and is served by four parks, Cherokee, Crescent Hill, Eva Bandman and Thruston outside the neighborhood. The level of service offered by recreational facilities considers two types of parks, "neighborhood park/playgrounds" and "community park/play fields."

Neighborhood Park/Playground. This category includes any park with less than 12.5 acres of land. Smaller parks in this category are typically referred to as mini-parks. Generally speaking this type of park includes playground equipment, benches and at least one active sports activity area. Additionally it is desirable for such a facility to provide safe convenient access for pedestrians, particularly children and provide areas for passive recreation and unsupervised play.

Both of the parks within Clifton are considered neighborhood parks. Bingham Mini-park is the larger of the two with 4.3 acres of land. It has basketball courts, playground equipment, restrooms, small athletic fields, walkway and a wading pool. Bingham Mini-park is located in a small wooded valley at the rear of lots facing Coral and Haldeman Avenues on the south side of Brownsboro Road. This small park can be approached from Coral Avenue or Brownsboro Road. Sidewalks are found along Brownsboro Road and on the opposite side of Coral Avenue from the park. A stop light at Haldeman Avenue's intersection with Brownsboro Road facilitates access from the north.

The second park, Clifton Mini-park, is a fairly recent addition to the neighborhood. Acquired and developed in 1976 with Community Development Block Grant monies, this small (1.2 acre) park is located in the southwest corner of the neighborhood off Arlington Avenue. Sidewalks do not connect directly with the park but do exist on the opposite side of Arlington Avenue. The park has basketball courts, tennis courts, benches, playground equipment and picnic grills available. The park's close proximity to I-64 is a detracting factor due to noise. Traffic on Arlington Avenue is not a problem.

To be considered adequately served by neighborhood park/playground facilities a resident should live within one-half mile of a facility. When examined for service adequacy against this one-half mile standard only a portion of the southeast corner of the neighborhood was found to lack adequate facilities. This is an area that may be served in part by the open space and playground facilities at Barret Middle School; the area southeast of Bickels Lane is within one-half mile of Cherokee Park. Only about 150 homes are not within the desired proximity and they are less than one-tenth mile out of the preferred area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

4. Analysis, f. Parks and Recreation

Negative responses from the issue identification survey involving parks include a concern that there were not enough play areas, ineffective use of the park areas that existed and a need for better play equipment in Bingham Mini-park. At the same time Bingham Mini-park was felt to be an important positive feature of the neighborhood.

Substantial improvements to facilities in Bingham Park will soon be installed. Refer to Metro Parks letter from Bob Kirchdorfer, dated August 22, 1989 in Appendix IV.

Community Park/Play Field. This category includes any park that contains from 12.5 to 100 acres of land. Parks in this category are generally oriented to vehicular access as well as pedestrian access. The service radius for adequate service by a community park/playground is one mile. There a-re no facilities of this size within the Clifton neighborhood but the area is adequately served by the four nearby facilities, Cherokee, Crescent Hill, Eva Bandman, and Thruston Parks.

Other Recreation Facilities. Non-Metro Parks recreation facilities in Clifton Neighborhood include the Franklin Elementary, Ursuline Pitt School and the Kentucky School for the Blind. A Class III bikeway crosses the neighborhood along Payne Street. A scenic easement exists along Grinstead Drive; this open space preserve is not open to the public.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

5. Government and Non-Government Actions

The Clifton neighborhood's development has been influenced by actions taken by public agencies and private groups. The major actions are summarized in this section of the plan.

The Louisville and Frankfort turnpike and Louisville and Frankfort Railroad were two of the earliest actions impacting the urbanization of the Clifton neighborhood. In 1855, the Kentucky School for the Blind moved to its present location from a West Chestnut Street location. A ring of fortification built late in the Civil War included a fort (Elstner) on the hill where Vernon, Bellaire and Emerald Avenues intersect, overlooking the area where Brownsboro Road passes in front of Kroger.

Zoning did not come into effect in Louisville until 1931. Clifton's early zoning recognized an existing land use pattern and limited much of the northeast corner of the neighborhood to single-family homes. A broad band of industrial zoning was created along the railroad on the south side of Frankfort and extended into the commercial strip along Frankfort Avenue. With few exceptions the current commercial zoning districts along Frankfort were established at that time or derived from the industrial zones at a later period. All the current commercial zones except the section from Mount Holly to Vernon along the south side of Brownsboro Road were also established in 1931. Most of the balance of the area was zoned for duplex residential except for the Kentucky School for the Blind and a strip along Frankfort and Bellaire Avenue to State Street zoned for apartments. Subsequent re-zonings developed the numerous apartment districts and commercial developments outside the boundaries established by the 1931 zoning and created the legally nonconforming industrial uses that are found in the neighborhood. Less permissive, non-pyramidal, zoning districts adopted in the mid-sixties created the nonconforming residential uses in industrial zones.

The Kentucky School for the Blind plays an important role in the neighborhood and creates some special demands for pedestrian facilities. A unique population of visually impaired and blind persons reside in the Clifton neighborhood. This state run facility is also associated with the largest employer in the neighborhood, the American Printing House for the Blind. The school facilities also serve as a meeting location for the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Needs Assessment

5. Government and Non-Government Actions

Another group active in the neighborhood is the United Crescent Hill Ministries located at 1860 Frankfort Avenue. Formed to provide services throughout Clifton and Crescent Hill after the 1974 tornado, this group represents 21 churches and provides a variety of community services. These include senior citizen meal programs, emergency assistance, and child care. The senior citizen programs receive funds from a variety of public and private sources including the City of Louisville, KIPDA, Jefferson County and the member churches.

Much of Clifton has been designated as a National Register Historic District. The Louisville Landmarks Commission conducted the research for the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. This designation recognizes the unique architecture of the area and provides limited protection from federal fund expenditure that would have a negative impact on the area. The designation also creates financial incentives for appropriate rehabilitation of income-producing structures in the area.

A recent ordinance provides for public notice and a 30 day waiting period for demolition of National Register listed properties. Recent sign regulations prohibit outdoor advertising signs within a National Register Historic District's boundary or depending on sign size, within 250 or 500 feet of a National Register Historic District's boundary.

Community Development Block Grant money has been used for the 1976 acquisition and improvement of Clifton Minipark. Bingham Minipark was renovated in 1978 with CDBG money. The play areas and restrooms were improved and a bridge was constructed to allow handicapped access. Since 1980 CDBG funds have been used for only one project in the neighborhood, pedestrian improvements including the extension of new stairs from Vernon Avenue to Brownsboro Road and new sidewalks in other low and moderate income parts of the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Needs Assessment

6. Summary of Problems and Issues

1. There is a lack of good restaurants in the neighborhood.
2. Some commercial facilities along Frankfort Avenue are not adequately maintained.
3. Existing zoning would permit substantially higher residential densities in the neighborhood.
4. There is a minor shortage of neighborhood park land in the eastern part of the neighborhood. 1Other parks are not developed to their full potential. Metro Parks feels Bingham Park should be limited in its development potential for aesthetic reasons. Refer to Metro Parks letter from Bob Kirchdorfer dated August 22, 1989 in Appendix IV.
5. Deteriorated dwellings detract from the quality of the neighborhood, particularly in the area west of Haldeman Avenue.
6. Vacant land, businesses and residential structures detract from the quality of the neighborhood.
7. Air pollution in the neighborhood is a problem due to interspersed industries and others nearby.
8. Loss of trees as a result of trimming around utility lines is a problem. The trees are an important resource that need to be protected through maintenance and limited utility related trimming.
9. Trash, high weeds, overgrown sidewalks and other poorly attended landscaping are problems in the neighborhood.
10. Crime and vandalism are problems in the neighborhood. Repeat offenders remain on the streets. Block watches are lacking in the area. Teenagers need curfews and something for them to do to keep them from getting in trouble.
11. Dogs, a lack of leash law observation and noise control are problems in the neighborhoods.
12. Improved street lighting is needed in several areas of the neighborhood.
13. The quality of electric service in the neighborhood is poor. There are frequent outages.
14. Drainage problems exist in some areas.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Projections of Existing Conditions

This section of the Clifton neighborhood plan develops a projection of future conditions in the neighborhood based on current levels of public investment and physical trends. This is a projection of conditions that can be reasonable forecast for the neighborhood if recommendations to address problems facing the neighborhood are not addressed (a "null" alternative). The projections are followed by a listing of relevant guidelines from the Comprehensive Plan. These guidelines are general policies intended to state desired future conditions in Louisville and Jefferson County. The impacts of the "null" projection on Clifton should be evaluated against the "desired" conditions listed in these guidelines.

1. Projected Future Conditions

Existing development will continue to dominate the land use pattern of the neighborhood. However, it would be likely that the land along I-64 would be developed into a 'Crescent Springs' type of condominium or rental facility and that this area may become a new "neighborhood within a neighborhood" owing to the physical barriers between this area and the balance of Clifton. This development and development of scattered sites throughout the neighborhood are likely to occur at densities above 10 units per acre and to involve potentially 400 units. Gross density in the neighborhood (all acreage) will rise under this scenario from 4.6 units per acre, to 5.6 units. However, net density of the residentially developed area would remain constant at about 9.9 units per acre. This is a medium development density according for the Comprehensive Plan Guideline R-6.

Household size may stabilize in the area as the 1960 rate (2.4 persons per unit) was relatively low and the number of owner occupied units will continue to increase. Housing conditions in the neighborhood may deteriorate with owners of the larger homes finding costs associated with rehabilitation too high. Areas with smaller homes on the western edge of the neighborhood may be more affordable to rehabilitate but in some areas the overall decline may dampen individuals inclination to make such investments. Further, rehabilitation of these homes depends on a market for residential units with less than 1,000 square feet of floor space and little or no yard space. The northwest corner of the neighborhood may be impacted most severely by this decline based on the concentration of "c" rated housing units in this area and the proximity of nuisance/conflicting land uses.

If current trends continue the commercial strip along Frankfort Avenue is not likely to improve in a consistent manner although individual rehabilitations may improve spot locations. overall environmental conditions, landscaping, streetscape, sidewalk litter and parking problems will continue to detract –from reaching the full potential of this area. Occasional undesirable business sitings in the C-2 zones may discourage existing businesses or those seeking to locate there. Restaurants are likely to remain difficult to attract or keep in the area. Parking needs may result in loss of non-commercial structures or poorly utilized commercial structures in this area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Projections of Existing Conditions

2. Comprehensive Plan Recommendations

The following guidelines from the Comprehensive Plan are relevant to the future conditions projected for Clifton neighborhood.

E-10 Develop buildings and lot improvements on sites with slopes that were or will be greater than 12 percent, only if it is conclusively demonstrated that:

- a) adequate measures will be taken to prevent landslides and slope failure and
- b) adequate drainage control measures will be implemented to prevent erosion and flooding of adjacent lands and degradation of streams and
- c)* on-lot wastewater disposal systems, if proposed for the new development, will function adequately to protect the public health and water quality and
*Element of the guideline, not suggested for application in the Clifton neighborhood.
- d) grading and cut-and-fill operations will be minimized and
- e) natural landforms and vegetation will be preserved to the extent possible.

E-11 Develop buildings and lot improvements on sites with slopes that were or will be greater than 20 percent, only if steep hillside construction techniques will be utilized, based on the following professional engineering reports:

- a) erosion and sedimentation control plans indicating pre-construction techniques and future maintenance measures and
- b) drainage control plans indicating drainage patterns and on-site storm water retention and
- c) geologic data indicating the strength, bearing capacity and stability of sub-surface conditions and
- d) soils analysis indicating slope characteristics, soil stability and suitability of soils for on-lot disposal of wastewater, if proposed for the new development and
- e) grading plans indicating existing grade, proposed grade and areas of cut-and-fill.

E-16 Take all reasonable actions to reduce air pollution from stationary sources.

E-19 Preserve buildings, sites and districts that are recognized as having historic or architectural value.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Projections of Existing Conditions

2. Comprehensive Plan Recommendations

E-25 Assist the preservation of historic districts and sites by:

- a) acquiring, when feasible, buildings and sites or easements for public use and
- b) utilizing government funds for historic preservation to leverage other funding sources and
- c) providing technical advice to the private sector on seeking funding sources, determining appropriate re-uses, formulating rehabilitation strategies and disseminating information regarding federal tax incentives.

T-7 Provide adequate access to, from and through all development for the proper functioning of the streets, walkways, bikeways and transit systems for emergency vehicles by linking the interior roadway, walkway, bikeway and transit systems with systems already built or planned in the surrounding area.

T-11 Provide off-street parking and loading of sufficient quantity and adequate design for the type and intensity of development, for the mode of access to the development and for its users.

R-1 Protect residential neighborhoods from adverse impacts of proposed development and land use changes.

R-4 Avoid residential development that has a significantly different size, height, mass or scale from adjacent development.

R-5 Develop residential densities that are compatible with adjacent residential areas and other adjacent land uses.

R-16 Expand opportunities for people to live in sound, affordable housing in locations of their choice by:

- a) providing for lower-cost housing in dispersed locations throughout the community, including identification of suitable sites for lower-cost housing and necessary actions to assure construction;
- b) using incentives to encourage a mixture of housing types and costs for new housing;
- c) upgrading existing housing and
- d) keeping overall housing costs as low as possible without sacrificing basic health, safety and welfare objectives.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Projections of Existing Conditions

2. Comprehensive Plan Recommendations

- R-17 Ensure that new land uses are compatible in terms of height, bulk, scale, architecture and placement on the lot if they are to be located in or next to residential areas of recognized historic or architectural significance.
- C-2 Design all commercial development:
- a) to include, where appropriate, circulation patterns for pedestrians, bicycles and handicapped people and
 - b) to provide, where appropriate, trees, landscaping, benches, bus stops and other site amenities and
 - c) to promote a good transition between adjacent buildings and land uses in terms of size, height and materials and
 - d) to prevent signs from being a visual nuisance or a safety hazard to vehicular traffic.
- C-3 Provide buffering, screening, separation or other techniques to mitigate nuisances when a commercial land use will produce or is associated with such nuisances as:
- a) automobile lights, outdoor lighting or illuminated signs or
 - b) loud noise or
 - c) odors, smoke, automobile exhaust or other noxious smells or
 - d) dust and dirt or
 - e) litter, junk or outdoor storage or
 - f) visual nuisances.

If current trends continue some of the guidelines listed above will be met by new development. However T-7 and T-11 will not be met if current development patterns continue. Some historic homes and non-residential structures will be lost in the absence of a cohesive strategy to rehabilitate the area as individual property owners seek their own "best use" for their property.

Most of the potential apartment development would be strongly separated from the existing residential areas, but reconstruction or infill on the smaller vacant lots could be incompatible with the development on adjacent sites. Further, pressure to develop marginal lots could lead to conflicts with E-10/11 as sloped land is brought into development creating drainage, erosion and access problems.

Commercial pedestrian access and off-street parking problems will likely worsen and nuisances associated with commercial uses will likely increase conflicting with guidelines C-2 and C-3.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Alternatives and Recommendations

Recommended strategies for the Clifton neighborhood are developed in this section of the plan. The problems and issues identified by analysis of existing conditions, survey of the residents, and discussions with the Task Force members indicate aspects of the neighborhood needing remedial action. Several alternative strategies were generated for each issue needing to be addressed by the neighborhood. The alternatives were considered and discussed by the Task Force with input from the Planning Commission, Neighborhood Services, Public Works and Landmarks Commission staff persons. The best alternative or combinations of alternatives was selected through this process.

1. Alternative Strategies

Issues and the related alternatives are presented below. A rationale statement explaining the chosen alternative follows. This section concludes with the recommended land use plan.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue A: *There is a lack of good* restaurants in the neighborhood. Restaurants offering table service have been in short supply and have a high turnover rate in the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Meet with area restaurateurs and encourage them through a market profile to locate an outlet in the neighborhood.
- 2) Prepare a listing of available vacant structures/spaces for such activities in Clifton.
- 3) Do nothing and assume a quality restaurant will locate in the area on its own.

Alternatives 1 and 2 are recommended. The Task Force felt that it was important to work at retaining good restaurants in the neighborhood and keeping commercial structures occupied. The high rate of restaurant turnovers in the area indicates that, despite current activity (one planned and one open restaurant), this problem may recur in the future. A good place to dine was considered to be a strong amenity for the neighborhood. Further, filling vacant commercial structures as quickly as possible was felt to be important for maintaining the properties and in preventing negative impacts on adjacent properties. This is of particular concern along Frankfort Avenue where vacant structures can quickly become eyesores that collect litter.

*Note: A new restaurant has opened and another is planned for the neighborhood. For purposes of this plan a good restaurant is considered as one providing table service, not a fast food restaurant or short order grill.

The market profile and vacant structure list was felt to be a strong tool to accomplish the goals of the Task Force. Nearby restaurants were already drawing on the Clifton area population for support (K.T.'s, Tumbleweed, and Pat's Steak House for example) but locations within the neighborhood were felt to be lacking. Alternative 3 was not selected although it had been discussed; there was concern that alternatives 1 and 2 might create undue competition for a recently opened restaurant and two proposed restaurant facilities. This concern was dismissed as it was felt that restaurant turnover would result in the area anyway and the shortage of good restaurant facilities would recur.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue B: *There is a potential for undesirable businesses and nuisance uses that have created problems in the past to locate in the Clifton neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Create a special zoning classification to prevent the establishment of undesirable uses.
- 2) Business and residents should meet with owners of problem businesses and encourage changes to remove problems (operating hours, clamping down on rowdy individuals, etc.).
- 3) Rezone commercial areas from C-2 to C-1 to reduce the potential for future problems from being established without a rezoning review.
- 4) Do nothing and hope the problem will self correct.

Alternatives 2 and 3 were recommended. The two-fold approach of business representatives "policing" their own and residents trying to work with businesses to let them know the problems they are creating was felt to provide for a better understanding of residents' expectations among business operators. This also allows the adjacent businesses to shoulder some of the responsibility for cleaning up existing business nuisances. Nuisances include dangerous bars, auto repair operations and late night operations. The rezoning of C-2 areas to C-1 was felt necessary to prevent future nuisance uses from locating in the neighborhood without a public hearing. This will require a lot by lot review of existing uses and their zoning requirements to prevent creating non-conforming uses.

Alternative 1 was discussed but dismissed as it was felt to require substantial effort to establish a new zoning district or overlay zone and apply it in the neighborhood without substantial benefits over using an existing tool; rezoning to C-1. Doing nothing (alternative 4) was not considered an adequate response.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue C: *The historic character of the neighborhood is not being maintained.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Continue to provide educational programs about the historic qualities of the neighborhood and features that need to be protected.
- 2) Develop a local restoration program that provides financial incentives for proper rehabilitation.
- 3) Require public improvements to conform with the historic character of the area.
- 4) Develop an awards program to give recognition to the restoration of buildings in the area.
- 5) Prepare design studies showing recommended improvements to specific homes or blockfaces in the neighborhood.

All five alternatives are supported by the task force. Educational programs and design studies can provide residents with a better understanding of the design features present in the area and show them how restoration can increase the value of their investment and improve appearances. The low income characteristics of many of the residents indicates a need for subsidy programs to cover the costs of restoration.

Public improvements should compliment the restoration efforts in the neighborhood. Projects should be reviewed against design standards for the historic district to make sure they conform to the character of the neighborhood.

Finally, persons who have made notable contributions to the restoration of a structure or an area of the Clifton neighborhood should receive recognition for their achievements by the Clifton Community Council. These "award winning" projects can also serve as illustrations of the benefits associated with proper restoration.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue D: *Some commercial facilities do not maintain their facades along Frankfort Avenue.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Create a more effective business organization to deal with problems along Frankfort Avenue.
- 2) Develop a design plan for facade improvement.
- 3) Improve the streetscape in commercial areas (improvement of public spaces: sidewalks, street trees, condition of alleys/pavement).
- 4) Educate the public about available programs for commercial rehabilitation.
- 5) Create a local historic landmark designation or a design overlay district - for the area.

All five alternatives were recommended by the Task Force. A more effective business organization was felt to be essential to the development of a design plan and its implementation. The business organization was also felt to be essential to creating a unified streetscape improvement program and individual site improvements. Some preliminary steps toward establishing a business group along Frankfort Avenue have already been taken. The interests of these businesses are as diverse as their building designs and existing site utilization characteristics. office for Economic Development facilitators will be the primary source of information about available commercial rehabilitation programs. The City of Louisville also has low interest loan programs for commercial sidewalk repairs. (See Appendix II for details.)

Developing a local historic district or design overlay district was -seen as a way to minimize conflicts with the design of new structures and set standards for rehabilitation work. Individual structures meriting historic preservation should be restored to original form within the corridor when possible. Other structures should conform to design standards.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue E: *Existing zoning permits substantially higher residential densities than exist in the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Rezone block faces with significant apartment uses to the zoning district appropriate for the existing density.
- 2) Rezone predominantly single family block faces from apartment to single family or two-family zoning districts.

Both alternatives 1 and 2 are recommended. These reflect a desire to limit the growth of parking problems, prevent new apartments from being established in predominantly single family areas and prevent razing of existing low density apartments for high density facilities permitted by the existing zoning. Vacant land in developed areas would be recommended for rezoning to zoning districts that reflect adjacent development patterns. The undeveloped property along I-64 owned by the State of Kentucky would be rezoned to R-1 based on the recommendation of Issue f., below.

Concern was voiced about the difficulty that maintaining large single family homes might present in terms of cost and marketability if they were rezoned for single family use. It was felt they might be more appropriately used as multiple unit dwellings and that the existing zoning would permit that choice. This was rejected based on the potential conversion to apartment occupancy without neighborhood review and the potential parking problems that such conversions were perceived to generate. If such conversions required rezoning it was felt the neighborhood would have a better tool for controlling off-site impacts. A residential zone permitting duplexes was also considered as a possible tool to protect marketability of the larger structures.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue F: *There is a minor shortage of neighborhood park land in the southeastern part of the neighborhood. Other parks are not used effectively.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage creation of a neighborhood park in the southeastern portion of the neighborhood.
- 2) Provide additional programs and facilities in the existing parks.
- 3) Utilize the Kentucky School for the Blind and Franklin School facilities as neighborhood recreation facilities.
- 4) Develop better access to Cherokee Park and the developing Waterfront of the Ohio River.
- 5) Preserve state-owned property along I-64 as open space.

Alternatives 2, 3, 4 and 5 are recommended. Adding new facilities and programs in the existing parks is considered more appropriate than creating a new neighborhood-level park. The Franklin School site and Kentucky School for the Blind would have the potential for more widespread use if noise and liability issues could be addressed. Developing better access to Cherokee Park is of interest particularly for pedestrians. Currently one must exit the neighborhood east on Frankfort Avenue and take Peterson Avenue south to Grinstead Drive and then west to the park. A trail or sidewalk facility connecting the southeast corner of the neighborhood to Grinstead Drive would substantially reduce the distances involved. This could possibly follow the South Ewing right-of-way through its closed portion.

Better access to the Waterfront could be developed through working with the Butchertown neighborhood to provide sidewalks and improvements along Ohio Street. The Waterfront development along the Ohio River is expected to provide new recreational opportunities for the Clifton neighborhood.

The concern that the State of Kentucky might sell property along I-64 for development generated the alternative 5 recommendation. Zoned R-6 Multi-Family Residential, this area could have 17.4 dwellings per acre if fully developed. If used for a park or open space with a walkway it could serve as a link between Cherokee Park and the neighborhood. The property was acquired under the 1964 Highway Beautification Act and is subject to federal approval of any activities taking place there.

Alternative 1 was rejected because a small facility was felt to create more maintenance problems and be less desirable than seeking better programs for the existing facilities. The land along I-64 would be classified as a "community" park or as an extension of Cherokee Park.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue G: *Deteriorated dwellings detract from the quality of the neighborhood particularly in the area west of Haldeman Avenue.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage publicly assisted housing rehabilitation programs.
- 2) Develop neighborhood self help rehabilitation programs: tool library, workshops, labor sharing.
- 3) Provide assistance to individuals seeking loans from private sources and in selecting reputable rehabilitation contractors.
- 4) Encourage persons in the Enterprise Zone portion of the neighborhood to seek tax credits for housing rehabilitation costs.
- 5) Provide information concerning tax incentives for rehabilitation of income producing historic properties and property tax moratoriums for rehabilitation of any structures at least 25 years old. Refer to Appendix II, Development Incentives.
- 6) Require property owners to bring their buildings up to code and maintain.

Alternatives 1 through 6 are supported by the Task Force. Public assistance for housing rehabilitation is felt to be necessary given the numbers of units involved and the low income characteristics of the residents involved. The area is at a point where parts of it could come back from dilapidation or fall to a point where rehabilitation is impossible. Establishing the neighborhood self help programs let's people know they are not alone in trying to improve the area. Loan assistance is needed to help low income persons, elderly persons or those who do not understand financial -'Instruments in applying for the loans they need to finance property improvements. Similarly a local clearing house for rehabilitation contractors could prevent fly-by-night operations from preying on residents of the neighborhood.

The part of Census Tract 81 that is in Clifton neighborhood is also a part of the Louisville Enterprise Zone. This is the southwest corner of the neighborhood bounded by Frankfort Avenue, South Bellaire, Payne Street, Sturgis Avenue, I-64 and Mellwood Avenue. Homes and businesses in this area are eligible for a wide range of tax incentives and benefits.

Because of recent tax reforms at the federal level, tax incentives to investors in a National Register Historic District are reduced or more difficult to use. It is important to know if changes in federal law occur and to disseminate information about such programs in a timely manner.

Code enforcement is the "stick" necessary to encourage owners to maintain their property and take advantage of any "carrot" programs available for rehabilitation of property in Clifton neighborhood. Homeowners have more motivation to maintain their environment than do absentee owners but those who do not should be cited.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue H: *Vacant land, businesses and residential structures detract from the quality of the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage occupancy of vacant structures.
- 2) Encourage maintenance of vacant lots until desirable use activities for them can be established.
- 3) Enforce ordinances regarding vacant structures and weeds.

All three alternatives are supported. Vacant lots and structures can become eyesores very easily. Strict enforcement of existing ordinances can prevent problems from proliferating. A neighborhood listing of properties available for purchase or rent could be developed in cooperation with active realtors in the area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue I: *Persons in the area are unfamiliar with zoning and building code regulations.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Hold information seminars in the neighborhood.
- 2) Publish an informational column in the neighborhood newsletter and have an "advice" column.
- 3) Create a neighborhood resource center with copies of the regulations available for review.
- 4) Encourage the Clifton Community Council committee on zoning to review enforcement of zoning and building regulations in the area.

All four alternatives are supported by the Task Force. Informational meetings, newsletters and a resource center for researching zoning and building codes for the area combined with expanded review by the existing Clifton Council Committee on zoning of issues brought to their attention by this process, should provide for better understanding and enforcement.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue J: *Dumping and ill-kept alleys and rear yards.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Organize cleanup campaign to supplement and assist Operation Brightside efforts.
- 2) Cite violators under existing laws.
- 3) Have the city clean up violations and place liens on property to satisfy costs.

All three alternatives are supported by the Task Force. Brightside efforts are applauded by the Task Force but an on-going neighborhood based effort is needed to deal with the problems present in the area. Serious problems warrant citing under existing regulations and, if the property owner is unwilling to clean up the problems, the City should and recuperate clean-up costs through liens placed on the property. Exceptions should, however, be made for hardship situations such as poverty, age or handicap with special efforts on the behalf of the volunteer clean-up workers to assist these property owners. Liens have limitations in their effectiveness due to a five year limit on their applicability.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue K: *Air pollution in the neighborhood is a problem due to industries in and adjacent to the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage Air Pollution Control District of Jefferson County to review problem areas.
- 2) Meet with businesses to relate concerns of neighborhood residents.
- 3) Take air pollution impacts into consideration in the development of the land use and rezoning plan for Clifton.

All three alternatives are supported. Complaints generally revolve around odors and particulates that periodically settle on cars in the area. Relating these concerns to the Air Pollution Control District of Jefferson County and meeting with them and the businesses involved may abate this problem. Reviewing potential air pollution impacts of future development suggested by the land use and rezoning plans for Clifton will minimize future problems.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue L: *Protection is needed for the tree covered slopes along Brownsboro Road.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Seek scenic easement donations from property owners.
- 2) Purchase the property from the current owners and preserve it as open space.
- 3) Create a landscape buffer overlay zone.
- 4) Rezone the property to a very low density residential zone.
- 5) Negotiate with the owners to minimize the impacts of clearing vegetation along the sloped areas.
- 6) Educate persons about the negative impacts of tree cutting on erosion and noise in the area.

Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are recommended by the Task Force. This is an area where existing regulations are ineffective for protecting the aesthetic and environmentally sensitive areas in a developed neighborhood. All of these tools can help protect sensitive areas. Scenic easements donated by the owners can provide for open space and protect the existing vegetation. A landscape buffer overlay if adopted in the area could prevent or limit vegetation clearing in the areas where it is applied. Some ground work in establishing the overlay type of a land use protection as a tool has been established but there are no landscape overlays currently in effect in Jefferson County.

Rezoning the property involved to a very low density residential zone could minimize the potential for highly intensive use activity on sensitive land and is a more conventional tool. Negotiating with owners and educating them about the potential negative impacts off-site that may result from clearing or developing land that is environmentally sensitive is a more direct tool that could prevent individuals from trying to develop their land before the other land use regulations discussed above could be developed and applied.

Alternative 2 was rejected as not cost effective.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue M: *Loss of trees to utility related trimming is a problem.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Request Louisville Gas and Electric Company to limit tree trimming to a minimum.
- 2) Seek underground utilities for new development.
- 3) Replant areas having overhead utility lines with trees which remain small.

All three alternatives are supported. Some tree trimming in the area has been extremely severe. If trimming could be reduced the character of the area would be enhanced. If modifications cannot be made or the type of tree located under the lines is the problem, then removal and replanting with trees that remain small is considered a reasonable approach. LG&E will benefit by not having to trim the trees and the neighborhood will not have lopsided or flat-topped trees.

Seeking underground utilities for new development is a long term goal. It would be desirable to place all utilities underground, but unless costs could be reduced it is unlikely to occur.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue N: *Trash, high weeds, overgrown sidewalks and other landscaping problems.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage enforcement of local ordinances on weeds.
- 2) Continue Operation Brightside cleanups.
- 3) Encourage private maintenance of sidewalks.
- 4) Encourage a trash receptacle program along Frankfort Avenue.
- 5) Enforce anti-litter laws.

All five alternatives are recommended by the Task Force. Each contributes to the efforts being made to clean up the area. Weed control and litter law enforcement will make offenders conscious of the concerns the area residents have with appearances. Brightside and a trash receptacle program along Frankfort Avenue can help clean up existing problem areas. More information about sidewalk maintenance is found in the Transportation Section of this plan.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue O: *Fear of crime and vandalism in the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Form additional neighborhood residential and business block watches.
- 2) Add street lights in the area.
- 3) Contact elected officials and police about criminal justice concerns in the neighborhood.

All of these alternatives are supported. Block watches are felt to be an effective means of reducing criminal activity. The addition of street lights also contributes to this effort. The criminal justice concerns relate to a perceived leniency toward repeat offenders who make Clifton their home and engage in criminal activity there. Refer to Issue p. also.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

Issue P: *Youth in the neighborhood do not have enough activities targeted toward their needs.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Seek supervised activities for youths in the area through schools, churches and Metro Parks.
- 2) organize social service programs to allow youths to perform volunteer services.
- 3) Develop a job program to match part-time and special demand jobs with young people in the neighborhood.

All three alternatives are supported. Vandalism and juvenile delinquency could be reduced if more structured activities were available for neighborhood youths. These could include recreational and social activities such as team sports or dances. A second possibility is social service volunteer work to assist the elderly, sight impaired or other persons in need of assistance in the area.

Small businesses and area residents frequently need assistance with odd jobs such as lawn mowing, leaf raking and snow shovelling.

These chores create seasonal part time work in the area that could be directed to area youth through bulletin boards located in activity centers or a hiring hall.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue Q: *Dog-related nuisance: noise problems and untethered animals.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage enforcement by the Animal Control office.
- 2) Encourage voluntary compliance through education of the residents via the newsletter.

Both alternatives are supported. Calling in noise or control problems with animals in the area should bring this problem to the attention of the owners. The newsletter can reinforce this with education about why this is a problem and note that the blind people in the neighborhood cannot see the droppings uncontrolled animals leave on sidewalks. The enforcement of Louisville's ordinance on cleaning up after pets will help get this message across.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue R: *Street and alley lighting is a problem in several areas.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Encourage a study of the need for additional street lighting in specific locations.
- 2) Encourage private businesses to install additional lighting.
- 3) Inform residents about the process for obtaining street lights if they perceive a need in their area.
- 4) Let the existing petition process determine the location of future lights.

Alternatives 3 and 4 are supported. It was felt that, if informed about the petition process for obtaining new lights, areas needing facilities would then pursue the improvements.

Alternatives 1 and 2 were not considered necessary to relieve the problems.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue S: *Quality of electric service in the neighborhood is poor. (South side of Frankfort Avenue: New Main/Albany area seems to be affected by frequent outages.)*

Alternatives:

- 1) Meet with Louisville Gas and Electric Company to discuss the concerns about service in the area.
- 2) Develop more specific information about the quality of service issues in the neighborhoods, possibly through the neighborhood newsletter.

Both alternatives are recommended. Documentation of the extent of the problem should be prepared before meeting with LG&E. Area residents could be asked to keep a log of outages through the newsletter.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue T: *Drainage problems exist in some areas.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Develop list of areas and submit to Metropolitan Sewer District.
- 2) Meet with Metropolitan Sewer District officials to discuss problem areas.

Both alternatives are recommended. A list needs to be developed. Residents should be surveyed in the newsletter. This doesn't appear to be a major problem but should be examined and if necessary taken to MSD for solutions if submitting a list of problem areas doesn't generate a suitable response.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan **Alternatives and Recommendations**

Issue U: *Future use of institutional buildings in the Clifton neighborhood is uncertain.*

Alternatives:

- 1) Allow current zoning to guide future use activities.
- 2) Recommend future reuse of institutional structures, if their current use leaves the area, that is compatible with surrounding use.
- 3) Allow reuse of the structure by another institutional use of a similar character.

Alternatives 2 and 3 are recommended. It is recognized that the plan cannot anticipate all land use changes or new uses which might involve the existing institutional structures. Making sure the new use is compatible with the surrounding uses will reduce potential conflicts arising from these changes.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

2. Recommended Land Use Plan

The land use plan, recommendations and criteria for future land use in Clifton neighborhood are presented in this section of the report. The land use plan consists of a set of guidelines and a map (Figure (I-F)). The guidelines contain the land use recommendations and the map shows specific locations these recommendations affect. The land use plan is the result of the problem identification and alternatives evaluation process conducted with the Clifton Plan Task Force and drawing on responses generated by the neighborhood nominal group. Recommendations addressing specific conditions found in Clifton based on the guidelines of the Comprehensive Plan are also incorporated in this plan. Site-specific recommendations (map and guidelines) represent the neighborhood's intent and prudent planning response at a given point in time. Changing conditions may affect the validity of these recommendations. Desirable future land use changes unforeseen by the planning process may be appropriate.

a. Land Use Guidelines

Appearances

1. Encourage a multiple faceted approach to dealing with the problems of litter, poorly kept properties and structures, vacant lots and vacant structures in the neighborhood. Encourage maintenance, occupancy of vacant structures, a trash receptacle program along Frankfort Avenue and observation of leash laws/animal control ordinances.
2. Establish a local historic preservation district and/or create a design overlay district to promote appropriate forms of renovation work or new construction in the Frankfort Avenue business corridor.
3. Minimize the extent of tree trimming by LG&E or replant the utility easements with trees that do not grow large enough to cause conflicts.
4. Enforce housing codes and ordinances on weeds, anti-litter laws, structural condition.
5. Prevent clear cutting vegetation on slopes along Brownsboro Road and elsewhere.

Commercial Development

6. Develop an effective business organization and strengthen cooperation between residents and businesses in the area.
7. Prepare a market profile for attracting quality restaurants to the area and a survey of vacant commercial structures to use in attracting new businesses to the area.
8. Develop a facade and streetscape improvement plan for the commercial strip along Frankfort Avenue. Encourage the restoration of historic structures utilizing tax incentives available to businesses.
9. Rezone areas currently zoned C-2 commercial to a lower intensity commercial district when the existing use activity does not require a C-2 classification, to minimize the potential for future "nuisance" uses.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Alternatives and Recommendations

2. Recommended Land Use Plan

Environment

10. Work with the Air Pollution Control District and businesses in the area to reduce air pollution. Consider possible air pollution impacts of future land use.
11. Develop a listing of drainage problem areas and work with Metropolitan Sewer District to solve those problems.
12. Educate the neighborhood about the building, housing and zoning codes and work to see that they are enforced better in the neighborhood.

Recreation

13. Increase the programs and facilities available at existing parks. Seek the use of the Kentucky School for the Blind facilities and Franklin School facilities for recreation; improve access to Cherokee Park. Retaining the vacant land along I-64 for open space and as possible access-way to Cherokee Park is encouraged.

Residential

14. Encourage residential rehabilitation through public programs, self-help efforts and rehabilitation training. Assist residents in making loan applications, in acquiring enterprise zone benefits in eligible areas, and in utilizing existing housing rehabilitation programs and the property tax assessment moratorium. Refer to Appendix II, Development Incentives.
15. Rezone existing single family, duplex and apartment areas to zoning districts which reflect their current developed density.

Social Environment

16. Develop additional block watch programs and relate concerns over criminal justice to elected officials.
17. Provide additional recreational, employment and social service opportunities for youth in the area.

Utilities

18. *Obtain additional street lights in areas where they are needed in the neighborhood.*
19. Document electrical service problems in the neighborhood and meet with LG&E to alleviate the problems.
20. Seek underground utilities when possible.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

This section of the Clifton Plan identifies available programs and actions necessary to implement the plan's recommendations. When possible, an estimate of costs associated with the implementation measure is included. All projects cannot be implemented immediately due to funding constraints and an extended period of time may be involved before they are completed. Some of the agencies noted as responsible for implementation and programs may change, however the report notes the resources, as they currently (mid 1989) exist.

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

a. The Role of Individuals in Implementing the Neighborhood Plan.

Efforts of Clifton residents are important to implementing the plan recommendations. Programs available to improve neighborhoods have limited funding resources. Further, the collective efforts of neighborhood residents through organizations such as the Clifton Community Council, the Clifton Community Council Business Group and churches can change overall environments in the neighborhood.

Clifton Property Owners

Property owners have a vested interest in the improvement of their property and its surroundings. Local government clean-up programs generally involve only the public right-of-way unless code violations occur on private property, a property owner failed to respond to citations and liens were placed on the property to recover costs of the clean-up. Property owners should take full responsibility for maintaining litter-free conditions on their properties and to the midpoint of streets and alleys. Unsafe sidewalk conditions, such as low limbs, sidewalk tripping hazards and overgrown sidewalks should be corrected by property owners. Loan money is available from the City of Louisville for sidewalk repair by homeowners, if a tripping hazard is cited. More detail is provided in Appendix II and in the transportation implementation section of this plan.

Other low cost activities that the individual property owner can undertake to improve the area include better yard and tree maintenance, including removal of dead trees or undesirable species (*Ailanthus* for example). Caution should be observed when trimming trees if electrical or other communication wiring is present and other utilities should be consulted before any digging is undertaken.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

Residential Rehabilitation

Another responsibility for individual property owners is maintenance of their structures and rehabilitation where conditions have deteriorated to the extent that simple maintenance will not suffice. A grant (the REHAB Incentive Program) targeted to low income persons living in older established neighborhoods such as Clifton will provide up to \$1,000 to assist in covering the cost of correcting cited exterior housing code violations. To be eligible a homeowner must live in the home and be in the "target" neighborhood (all of Clifton is included). Further, income guidelines apply and grant recipients must remain in the home for two years after its receipt. Appendix II provides greater detail about this program. It is administered by the City of Louisville Department of Inspections, Permits and Licenses.

These efforts by individual property owners will implement land use guidelines encouraging improved appearances in the neighborhood under guidelines 1 and 4 and residential rehabilitation under guideline 14.

b. Collective Actions By Neighborhood Residents

Clifton Community Council

The Clifton Community Council has taken an active role in the improvement of the Clifton neighborhood. The plan recommends strengthening membership and increasing involvement of business representatives.

Business Association

The Clifton Community Council Business Group has been established. Persons present at the early meetings have shown strong interest in the implementation of this plan's commercial development guidelines. The commercial corridors along Frankfort Avenue and Brownsboro Road are the facade that most outsiders passing through Clifton neighborhood see and is the basis for their image of the neighborhood. It is extremely important to the continued viability of the neighborhood that these commercial strips be attractive, landscaped, well maintained, and that structures remain occupied.

The Clifton Plan supports efforts to establish a working organization of neighborhood businesses. The recommendation for streetscape improvements along Frankfort Avenue needs the direct input and cooperation of businesses and property owners in the area. Commercial activity is enjoying a renaissance in the Frankfort Avenue area anchored by several exemplary historic restorations. Sharing insights gained by the businesses that performed the renovations with others in the area may help them decide to restore their property to original condition. Businesses could also work through the business group to improve the appearance of structures and to consult with the Clifton Community Council on problems and areas of mutual concern.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

b. Collective Actions By Neighborhood Residents

Institutions

Effective communication with the churches, schools and other institutions in the neighborhood will enable the Clifton Community Council to identify common interests and goals and more effectively allocate resources in pursuit of them. The local institutions may be able to facilitate the development of paid and volunteer social service activities for area youth by matching needs of area residents and businesses with young people seeking employment. Bulletin boards could post jobs and available employees or such information could be listed in newsletters and exchanged between groups. Further, institutions could sponsor and provide space for recreational activities for youth in the area.

The Clifton Community Council also needs to maintain close ties with elected officials and representatives of the public agencies that coordinate neighborhood revitalization efforts, infrastructure maintenance and zoning and code enforcement. The City of Louisville Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Neighborhood Services, operation Brightside, Inspections Permits and Licenses (building code and zoning enforcement) and Public Works all play key roles in the implementation of recommendations of the neighborhood plan. The joint City-County Office For Economic Development will play an important role in implementing the commercial corridor recommendations. Finally, the Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission will work to implement rezoning recommendations and see that future rezoning requests observe the intent of the plan.

The Clifton Community Council also needs to maintain communication links with the adjacent neighborhoods. Issues impacting multiple areas can be worked out through inter neighborhood task forces, shared meeting representation and newsletter exchanges. Clifton Community Council publishes a neighborhood newspaper that has 100% neighborhood coverage: residents, businesses and institutions. This should be continued on a regular basis and articles covering issues identified by the neighborhood plan guidelines included as regular columns.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

b. Collective Actions By Neighborhood Residents

Clifton Brightside/Clean Sweep

The need for a local effort that is patterned after the City of Louisville's Operation Brightside is evidenced by the magnitude of litter, poorly suited trees, and weeds present in the alleys and rear yards of many parts of the neighborhood. These conditions are not only a visual and aesthetic nuisance but also represent a violation of health and sanitation ordinances. Disorderly alleys and yard space become unusable for parking and access and undesirable for open space. Clifton is built in a fairly dense pattern of narrow lots. Parking space is in short supply and open space/yard space is limited and should not be compromised due to neglect.

Creating an organized group to work at cleaning up the neighborhood will facilitate the coordination of government support (provision of dumpsters, hauling junk cars, citing property owners that do not participate voluntarily and cleaning up such sites if, after citation, the owner still refuses to act) and will provide for the intensive effort needed initially in the Clifton neighborhood to gain the upper hand in dealing with the problem. After a sweep has been made of the entire area it should be possible to reduce the level of effort involved to an annual or semi-annual clean-up program.

The clean-up task force should include paid positions employing local youth, neighborhood volunteers, block area volunteers and a government liaison to provide guidance and support. As block areas are targeted contact should be made with each resident/property owner to tell them about the process and indicate the type of clean-up work that will be undertaken, seek their active involvement and see if they wish to be excluded from the effort. No private property should be accessed without the owner's permission and care should be taken in removing junk that may have "value" to the owner. It should be made apparent to the property owner that the neighborhood clean-up process is a voluntary "no cost" alternative to citation and mandatory clean-up if substandard conditions exist.

After the clean-up operation is completed in an area a followup effort to encourage maintenance, grass planting, fence reconstruction and landscape improvements should be made. If provision of a dumpster, alley reconstruction or other improvements is found to be necessary to minimize the potential for future reoccurrence, it should be undertaken.

Sources of funds for administering this program could come from existing youth employment programs, re-allocation of Department of Solid Waste Management and Services personnel, loaned Operation Brightside employees or employees using contributed funds from neighborhood sources.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

b. Collective Actions By Neighborhood Residents

Block Watch

Block Watch is a crime-fighting tool that informs residents who their neighbors are and encourages them to look out for each other. Residents organized at the block level for crime prevention purposes can also address other types of neighborhood issues. Block Watch can be used to improve grass roots organization of the neighborhood, especially in those portions of Clifton that have been less active in the Council. Once established, the Council should maintain close contact with them, to serve as a resource in dealing with block-level concerns, and to gain the assistance of the block clubs in implementing neighborhood programs. The Police Department provides a "starter kit" to help create the block watch, and will meet with each block one time. A similar operation for businesses called a Business Crime Watch is also available for fighting crime in the commercial areas of the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

c. Community Council Participation in Plan Implementation

The Clifton Community Council will play a key role in implementing the recommendations of the neighborhood plan and organizing the various groups necessary to implement recommendations. The Community Council can aid plan implementation in the following areas.

Plan Adoption

The first step toward plan implementation is the review of the draft plan by neighborhood and agency interests, revision as needed and adoption by the Louisville Board of Aldermen. The Neighborhood Services Department will be responsible for distribution of the draft when it is completed. Once the plan is adopted by the Board of Aldermen, it becomes a basis for seeking assistance with specific neighborhood improvement projects. The Council members should commit efforts to making sure this process is undertaken in a timely and thorough manner.

Design Overlay/Local Historic District Team

Guidelines for future land use in Clifton include recommendations for improving the quality of design, protecting historic resources, ensuring the compatibility of new construction in the Frankfort Avenue commercial area (Guidelines 2 and 8) and in maintaining the vegetation in utility easements and environmentally sensitive areas (Guidelines 3 and 5). The Clifton Community Council could further these objectives by organizing one or more design teams to establish standards that residents and businesses in the area can support. These groups could consist of volunteers from the neighborhood with design expertise or loaned experts from schools or government agencies. The group would develop the review procedures to ensure new development meets the guidelines created for areas affected by the overlay or historic district designation. This review could include exterior finishes, landscaping and parking arrangement. Core development of the program may require paid professional assistance. Funding could be sought through contributions from area business persons or from the City of Louisville. The Landmarks Commission, Planning Commission and possibly a private consultant will be involved in implementing this proposal.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

c. Community Council Participation in Plan Implementation

Zoning, Building Code and Land Use Committee

The Community Council's existing Zoning Committee has monitored zoning and land use issues for the neighborhood. The Committee should continue to watch these actions. Volunteers with expertise in zoning should continue to meet and to review any requests for zoning changes, and be alert to possible violations of the zoning regulations (Guidelines 10 and 12). The limited number of zoning enforcement officers in the city means that assistance from neighborhood people is essential. The process of carrying out the zoning changes proposed in this plan will require a significant effort by the Community Council to present the rezoning proposal and develop consensus among area residents. This process will help develop expertise in zoning matters among Council members.

As noted in the section title, the neighborhood plan recommends that the responsibility of this committee be expanded or a separate committee established to address problems with building code violations that may occur in the neighborhood. The need for an informed group of individuals parallels the reasons presented for the continued existence of the zoning committee.

Both of these groups should report actions in the neighborhood newsletter and provide a question and answer service column. Questions that the group cannot answer could be referred to the appropriate agencies for interpretations.

Business Association

The Clifton Community Council can assist in organizing area businesses. Currently the organization is working as the "Council Business Group". This incorporation into the Community Council may continue in the future or a separate group may evolve. Residents of the neighborhood should speak to the managers of businesses they frequent in the area and encourage their participation in the association.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

1. The Neighborhood Residents' Role

c. Community Council Participation in Plan Implementation

Recreation and Open Space Improvements

The Community Council could also take responsibility for implementing the open-space and recreation recommendations of the neighborhood plan (Guideline 13) and for protecting other natural areas from adverse development (guidelines 3 and 5). A walkway system should be developed that feeds into the large area along I-64 that is recommended for preservation as open space. The Council should contact the State Highway Department about Metro Parks acquisition of their property along I-64 through purchase or donation. This area should be integrated as an extension of Cherokee and Seneca Parks. (Similar treatment could be developed for the property along the southwest side of I-64 bordering Beargrass Creek). Metro Parks would be the likely party responsible for establishing and maintaining walkways. They could utilize a summer youth employment program to actually build and maintain the facility. Metro Parks has indicated that any expansion of park land will require budgetary adjustment. Refer to Appendix IV, Metro Parks letter from Bob Kirchdorfer.

Youth Activities

The Community Council could work as coordinator for the development of employment, volunteer work and recreational opportunities for the area's youth. This could be coordinated with schools, churches, the Kentucky School for the Blind and Metro Parks. The Community Council could, for example, prepare a survey of youth needing jobs or create a sign-up list to determine the number of persons and the types of work they can handle or would like to perform. They could then advertise the availability of the work force in the newsletter and work through responses from this and the institutions to match youth with jobs. Other, less formal ways of coordinating jobs and youths could also be developed. The neighborhood clean-up campaign could provide some jobs.

Creating recreational opportunities (youth dances, outings, sports leagues etc.) can be coordinated in a similar manner. The Community Council could survey young people about what they want to do and then work with the institutions and Metro Parks to provide these opportunities.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

2. Zoning Changes

A zoning change concept for the Clifton neighborhood has been prepared as part of the neighborhood plan. Much of the residential area of the neighborhood and some of the commercially zoned areas would be rezoned under this proposal. Zoning change would promote implementation of many of the plan's recommendations. The rezoning proposals are shown on Figure I-G and are discussed in the following sections. These are only to be considered as possible zoning changes that reflect the intent of the neighborhood plan. Comments received concerning the proposals will be used to develop an actual zoning change proposal for the neighborhood after the plan has been adopted. The rezoning implementation is a separate process that will cost an estimated \$5,000. These funds will be used to prepare the rezoning application, the zoning change staff report, identification and notification of affected property owners. The Clifton Community Council worked with the Board of Aldermen to arrange the funding to carry out zoning changes as part of the planning process for the neighborhood.

Owners of property proposed for rezoning will be notified by mail, signs posted at the property and by a legal advertisement. An informational meeting will be held to present the proposal to the neighborhood and to solicit comments before the public hearing held by the Planning Commission. The proposed rezoning and any modification will, if approved by the Planning Commission, go to the Louisville Board of Aldermen for approval.

The effectiveness of zoning depends on the quality of its administration. Enforcement today hinges on reporting of violations by concerned citizens. The Council's subcommittee on zoning can take a strong role in seeing that zoning violations are reported and dealt with in a timely manner.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

2. Zoning Changes

a. Lower Density Residential Zoning

The most extensive zoning change considered in the Clifton Plan would lower the permissible densities, and replace much of the apartment zoning in the area with single family zoning. These changes would reflect the plan's recommendation to rezone the area to reflect its current use activity and density (Guideline 15) and by stabilizing the potential residential density, provide support for individual rehabilitation efforts (Guideline 14).

The rezoning proposals shown on Figure I-G reflect the lowest zoning classification consistent with the predominant existing residential use. Areas zoned for apartment use predominantly used for single family purposes with densities below 7.3 units per acre are recommended for a single family zoning classification. Single family areas, currently zoned for apartment use with over 7.3 units per acre, are recommended for rezoning to a lower density apartment district that would strongly limit the potential for construction of additional units.

It should be noted that the zoning change concept shown on Figure I-G is based on the review of field survey and published directories as to the existence of apartments in residential structures. Nevertheless, there may be inaccuracies in the existing land use map, because of the difficulty of distinguishing homes that are single family from those converted to apartment use. The neighborhood review process should help identify any errors present. Evidence of errors in land uses presented at the eventual rezoning of the neighborhood will also be taken into account and corrected.

b. Reduction of Commercial Zoning

The Clifton Neighborhood Plan recommends rezoning commercial uses to a lower intensity commercial district when the existing use activity does not require a higher commercial zoning classification (Guideline 9). Existing residential areas are recommended for rezoning to zoning districts which reflect their current developed density (Guideline 15). To achieve these recommendations the rezoning concept suggests changing zoning in the Frankfort Avenue corridor between Mellwood Avenue and State Street from C-2 to C-1 and from C-2 to R-5A in the residential areas. Brief descriptions of the uses allowed in these zones are shown in Figure I-C. Between Bellaire Avenue and Ewing Avenue along Frankfort Avenue the plan recommendations include numerous rezoning proposals from C-2 Commercial to C-1 and various single family and apartment districts that reflect current use activity. The south block face of Brownsboro Rd between William St and State St (with the exception of the corner lot at William Street) is recommended for rezoning from C-1 to R-6 and R-5A apartment districts reflecting the existing density of the residential development in this area.

c. Rezoning to Protect Natural Areas

The strip of vacant land fronting along I-64 between Payne St and Grinstead Ave is recommended for future use as open space and is recommended for rezoning from R-6 Apartment to R-1 (the classification typically applied to park facilities). The R-6 zoning in the Clifton minipark and the C-1 zoning in the Bingham mini-park are recommended for rezoning to R-1, low density single family zoning also.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

3. Frankfort Avenue Commercial Area Improvements

The recommendations in this section of the plan will depend heavily on the existence of a strong neighborhood business organization. A commitment from a majority of the business owners in the area is needed to be successful. Guidelines 1, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 16 are involved.

a. Market Profile

The business association should seek professional assistance in developing a market profile of sales potential represented by the area's residents, an inventory of available commercial space, and commercial needs in the neighborhood. This information could help to attract new business (quality restaurants are desired) to vacant or underutilized structures in the neighborhood. A realty section of the business association could work with area realtors to market vacant and underutilized structures and, if it becomes known that a business is leaving the area, work to see that the structure is reoccupied as soon as possible. The Office for Economic Development could provide the expertise needed for preparing the market profile or a consultant could be employed.

The realty section should also informally police vacant structures on a regular basis to make sure that weeds, litter or vandalism are not going unchecked by the property owners. A business block watch program is suggested in earlier sections that might also incorporate this activity.

b. Streetscape and Facade Plan for Frankfort Avenue

A streetscape improvement plan that addresses sidewalks, curbing, parking, alleys, signage, lighting, location and character of landscaping and utility treatment in the Frankfort Avenue commercial corridor should be prepared. This will depend strongly on consensus being reached by the businesses involved about the type of improvements they will support and, eventually bear much of the responsibility for installing. A design overlay or local historic district designation could provide a mechanism for implementing a review procedure and setting design and facade standards in the corridor.

It is important that the business organization become strongly established and attempt smaller projects before attempting to undertake the overall corridor improvement program. The group should establish its ability to accomplish tasks with less controversial projects such as a trash receptacle program or the block watch program. Such programs will provide an environment where business persons can meet each other and develop the organization without the level of controversy that a design plan is likely to generate.

The eventual development of the plan can be performed by an architect, landscape architect, or possibly by the non-profit Louisville Community Design Center. Other alternatives for generating ideas include sponsoring a design competition or contacting one or more of the area schools of architecture (UK, UC, Ball State, or Notre Dame) for student project studies. The latter would generate varied ideas that the business group could select from to generate a recommendation.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

3. Frankfort Avenue Commercial Area Improvements

c. Screening of Commercial Uses

Landscaping and fencing are recommended to screen unattractive commercial uses and parking lots from homes located along Frankfort Avenue and Brownsboro Road. The landscape ordinance (Article 12 of the Zoning District Regulations) requires screening for new or expanded commercial use activities. A voluntary program is also recommended. The business association should encourage members to provide screening independently or as part of a coordinated package of alley improvements. A cooperative effort involving the individual property owners could provide screening at very low cost. A joint purchasing arrangement could reduce the cost of buying fences and landscape material. Similarly, competitive bids could be sought for installation of screening and plants. The creation of defined boundaries between residential and commercial areas also provides for better security.

d. Community Review of Commercial Development

Review of commercial development is encouraged, to promote compatibility between businesses and homes. The design overlay district or local historic preservation district are two ways to achieve this objective. As an alternative to regulatory controls, the local business association could encourage commercial uses to present their proposed developments to the neighborhood on a voluntary basis. A design overlay is essentially applied through a rezoning process with action by the Planning Commission to create and apply the district and approval by the Board of Aldermen is required for each action. The local historic preservation district would only require Board of Aldermen approval.

e. Tax Credits

There are financial incentives available for the substantial rehabilitation of income-producing properties in the Clifton National Register District (see Figure I-1). A tax credit is available, provided the improvements meet federal standards. The business association and Clifton Community Council should work with the Landmarks Commission, to ensure that businesses are aware of this program offered by the federal government. A letter to business owners or a meeting to explain the process should be considered.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

4. Preserving Neighborhood Resources

The Clifton Neighborhood Plan seeks to preserve those aspects of the neighborhood that are unique to its identity; open space, historic architecture, brick streets and environmentally sensitive areas (Guidelines 2, 3, 5, 8, 13 and 14).

a. Protection of Historic Structures

The plan recommends that the Clifton neighborhood consider creating a local Historic-Preservation District or a design review overlay district to protect the architectural resources in the commercial area along Frankfort Avenue. Continued publicity about the historic character of the neighborhood and illustrative examples of maintained or restored historic architecture in the area, contrasted with structures that have not been maintained; provides another mechanism for encouraging restoration. Slide lectures on Clifton generated by the City of Louisville Landmarks Commission staff are excellent teaching tools about the impacts and importance of historic preservation.

Tax credits are not available for owner occupied residential restoration at this time but they do still exist for commercial or rental residential (income producing) structures. The Landmarks Commission is the primary source of information on tax credit programs available from the federal government.

If a local Historic Preservation District or design review overlay district is enacted for the Frankfort Avenue commercial corridor, proposed exterior changes such as repairs, additions, new construction and demolition would be reviewed by a local architectural review committee and the Landmarks Commission.

A related issue in the neighborhood is the preservation of the remaining **brick streets** and alleys that enhance the historic character of the neighborhood. They should be restored by utility companies when disturbed during the installation and repair of underground utilities.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

4. Preserving Neighborhood Resources

b. Protection of Open Spaces

The existing open space and quarry cliffs along I-64 between Payne Street and Grinstead Drive are an important resource and are recommended for preservation as an extension of the Cherokee/Seneca park system. Similar treatment is also recommended for the Beargrass Creek and bikeway corridor along the west side of I-64 (outside the neighborhood). These areas are isolated by the cliffs and I-64 and impacted by some flooding. While not pristine areas of vegetation, they do represent significant examples of regenerative growth. A walkway facility through the open space corridor and sidewalks connecting it with the neighborhood is suggested. This walkway would parallel the successful bikeway facility on the west side of I-64. Metro Parks has indicated that any expansion of park land will require budgetary adjustment. Refer to Appendix IV, Metro Parks letter from Bob Kirchdorfer.

The vacant land along I-64 is currently owned by a number of different persons and organizations. The largest landowner however, is the Kentucky Department of Transportation. The rezoning proposal for this area suggests that it be rezoned from R-6 Apartment to R-1 low density single family use (a district generally applied to park facilities). Federal controls exist over use of the vacant land due to its acquisition for highway beautification.

c. Environmentally Sensitive Areas

The plan recommends the creation of a landscape buffer Development Review Overlay (DRO) to protect the steep slopes and vegetation along the south side of Brownsboro Road between North Clifton and State Street. Development in the overlay area would be subject to review for the impacts on existing vegetation, slopes, drainage and erosion if this were adopted. The Louisville and Jefferson County Planning Commission and Louisville Board of Aldermen would need to modify existing DRO legislation before this could be applied, possibly as part of the areawide rezoning of the neighborhood.

d. Air Pollution Problems

The neighborhood plan recommends that the Clifton Community Council and Business Group meet and discuss air pollution problems and then meet with representatives of the Air Pollution Control District of Jefferson County to address any problems not satisfactorily dealt with through the meetings. This will implement guideline 10. Air Pollution Control District makes specific comments about controlling air pollution from future development in the Clifton Neighborhood. Refer to Appendix IV letter from John Bartles.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Implementation

5. Utilities

The neighborhood listed problems with the provision, adequacy and responsiveness of three public utilities. The provision of better services will require the Community Council and residents of the neighborhood to meet with or present their problems to the service provider.

a. Electrical Services

Two problems exist in the neighborhood. Trimming of trees has destroyed numerous trees and residents feel that it has been excessive. The Community Council should relate their concerns about maintenance of trees in the area to Louisville Gas & Electric. If trimming cannot be limited then perhaps smaller trees could be planted to avoid conflicts or, particularly in the Frankfort Avenue commercial strip and new developments, the electrical services could be placed underground or within the railroad corridor. This could be coordinated with Louisville Gas & Electric as part of the streetscape improvement plan for Frankfort Avenue. LG&E does not remove the stumps of trees they remove, nor do they provide new trees to replace them. LG&E does suggest proper planting locations and tree species to avoid future problems. Part of their booklet is reproduced in Appendix II.

The second electrical service problem involves frequent power interruptions that occur in the area south of Frankfort Avenue.

Louisville Gas and Electric Company is upgrading the system and developing safe-guards that should reduce this problem. Refer to August 18, 1989 letter from George R. Siemens, Jr. in Appendix IV.

b. Drainage Problems

Figure I-J shows the locations where standing water has been a problem in the neighborhood. This information was forwarded to the Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD). MSD indicated that additional responsibility for drainage improvements lie with the Kentucky Department of Transportation, Metro Parks and the City Public Works Department. Refer to Appendix IV, MSD letter from Bruce Seigle.

c. Street Lights

The individual residents of the neighborhood are responsible for obtaining a petition for the installation of a street light from the City of Louisville Department of Public Works and collecting supporting signatures by their neighbors. The Public Works staff will review the request and install lights as they find necessary.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Priorities

This section of the Clifton neighborhood plan prioritizes the land use guidelines developed in Section I-D. Recommended land use guidelines have been placed in one of four classifications: highest priority, high, medium or low priority. These classifications indicate the relative importance the Clifton Task Force assigns each of the recommendations of the land use plan.

The priority list is based, in part, on the costs of implementing guidelines, the availability of funds targeted to specific activities, and the critical nature of some of the problems addressed. Activities that the individual or neighborhood council can initiate with relatively low funding are often given high priority while others focus on specific programs that include more expensive projects.

In the future funding sources will change, tasks will be completed and problems will be solved in the neighborhood. The Clifton Council may wish to re-evaluate the priority list and add new items to be addressed on a periodic basis to reflect the changes that occur.

The following table presents the recommendations prioritized by the Task Force in March and April of 1989. Plan recommendations were prioritized rather than implementation measures. Implementation measures will change with programs, agency consolidations, changes in the conditions warranting the implementation measures and new techniques for addressing implementation.

Land Use Guidelines

Implementation Measures

(Highest Priority)

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 6. | Develop an effective business organization and strengthen cooperation between residents and businesses in the area. | |
| | D.1, D.3 | |
| 7. | Prepare a market profile for attracting quality restaurants to the area and a survey of vacant commercial structures to use in attracting new businesses to the area. | D.3 |
| | 17. Provide additional recreational, employment and social service opportunities for youth in the area. | D.1, |
| | | D.4 |
| 9. | Rezone areas currently zoned C-2 Commercial to a lower intensity commercial district when the existing use activity does not require a C-2 classification to minimize the potential for future nuisance uses permitted. | D.1, D.2 |
| 15. | Rezone existing single family, duplex and apartment areas to zoning districts which reflect their current developed density. | D. 2 |
| 4. | Enforce ordinances on weeds, antilitter laws, structural condition and housing codes. | D.1 |

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Priorities

(High Priority)

18. Obtain additional street lights in areas where they are needed in the neighborhood. D.5
3. Minimize the extent of tree trimming by LG&E or replant the utility easements with trees that do not grow large enough to cause conflicts. D.5
8. Develop a facade and streetscape improvement plan for the commercial strip along Frankfort Avenue. Encourage the restoration of historic structures utilizing tax incentives available to businesses. D.1, D.3
1. Encourage a multiple faceted approach to dealing with the problems of litter, poorly kept properties and structures, vacant lots and vacant structures in the residential areas of the neighborhood. D.1
12. Educate the neighborhood about the building and zoning codes and work to see that they are enforced better in the neighborhood. D.1

(Medium Priority)

11. Develop a listing of drainage problem areas and work with Metropolitan Sewer District to solve those problems. D.5
10. Work with the Air Pollution Control District and businesses in the area to reduce air pollution. Consider possible air pollution impacts of future land use. D.4
16. Develop additional block watch programs and relate concerns over criminal justice to elected officials. D.1
19. Document electrical service problems in the neighborhood and meet with LG&E to alleviate the problems. D.5
14. Encourage residential rehabilitation through public programs, self help effort and rehabilitation training. Assistance in making loan applications, in acquiring enterprise zone benefits in eligible areas, and in utilizing existing housing rehabilitation programs should be provided to area residents. D.1
13. Add park programs and facilities in the existing parks. Seek the use of the Kentucky School for the Blind and Franklin School facilities for recreation and improve access to Cherokee Park. Retaining the vacant land along I-64 for open space and as possible access-way to Cherokee Park is encouraged. D.1, D.4

(Low Priority)

9. Prevent vegetation from being cleared from the slopes along Brownsboro Road and elsewhere. D.4
2. Establish a local the historic preservation district and/or create a design overlay district to suggest appropriate forms of renovation work or new construction in the Frankfort Avenue commercial corridor. D.4
20. Seek underground utilities when possible. D.5

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

1. Summary of Findings

- Clifton's neighborhood identity is strongly defined by the major transportation routes that border and bisect the area, Brownsboro Road, Frankfort Avenue and I-64.
- Traffic capacities of the major streets and intersections are adequate throughout most of the area. Only one intersection had an unacceptable level of service (Brownsboro Road and Ewing Avenue).
- Sidewalks are in need of maintenance and repair in many areas of the neighborhood. They are lacking in some parts of the neighborhood.
- Narrow streets and on-street parking slow traffic in many of the residential areas. This is viewed somewhat positively by residents, as speeding is discouraged.
- Truck traffic is a problem on some of the residential streets.
- Brick streets and stone curbs are being lost through repavings and underground utility work that does not replace the original materials or destroys them.
- Special pedestrian facilities to serve the needs of the blind and visually impaired residents of the neighborhood are needed. Routine maintenance of these facilities is also needed.

2. Existing Conditions

a. Roadways

Clifton's street system is defined by two radial, major arterial streets that essentially begin their outward journey from Louisville's Downtown to its eastern suburbs in the Clifton neighborhood. The construction of I-71 and I-64 has diverted some through traffic from the area but both Frankfort Avenue and Brownsboro Road still serve as important transportation routes. Most of the balance of the streets, running north and south, are residential streets serving the homes that line them.

The "**functional classification**" of streets identifies the role of each street within the roadway network. The roadway network and functional classification based on Core Graphic 13 of the Comprehensive Plan are shown on Figure II-A. The highest functional classification "**expressway**" applies only to I-64, which borders the neighborhood on the south side and has interchanges at the western and eastern corners of the neighborhood. An expressway carries high volume, high speed traffic and provides regional accessibility. The interchange at Mellwood Avenue is split allowing I-64 eastbound traffic to access the expressway and I-64 westbound to exit onto Mellwood Avenue. Story Avenue has the balance of this interchange. Mellwood and Story Avenues are both one way streets forming a "**one-way couple**". This creates an island of land bounded by Story Avenue, Spring Streets, Mellwood Avenue and Frankfort Avenue, just outside Clifton neighborhood, that traffic must circle when entering or exiting the expressway.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

"**Major arterials**" link major activity centers (employment, shopping, suburbs) within a metropolitan area and provide access to higher and lower function classifications. In Louisville the speed limit is generally set at 35 miles per hour on an urban arterial. Brownsboro Road, Frankfort Avenue and one-way (north) Mellwood Avenue are the major arterials within the Clifton Neighborhood. Story Avenue is paired with Mellwood Avenue as a southbound major arterial outside the neighborhood.

There is one "**minor arterial**" in the Clifton neighborhood, Grinstead Drive. Minor arterials serve as links between expressways, major arterials and collectors. The speed limit is set at 35 miles per hour on this section of Grinstead Drive.

There is also only one "**collector**" street in Clifton: Payne Street (and that portion of Ewing connecting Payne Street with Frankfort Avenue). Collectors generally provide for internal movement within neighborhoods or as access to more heavily traveled facilities.

The remaining streets within the Clifton neighborhood are classified as **local** streets. They serve as primary access to residences from streets of higher functional classifications. Many of the local streets in Clifton date from the nineteenth century. Some were never built or have been abandoned, but they still exist as platted roads because they have not been officially "**closed**". These routes are shown shaded on figure II-1. Narrow local street pavement widths are a problem in several parts of the neighborhood.

b. Traffic Volumes

Average daily traffic (ADT) is the volume, or amount, of traffic passing by a designated point on an average day. ADT's represent adjustments of actual counts to allow for statistically determined variations in actual counts due to day of week, time of day, and month. I-64 carries the highest volume of traffic of streets in the study area with 1985 and 1987 ADT's of between 50,000 and 57,000 vehicles at the east and west ends of the neighborhood. Figure II-B identifies the ADT's for selected routes in the Clifton area and the year of survey.

The highest traffic volumes on surface streets in the neighborhood are found on Brownsboro Road (10,000 to 00,500 ADT at the west and east ends of the neighborhood), Mellwood Avenue (7,400 to 12,200 ADT) and Frankfort Avenue (10,000 to 10,400 ADT at the east and west ends of the neighborhood). Parking is allowed, with directional peak hour prohibitions in some areas, along Frankfort Avenue. Only the portion of Brownsboro Road west of State Street allows parking during off peak hours. The balance of Brownsboro Road prohibits parking.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

c. Public Transportation

Public transportation in the study area is provided by the Transit Authority of River City (TARC). There are five routes with direct service to the area and two express routes, without stops, that pass the area on I-64.

They are as follows:

Market Street	(Route No. 15)
Muhammad Ali Boulevard	(Route No. 19)
Oak Street	(Route No. 25)
Middletown	(Route No. 31 express on certain trips)
River Road	(Route No. 59)
Breckenridge Express	(Route No. 53)
Plainview Express	(Route No. 61)

The location of these TARC routes within Clifton neighborhood are shown on Figure II-C, "Bike Routes and TARC Routes".

TARC routes are categorized according to function and general area served. The Market Street, Muhammad Ali Boulevard and Middletown routes are considered radial routes. River Road is a secondary radial route that connects the northeast area of Jefferson County to other parts of the City of Louisville utilizing other bus routes. Its western terminal is at Brownsboro Road and Mellwood Avenue. The Oak Street route is circumferential route that connects the study area with St. Matthews in the east and central Louisville in the west. The Breckenridge Express and Plainview Express routes bypass the neighborhood. Express routes provide limited trips from one area of the city or county to another with limited stops at either end of the route. The Middletown route has express service during certain peak hours but functions as a regular radial route otherwise.

Four of the five routes providing service to the neighborhood have buses running seven days a week. The River Road route only involves two morning and one evening eastbound and westbound trips during the week. No service is available on weekends. The Middletown route bypasses the Clifton neighborhood during peak hour express service.

Wheelchair lifts are available in selected TARC bus trips along the Market Street, Oak Street and Muhammad Ali Boulevard routes. Kneeling buses are provided on routes throughout the TARC system on a random basis. These buses feature an air powered device which lowers entrance steps, making the coach more accessible to the elderly and physically handicapped who can walk.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

An additional public transportation service that TARC makes available to the elderly and handicapped is **TARCLIFT**. This service is provided for regular subscribers to the service and to those making advance call-in requests. The regular subscription is geared to meeting the routine needs of work or school trips. It operates Monday through Friday from 6:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. A person wishing to use this service sets up a regular pick-up and delivery schedule with TARC and must use the service at least three days a week.

The "**advance call-in**" service, offered by TARC, operates on a demand-response basis. Buses operate from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Tuesday and Thursday. Weekend service is also available from 11:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday and from 7:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. on Sundays. Reservations for transportation services are taken one week in advance by TARC. Generally, medical/rehabilitation trips take first priority. Shopping or recreation trips are fulfilled after priority trips are accommodated.

In addition to TARC's special handicapped service, the **WHEELS** program sponsored by the American Red Cross provides transportation services for the elderly and handicapped. The program consists of the use of several vehicles to provide access to nutrition, medical and social centers. Although there are some set routes used by the WHEELS program, schedule times and routes are generally determined by the number of people traveling to each location on a particular day. Individuals wishing to use the service are requested to schedule needed services at least five days in advance.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

d. Goods Movement

Trucks. Traffic count data developed for the "1982 Vehicle Classification and Occupancy Survey: Louisville Urban Area" shows that Clifton neighborhood has significantly lower amounts of truck traffic than the city as a whole. Three percent of the vehicles on Brownsboro and Frankfort were found to be heavy trucks by the traffic counts, while the city average for major arterials was 7.5%. On Mellwood Avenue truck traffic was a slightly higher 4.1% of the vehicles, reflecting the proximity of the Interstate 64 interchange and industrial activity.

Rail. CSX Railroad (formerly the Louisville and Nashville Railroad) operates a Class 1 single line track through the study area on the north side of Frankfort Avenue. A Class 1 railroad carrier is one which receives fifty million dollars or more in annual gross receipts from rail operations.

The rail line is functionally classified as an "**interstate mainline**" and has a traffic density of 17.4 million annual gross ton-miles per mile according to the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet's 1983 Rail Transportation in Kentucky Report. The maximum speed for the twelve miles of mainline between Louisville and Anchorage is 50 miles per hour, but the average speed is 25 miles per hour through the study area. The tracks presently carry ten trains a day, five in either direction, according to Seaboard Systems.

There are four at **grade crossings** within the study area, and all of these have automatic warning devices (flashing lights and signal bells) with gates. Railroad crossings and the markings/warning devices are shown in Figure II-D "Traffic Control Devices".

Within the study area there is one **grade-separated crossing**: the crossing at Pope Street. According to Seaboard Systems the average length of time that intersections are blocked by train traffic is 8-10 minutes, with the maximum delay being approximately 15 minutes. The trains cause intermittent traffic delays for north-south traffic within the study area, and the east-west commuter traffic where the tracks cross Frankfort Avenue. The grade-separated crossing at Pope Street places additional traffic on Pope Street and raises concern over the narrow pavement widths particularly for emergency vehicle access. The street is 30 feet wide in this area with parking on both sides. Traffic from opposing directions cannot pass freely.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

e. Sidewalk and Pedestrian Facilities

Sidewalk and street crossing aids should ideally be provided to ensure safe pedestrian access to and from centers of activity. For Clifton neighborhood, the large number of blind and visually impaired persons in the neighborhood create special demands for quality pedestrian facilities and unique devices to aid in crossing streets. Figure II-E shows the location of sidewalks and walk/wait signals in Clifton. Most areas have facilities but there are shortcomings in the availability and quality of the facilities.

f. Bikeways

The study area is served by an officially designated and marked **bicycle route**. The bicycle route serving the study area is part of a larger bikeway system serving most of the city. The bikeway system, including the portion in the study area, was established in 1977 with the adoption of the bikeway plan by the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA). There is a Class III bike route in Clifton. Cyclists using these routes share the roadway directly with the motorist; streets with bikeway facilities are marked by signs. Only streets with sufficient roadway widths, low traffic volumes, low speed limits and continuity with the bike route system are selected. Roadways that are part of the Class III bike route include Payne Street, Ewing Avenue and the alley south of Frankfort Avenue.

A second bike route serving Clifton connects with the Payne Street route at Spring Street and goes from Downtown to Cherokee Park. This is a Class I and Class II facility; portions of this bike route are an independent pathway, away from streets; other segments occupy part of the street, identified by striping. Refer to Figure II-C for the location of bike routes.

g. Parking Facilities

Parking facilities are an important part of a neighborhood's transportation system. Properly designed off-street parking in adequate amounts ensure traffic flows will not be disrupted by ingress and egress or parallel parking on-street. On-street parking continues to play an important role for the older residential areas of Clifton and for the Frankfort Avenue commercial strip. Small lot sizes in the older residential areas, a lack of usable alleys and narrow side yards result in many homes in the area utilizing on-street parking. The problems of on-street parking are intensified in areas where duplexes and multi-family units exist, off-street parking is not available and pavement widths are inadequate.

Commercial uses along Frankfort Avenue depend on on-street parking. The on-street parking may interrupt traffic flows as automobiles enter and leave parking spaces. Parking along Mellwood Avenue and Brownsboro Road west of Drescher Bridge Avenue similarly impacts traffic flows.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

3. Analysis of Existing Conditions

a. Roadways

Surface streets in Clifton experience some peak hour congestion primarily along Frankfort Avenue and Brownsboro Road and intersections with Ewing and Mellwood Avenue. A level of service analysis* of six intersections was prepared by engineering staff of the Louisville Department of Public Works. It found the worst conditions ("F" level of service) occurred during peak hours at the Brownsboro Rd and Ewing Ave intersection, where delays average as high as 68.8 seconds per vehicle. Brownsboro Road and Mellwood Avenue intersection had a "D" level of service rating and much lower (27.9 second) average vehicular delays. Tables II-LA and 1B summarize the level of service found at the two unsignalized and four signalized intersections studied by the Works Department. A more detailed discussion of intersections is provided in part b) "Level of Service".

*Level of Service (LOS) is defined by average delay, i.e., LOS "D" = 25.1 to 40.0 seconds, LOS "E" = 40.1 to 60 seconds and LOS "F" = greater than 60 seconds.

A more common problem affecting traffic flow in Clifton neighborhood is **narrow pavement width**. The development of much of the western part of the neighborhood predates the automobile. Other areas do not have alleys that might provide rear lot access for parking and distances between structures generally do not allow for side yard parking. Pavement widths less than 36 feet create difficulties for vehicles to pass freely with parking on both sides. Figure II-F shows pavement width and highlights the location of streets with pavement widths of 36 feet and below. Thirty feet is the minimum width required for accommodating two-way traffic with one lane of parking.

Creating one-way streets, widening existing pavements and parking prohibitions are three ways the narrow streets can be dealt with. In many cases the right-of-way exists for a somewhat wider pavement but such construction would remove sidewalks, narrow lot sizes further, remove mature trees and likely be very unpopular among affected residents. on-street parking is very much in demand in the residential areas. Lot sizes and configurations do not provide many on-site alternatives for parking and thus residents are also likely to oppose reducing existing on-street parking areas. Creating one-way streets may also create flow disruptions that make it undesirable to residents but it seems the least offensive of the three alternatives.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

Accidents. The City of Louisville Police Department provided information to the City of Louisville Department of Public Works on all accidents that occurred in the Clifton neighborhood during the last two years. Six locations had 10 or more accidents occurring during 1987 and 1988. They are shown in Table II-3. The highest number of accidents occurred at the intersections of Frankfort and Mellwood Avenues (27) and Brownsboro Road and Mellwood Avenue (23). When adjusted for traffic volumes the intersection with the highest "accident rate" (see Table II-3 for an explanation) was at Frankfort Avenue and Pope Street, an unsignalized intersection.

(Note the City of Louisville Department of Public Works will suggest physical improvements which can be made at these intersections).

b. Level of Service

A street intersection can be rated in terms of how well that intersection handles the traffic flow. The level of service ratings range from "A" to "F". Rating "A" implies free flowing traffic conditions. Ratings "A" and "B" indicate generally good traffic flow with capacity to handle additional vehicles. Intersections with a rating of "C" experience acceptable delays. Rating "D" indicates almost unstable flow, although delays are tolerable. Rating "E" implies substantial congestion with traffic making frequent stops and starts. Rating "F" indicates traffic is backed up or jammed during peak traffic periods. Table II-1 shows the peak hour level of service for key intersections in the Clifton neighborhood.

Summary

Only the Brownsboro Road and Ewing Avenue intersection had an unacceptable level of service (LOS). This intersection had an LOS of "F" for P.M. peak hour volumes. The Brownsboro Road and Mellwood Avenue intersection had a "D" LOS for the peak hour. Level of service was also analyzed for unsignalized intersections at the Frankfort Avenue and Pope Street, and Ewing Avenue and Payne Streets* The worst LOS found at the unsignalized intersection was southbound Pope Street, which was found to be LOS "D". A more detailed examination of problems specific to the Brownsboro Road and Ewing Avenue intersection is provided below. The southbound approach to the Frankfort and Ewing Avenues intersection on Ewing did have an "F" LOS due to the rail crossing but the overall intersection functioned at "C" LOS. However, overall the street system functions very well in the Clifton area.

*For unsignalized intersections, LOS is determined for each directional movement but not for the intersection as a whole. Table II-1 shows these results.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

Brownsboro Road and Ewing Avenue Intersection

Capacity analysis to determine level of service indicates that this intersection operates at a LOS "F" during the evening peak hour. This is a "worst case" modeling of conditions at the intersection and gives emphasis to problems experienced by eastbound Brownsboro Road left turns due to the absence of an exclusive left turn arrow in the signal sequence. However, a left turn to the portion of Ewing Avenue north of Brownsboro Road provides access only to a dead-end stub into a small commercial area for which limited need is apparent. The traffic volumes used in the model for the peak hour traffic indicated 1,283 through vehicles eastbound on Brownsboro Road, 112 right turns and only six (6) left turns.

In addition to level of service problems, some intersections experience **inadequate sight distances** that create driving hazards. A specific example is the Pope Street and Frankfort Avenue intersection. Cars parked along Frankfort limit visibility for vehicles coming northbound on Pope Street. A possible way suggested to improve safety at this location is providing a signal or perhaps limiting some of the parking areas. North Jane Street at Brownsboro Road is another problem area for sight distances. The incline of the road and shrubs along Brownsboro Road and the slightly off-set opposing intersection of Mount Holly Avenue add to the confusion at this intersection. A third area where sight distance problems occur is the intersection of Pope Street with the alley next to the railroad. The railroad overpass and curve in Pope Street make it very difficult for drivers vehicles coming out of the alley to see northbound traffic on Pope Street.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

TABLE II-1: ANALYSIS OF KEY INTERSECTIONS
(Level of Service)

A. Signalized Intersections

Signalized Intersection	Signal Type (Sec.)	Cycle Length	Approach	LOS By Approach	Inter-section Delay (Sec.)	Inter-section LOS
Brownsboro & Ewing	Actuated	59	EB WB NB SB	F D C B	68.8	F
Brownsboro & Mellwood	Actuated	78	WB NB SB	D D B	27.9	D
*Frankfort & Ewing	Semi-Actuated	64	EB WB NB SB	B B C F	21.1	C
Frankfort & Mellwood	Semi-Actuated	80	EB WB NB	B B B	13.9	B

B: Unsignalized Intersections

Unsignalized Intersection	Type	Major Street	Minor Street	LOS
Frankfort & Pope	4-Leg	Frankfort	Pope-NB Pope-SB	A C D
Ewing & Payne	3-Leg	Ewing	Payne-EB	A A

Source: City of Louisville Public Works Department; Pat Johnson.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

c. Public Transportation

Existing bus service in Clifton neighborhood appears to be adequate. The residential layout of the neighborhood was somewhat based on a street car transit system that ran east and west and today's bus lines are the successors to that system. Most residents are within a short walk of a bus line.

Four of the five routes that serve Clifton neighborhood link it directly with the downtown area of the city and connect there with routes going throughout the city and county. The fifth route is a specialty route linking the neighborhood with the Prospect area of the county. The other four routes offer fairly frequent service and experience heavy ridership.

Potential transit users can be discouraged from using transit due to problems with convenience waiting times accessibility, and comfort for the passengers. According to TARC a three to four block walk (1 mile) is an acceptable distance to travel to reach a bus stop although a one to two block distance is more desirable. The residents of homes in the vicinity of the South Keats Avenue and Payne Street and Brownsboro Road and Drescher Bridge Avenue intersections have the greatest walking distances to travel to a bus stop in the neighborhood, about 1,000 feet. Bus shelters also improve the transit users safety and comfort. There are only three shelters in the Clifton neighborhood.

d. Goods Movement

Existing truck traffic levels on the major arterials in Clifton neighborhood are only about half the average city wide for arterial streets. However, because there are some industries and several commercial uses in the neighborhood that use heavy trucks, the trucks' use of residential streets to cross the neighborhood north and south poses a problem. The narrowness and steepness of the streets intensifies the problem. Further, some of the brick streets in the area cannot take the loads carried by heavy trucks.

The CSX railroad creates several crossing problems to which residents apparently have become fairly well adjusted. The nominal group sessions mentioned the railroad in only one of the three groups and no one voted for it to be one of their top five problems. The Pope Street grade separated crossing allows some freedom of movement within the neighborhood when trains are passing. However, the Frankfort Avenue and Ewing Avenue crossings can produce substantial backups of traffic.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

e. Sidewalks and Pedestrian Facilities

Sidewalks exist throughout most of the Clifton neighborhood. Along the Frankfort Avenue commercial strip, repaving has lowered the separation between street and sidewalk. Elsewhere in the neighborhood the age of the sidewalk and tree roots have created tripping hazards. Figure II-E: Pedestrian Facilities shows the location of tripping hazards observed by the field survey crews in the fall of 1988.

Sidewalks are absent on several streets, or on one side of the streets. Areas with sidewalk deficiencies include the south side of Brownsboro Road between State Street and Haldeman Avenue; the north end of Haldeman Avenue at Brownsboro Road where sidewalks are absent in a very steep area with rock walls on either side of the roadway; parts of Sycamore Avenue, North Jane and parts of North Clifton Avenue in the vicinity of Kroger where sidewalks are not provided; and, finally, absence of sidewalks for portions of streets connecting the Crescent Springs Condominium to the balance of the neighborhood (Ewing Avenue, Keats Avenue, Jane Street and Saunders) and some sections of the streets that have been constructed recently (Jane Street and Keats Avenue). (Topography played a role in the absence of streets in these areas.)

Walk/wait signals are installed at three of the intersections along Frankfort Avenue and one along Brownsboro as shown on Figure II-E: Pedestrian Facilities. Possible locations needing pedestrian crossing facilities include the Haldeman and Frankfort Avenues intersection and the Ewing Avenue and Brownsboro Road intersection. Pedestrian traffic from the north side of Brownsboro Road in the vicinity of Krogers is also high. Absence of stop lights in this area create problems for installation of a pedestrian walk/wait facility.

Special pedestrian facilities for the blind are provided in the Clifton neighborhood, primarily along Frankfort Avenue. These are generally audio signals at intersection that supplement the walk/wait signals. The presence of a large blind and sight impaired population places additional emphasis on the need for safe sidewalks free of tripping hazards and obstructions. The location of special facilities for the blind are shown on Figure II-E: Pedestrian Facilities.

f. Bikeway Facilities

The Payne Street bike route provides bicyclists in the neighborhood with a direct connection to the only Class I bicycle facility in the city that travels along Beargrass Creek to Cherokee Park and along Spring Street and Elm Street to downtown Louisville. Payne Street is a low traffic volume street with a 25 mile per hour speed limit that provides for fairly safe bicycle usage. All roadways in Louisville, with the exception of limited access expressways, allow bicycle usage. The topography, brick streets and high traffic volume on a street like Brownsboro Road are factors which detract from bicycle use in the area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

g. Parking

Parking is inadequate in several of the residential areas of Clifton particularly in the higher dwelling unit density areas. Narrow streets and a lack of off-street facilities in these areas compound the problems experienced. Automobile ownership is increasing and on a per unit basis single family owner occupied units generally have substantially more vehicles than apartments. Thus, while the number of rental units has declined, automobile ownership may have increased. The table below illustrates how at a total Census Tract level automobile ownership changed from 1970 to 1980 in the vicinity of Clifton neighborhood*.

TABLE II-2 AUTOMOBILE OWNERSHIP: CLIFTON VICINITY

Census (Year)	Total Tract	Occupied Units	Available Automobiles per Unit							
			0		1		2		3 or more	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
(1970)	74	1,160	281	24	598	52	249	21	32	3
	80	395	111	28	225	57	40	10	19	5
	<u>81</u>	<u>1,314</u>	<u>439</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>684</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	(1970)	2,869	831	29%	1,507	53%	451	16%	80	3%
(1980)	74	1,118	203	18	553	49	264	24	98	9
	80	372	100	27	169	45	54	15	49	13
	<u>81</u>	<u>1,154</u>	<u>323</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>478</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>322</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	(1980)	2,644	626	24%	1,200	45%	640	24%	178	7%

*This includes population outside Clifton neighborhood and Census Tract boundaries are slightly different for 1970 and 1980.

Source: 1970 and 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Totals may vary due to boundaries.

The table above illustrates reasons that parking has become a complex issue in the Clifton neighborhood (as well as many other areas of the city). The apartments and duplexes in the neighborhood are not new, but auto ownership for their occupants and that of the single family homes has increased. For 1970 to 1980 the three Census Tracts show 7.8% fewer units and, assuming only three cars in those units with three or more, a 13.8% increase in automobiles. It is unlikely that this trend has abated since 1980 and thus parking has become an issue in the residential parts of the neighborhood.

In commercial areas along Frankfort Avenue there is generally adequate off-street parking to satisfy demand although some deficiencies that occur in the area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

4. Issues and Problems

1. Sidewalks are in disrepair in several parts of the neighborhood. Tripping hazards, tree limbs blocking the sidewalks and generally overgrown sidewalks detract from the safety and appearance of the neighborhood.
2. Pedestrian access for the Brownsboro Road commercial areas and other destinations is inadequate.
3. Heavy automobile traffic and truck traffic on residential streets present a hazard to pedestrians, particularly children, and a noise nuisance.
4. Brick streets should be protected.
5. Steep inclines on neighborhood streets create extremely hazardous conditions when ice or snow is present.
6. Pedestrian access for handicapped persons is lacking in many areas of the neighborhood. Some of the facilities for the visually impaired do not function as intended.
7. Improper alley usage between Peterson Avenue and Ewing Avenue parallel to Frankfort Avenue.
8. Dangerous intersections have been identified at eight locations in the neighborhood based on accident studies and neighborhood comments.
9. Narrow streets in the neighborhood cause problems.
10. Dark streets and alleys are a problem in several areas.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

5. Government and Non-Government Actions

The provision of transportation facilities, with the exception of railroads, is primarily the responsibility of government. The issues identified in the previous section of this plan are the results of actions and inactions by government and inappropriate behavior by Clifton residents, commercial establishments and commuter traffic of private autos and business vehicles. This section will summarize major actions taken by both government and private groups which have affected the quality and quantity of transportation facilities in Clifton neighborhood.

a. Roadways

The core of the neighborhood's street system, Brownsboro Road and Frankfort Avenue, was initiated in the first half of the nineteenth century. Frankfort Avenue was authorized in 1818 as the Shelbyville and Louisville Turnpike and Brownsboro Road was authorized in 1850 as the Jefferson and Brownsboro Turnpike.

Subsequent development of the neighborhood street system in Clifton was the result of individual actions by developers. Development has taken place over a 140-year period, resulting in some shortcomings of the local street system. Automobiles were not a consideration when the older areas of the neighborhood were developed. Even the horse drawn and later electric streetcars only reinforced the use of local streets as a pedestrian connector in the neighborhood. Today, the narrow streets built or laid out in the early days of the neighborhoods development, are problem areas for parking, emergency access and through traffic.

More recently the Federal Interstate Highway system has provided the Clifton Neighborhood with a reduction in through traffic on both of its major radial arterial streets while providing highspeed access to the rest of metropolitan Louisville and particularly the Central Business District. Interstate 64 did not create severe barriers between the Clifton neighborhood and areas to the west. The old quarry bluffs and Beargrass Creek already established a "boundary" in this area.

The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KTC) maintains road surfaces and through a contract with the City Works Department provides funding for traffic signals and route number signage on state maintained routes in the neighborhood. These include Brownsboro Road, Frankfort Avenue, Grinstead Drive, Mellwood Avenue and Interstate 64. In addition, KTC administers federal monies: Federal Aid to Urban Cities, Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Fund and the Safer Off-System Road Fund. These are used for improvements initiated on urban system streets by local government. State and/or city governments must provide matching money on most federally funded road improvement projects.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

Improvement and maintenance of all Clifton study area streets not maintained by the KTC is the responsibility of Louisville's Public Works Department. Under this responsibility the Public Works Department resurfaces, cleans and removes snow from streets.

The Public Works Department also prepares analyses of high accident areas and intersection studies for levels of service to facilitate the flow of traffic in the neighborhood. The Works Department also regulates the on-street parking in the study area, establishing no parking zones and restricting hours when parking is allowed. These restrictions provide space for bus stops, handicapped parking and prevent traffic hazards from inadequate sight distances, narrow movement lanes, or an inadequate turning radius.

Off-street parking is regulated through Zoning District Regulations and enforced by the Zoning Enforcement Division of the Building Inspection Department. Many of the business locations along Frankfort Avenue were constructed before zoning regulations were established and are lacking adequate off-street parking. However, the regulations do apply to new construction, new uses requiring additional parking in existing structures and the expansion of existing structures if the new use or expansion will result in a demand for more than three parking spaces. Several recent rehabilitations of existing commercial structures apparently have not conformed to this regulation. Zoning District Regulations parking requirements for various use categories are listed in Appendix II.

b. Goods Movement

The maintenance and improvement of the railroad tracks in the Clifton Neighborhood are the responsibility of the CSX Corporation. The maintenance and improvement of railroad crossings are the joint responsibility of the City of Louisville and CSX. The Ewing Avenue crossing was reconstructed in 1985. CSX is also responsible for installation and maintenance of the warning signs, signals, crossing gates, and restoring adjacent facilities damage through repair activities.

The City of Louisville Works Department is responsible for signage showing truck traffic restrictions. The city does not designate truck routes. Enforcement is the responsibility of the City of Louisville Police Department. The city provides for fines of between \$25 and \$100 for violations of truck traffic restrictions. For this process to work individuals must report offenses as they occur.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Needs Assessment

c. Public Transportation

Public transportation in Clifton is provided primarily by the Transit Authority of River City (TARC). Transit -service depends heavily on federal funds to subsidize operating costs and capital expenditures. Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) under Section 9 of the Surface Transportation Act of 1982 provides these funds. TARC services are also subsidized by the Local Mass Transit Fund derived from the 0 '2 percent occupational tax paid by persons employed in Jefferson County. Subsidy of public transit for the elderly and handicapped has been provided primarily by UMTA Section 9 funds which can be used to finance up to 50% of operating costs and 80% of capital expenditures.

The primary source of funding for the WHEELS Program is the United Way Campaign's allocation to the American Red Cross. Some special federal funds (UMTA Section 16 (b) (2) are available to transportation providers to the elderly and are a possible source of funding for the WHEELS Program).

Two recent studies have explored transportation alternatives for the Clifton area as part of areawide transportation systems; Louisville and Southern Indiana Corridors Analysis (June, 1981) and the Eastern Corridor Transportation Study (July, 1984), both prepared for the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency by Schimpeler Corradino Associates. The 1981 study examined alternative improvement concepts for eight transportation corridors, including Frankfort Avenue. This report recommended construction of a busway in the L&N right-of-way along Frankfort Avenue, with at-grade and elevated sections and a limited number of access stations. This bus way would be part of an integrated system for the city and would terminate at Hurstbourne Lane near I-64 and at Lakeland Avenue in Anchorage on the east and originate downtown at a "transit mall". The more recent Eastern Corridor Transportation Study maintains the busway recommendation as a possible long-term solution. Because of its high cost (\$5 to \$10 million per mile), however, this report focuses on different transportation improvements.

d. Pedestrian Facilities

Facilities for pedestrians are the responsibility of the Public Works Department and adjacent property owners. The Department determines the need for pedestrian signals. It also reviews proposed transit shelters and requires that wheelchair ramps be provided as part of any project necessitating reconstruction of sidewalks. Construction and maintenance of sidewalks generally are the responsibility of adjoining property owners. The City of Louisville Department of Public Works is responsible for seeing that property owners maintain the sidewalks in front of their property. They will site hazardous locations and require that the property owner provide the repairs or will make the repairs and place a lien against the property. The city does however provide forgivable loans to home owners who repair their sidewalks and remain in the homes for an additional five years. A low interest loan program is available for sidewalk repairs in commercial areas. Rental residential property is not eligible. Details of both of these programs are provided in Appendix II.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Needs Assessment

e. Bikeways

Bikeways are also a local government concern. The Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA) has been responsible for determining the need for bikeways in the area. The needs and recommendations for bikeways as determined by KIPDA are presented in the 1977 KIPDA Bikeway Plan. Expansion of the bikeway system has been curtailed because funding is not available.

f. Emergency Access

The narrow streets and topography of the Clifton Neighborhood and the railroad create problems for emergency access, particularly fire engines. The restriction of on-street parking in areas where it may impact emergency access is the responsibility of the City of Louisville Works Department and the Louisville Police Department is responsible for enforcement

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Projections

This section of the plan develops a likely future scenario for transportation facilities in the Clifton neighborhood if the recommendations contained within this plan are not implemented and the current practices of government and other groups affecting transportation continue. The transportation network consists of the streets, sidewalks, parking (on-street and off-street), transit, bike routes, goods movement by truck and rail and the secondary signage, warning and traffic control system necessary for functional interaction.

1. Projected Future Conditions

If current trends continue, peak hour problems will continue at the intersections of Ewing Avenue and Brownsboro Road. No strong increases in car or truck traffic are anticipated due to population growth or commercial activity. Train related blockages of Frankfort Avenue and Ewing Avenue will continue to be a nuisance.

Parking inadequacies, particularly in the residential areas with narrow street widths will continue to worsen. Individual commercial activities may create worsened conditions along Frankfort Avenue and west of Drescher Bridge Avenue on Brownsboro Road. Truck traffic will continue to use residential streets in an inappropriate manner and will damage brick streets. Utility work will also add to the damages to the remaining brick streets. Sidewalks will continue to deteriorate due to tree roots, weeds and age. Deterioration will negatively impact the residential and commercial areas. Negative impacts along Frankfort Avenue will be compounded by curbs that disappear due to resurfacing operations raising the pavement levels. Cars will park on sidewalks and runoff will not be conveyed to storm sewers adequately. Pedestrian safety will be at a risk.

Transit service in general and bicycle facilities will remain at current levels.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Projections

2. Comprehensive Plan Guidelines

The following Comprehensive Plan guidelines are relevant to the future transportation system under the above scenario.

- T-1 Provide that all development and land use changes have adequate street facilities to handle anticipated traffic.
- T-2 Provide for the movement of pedestrians through the construction of:
 - a. walkways from residential areas to recreation areas, schools and shopping facilities in the neighborhood and
 - b. walkways for access to transit stops and
 - c. walkways where heavy pedestrian movements may be anticipated between land uses and
 - d. pedestrian overpasses/underpasses when street closings are impractical and vehicular and pedestrian volumes warrant such separation and
 - e. walkways through expressway interchange areas where appropriate.
- T-3 Provide for the movement of bicycles from residential areas to neighborhood recreation areas, schools, shopping facilities and major employment centers.
- T-5 Provide adequate rights-of-way to accommodate required and anticipated roadway, walkway and bikeway improvements through dedication.
- T-11 Provide off-street parking and loading of sufficient quantity and adequate design for the type and intensity of development, for the mode of access to the development and for its users.

Inadequate intersections would conflict with Guideline T-1 and deteriorated sidewalks would conflict with Guideline T-2. Bicycle facilities will be adequate in the neighborhood although parking/storage facilities are not provided. The existing narrow streets in the area will continue to conflict with the intent of Guideline T-5. Finally, the provision of off-street parking along Frankfort Avenue and the area west of Drescher Bridge Avenue along Brownsboro Road will probably continue to be inadequate and thus in conflict with Guideline T-11. Conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan Guidelines indicate a need for corrective actions or enforcement of existing regulations in order to support the efforts to revitalize the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

This section of the plan develops the recommended policies and specific actions to address Clifton's transportation needs. The issues and problems were developed from the responses received at the first public meeting, discussions with the Task Force and a review of the existing and projected conditions. A list of alternatives for correcting the problems identified was developed by the Planning Commission staff, reviewed with the Task Force and recommended alternatives selected. The issues statements and the selected alternatives are shown below. This section concludes with the recommended transportation plan.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue A: *Sidewalks are in disrepair in several parts of the neighborhood. Tripping hazards, tree limbs blocking the sidewalks and generally overgrown grass along the sidewalks detract from the safety and appearance of the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

1. Seek public investment in rehabilitating sidewalks in front of residential and commercial uses in the area.
2. Encourage better private maintenance of sidewalks in the area.
3. Educate neighborhood residents about the importance of maintenance and legal requirements

Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are recommended. A joint private/public effort to provide sidewalk and curb improvements in the commercial areas along Frankfort Avenue is recommended. Tripping hazards identified on Figure II-E should be reviewed by Public Works and cited. An educational newsletter should be published making property owners aware of the forgivable loan program for owner occupied units and the low interest loan program for commercial properties before citing owners with the tripping hazards.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue B: *Pedestrian access for the Brownsboro Road commercial areas and other destinations is inadequate.*

Alternatives:

1. Encourage public construction of sidewalks in areas where they are lacking throughout the community.
2. Encourage private construction of sidewalks.
3. Develop a pedestrian access plan for the Clifton area, funding sources and a timetable for its implementation.
4. Do nothing and allow people to continue to walk in the roadways.

Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are recommended. The access plan should establish priorities for construction of new sidewalks. Funding should be sought to provide sidewalks at Haldeman Avenue and Brownsboro Road, along Brownsboro Road from State Street to Haldeman; on the east and west side of the Kentucky School for the Blind; on Sycamore Avenue, North Clifton Avenue and Jane Street in the vicinity of Krogers; connections for the Crescent Springs development with Frankfort Avenue along either South Jane Street, Keats Avenue, or South Ewing Avenue. Creation of pedestrian access along the unbuilt right-of-way of Ewing Avenue to Grinstead Drive and along Grinstead Drive extending out of the neighborhood to Cherokee Park is encouraged. Design of new sidewalk facilities should allow for steep embankments and protection of brick streets.

Doing nothing and having people walk in the streets is not felt to be an adequate response. The neighborhood is compact enough to utilize pedestrian facilities and the number of blind and visually impaired persons in the area make it imperative that these facilities are high quality. Although traffic volumes are low on many of the neighborhood streets, walking in them is not safe.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue C: *Heavy automobile traffic and truck traffic on residential streets present a hazard to pedestrians, particularly children, and a noise nuisance.*

Alternatives:

1. Install additional stop signs and other traffic control measures to redirect through traffic or slow its passage.
2. Develop alternate routes for traffic currently passing through residential areas.
3. Lower speed limits and strictly enforce.
4. Approach businesses on reducing truck related nuisances.

All four alternatives are recommended. Stop signs should be used judiciously as they may increase congestion, noise and air pollution or create accident problems. Alternate routes for heavy truck traffic can be established by posting streets where truck traffic is prohibited and enforcing restrictions. This effort combined with an outreach meeting with the businesses generating the traffic can help prevent hard feelings and prevent unexpected hardships due to changes. Some businesses, because of their locations, must use neighborhood streets for access. Speed limits probably cannot be lowered but the existing 25 mile per hour limits can be more strictly enforced. (Note : The Public Works Department does not endorse alternative 1 due to adverse impacts on traffic flows and accidents). KIPDA has expressed similar reservations about alternatives 1) and 3). Refer to Appendix IV, KIPDA letter).

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue D: *Brick streets and stone curbs need protection.*

Alternatives:

1. Restrict truck traffic.
2. Require utilities and public works to restore roads to original condition when working in the area.

Both alternatives are supported. Truck traffic is seen as a primary cause of traffic damage on these streets due to weight. Enforcing restrictions on the use of residential streets by trucks will help. However, public utilities and the Public Works Department cause much of damage to these streets. After underground utilities work, they destroy stone curbs, replace brickwork poorly or routinely pave over the streets. Brick streets and stone curbs are an important historic resource for Clifton neighborhood. Protection of the remaining areas of brick streets and stone curbs require extra effort from government and utilities, but it should be undertaken.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue E: *Steep inclines on neighborhood streets, particularly along Brownsboro Road, create extremely hazardous conditions when ice or snow is present.*

Alternatives:

1. Add these streets to the Works Department's "priority" (for sanding/snow removal) list.
2. Prohibit use during hazardous periods.
3. Add warning signs about the hazards.

Alternatives 1 and 3 are recommended. If the Works Department can get to these streets sooner they will not pose as much of a hazard. However, because some slopes face north, snow and ice may persist. Warning signs are needed to prevent accidents.

Alternative 2 was considered but rejected because in some areas residents would not have alternatives because they park on the hills.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue F: *Pedestrian access for handicapped persons is lacking in many areas of the neighborhood. The facilities for the visually impaired do not function as intended in some cases.*

Alternatives:

1. Work with the Kentucky School for the Blind to develop preferred pedestrian routes and systematic improvements.
2. Construct wheelchair ramps as part of sidewalk reconstruction process.
3. Require commercial land use compliance with federal handicapped access regulations.
4. Request a policy in the Public Works Department to quickly handle the requests for maintenance of special facilities for the blind.

All four of the alternatives are recommended by the Task Force. It is probably impossible for sighted persons to fully comprehend the needs of blind persons and those who are visually impaired. The staff of the School for the Blind identified two specific improvements they feel are necessary that have been incorporated in the transportation improvement recommendations for the neighborhood. Audio crossings have been suggested for the Ewing and Frankfort Avenues and Brownsboro Road and North Clifton Avenue intersections.

Several suggestions raised at the neighborhood nominal group session by members of the blind community pointed out that devices intended to assist them in crossing streets had the opposite effect when the noise they make is so loud that a moving vehicle cannot be heard over it. Creation of a special procedure in the Works Department to make sure that these facilities (and any future expansion of them) work as intended or are repaired rapidly, seems very important.

Adding wheelchair ramps in sidewalk reconstruction efforts and making sure that businesses in the commercial sidewalk reconstruction areas also provide handicapped parking and access as required by federal and local regulation is also suggested.

It may be possible that the unique situation in the Clifton neighborhood could qualify it for some type of demonstration grant from a public or private source to develop an effective pedestrian network in the area.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue G: *Alleys are used improperly between Peterson Avenue and Ewing Avenue parallel to Frankfort Avenue.*

Alternatives:

1. Create one-way alleys in opposite direction of improper flow.
2. Add speed control signage along the alleys involved.
3. Create alternative routes to handle the traffic currently using the alleys.
4. Do nothing at this time and work with Crescent Hill to deal with this problem.

Alternative 4 is recommended. This problem, though identified by Clifton residents is actually located in Crescent Hill. The Task Force will work with Crescent Hill to solve the problem but consider it Crescent Hill's primary responsibility.

Two of the three alternatives which were not selected were felt to be possible solutions to the problem but not for Clifton to initiate. An alley is used to bypass the light at Frankfort Avenue and Ewing Avenue and the stop sign at Frankfort Avenue and Peterson Avenue. A one-way alley or two one-way alleys meeting in the middle and exiting through a business onto Frankfort would stop or slow improper usage. Extending Ewing Avenue to Grinstead Drive would provide an alternative to Peterson Avenue for exiting the neighborhood.

The speed control alternative was rejected due to existing 15 mile per hour speed limits.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue H: *Dangerous intersections in the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

1. Encourage the City of Louisville Public Works Department to modify the intersections.
2. Add warning signs at these intersections.

Alternative 1 is recommended.

TABLE II-3

Location/ Intersection	# of Accidents 1987	# of Accidents 1988	Total	Accident Rate * (Aug1987-1988)
Frankfort & Mellwood	16	11	27	1.501
Brownsboro & Mellwood	6	17	23	1.471
Frankfort & Pope	7	10	17	2.025
Brownsboro & Ewing	8	8	16	.860
Frankfort & Ewing	10	5	15	1.057
Brownsboro & Jane	4	7	11	.758

Source: Louisville Department of Public Works and Louisville Police Department: 1989.

*Accident Rate = number of accidents per million vehicles entering the intersection annually.

Warning signs were not felt to be effective.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Issue I: *Narrow streets limit traffic movement in the neighborhood.*

Alternatives:

1. Widen streets. This could result in loss of yards.
2. Limit on-street parking. This may create parking hardships elsewhere. Widening streets or removing parking could also increase traffic speeds through residential areas.
3. Create one way streets.
4. Rezone areas where parking problems exist to prevent more cars.
5. Create alleys in areas of the neighborhood where they are absent.
6. Do nothing.

The Task Force recommended specific application of alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4. These are reflected on Figure II-H: Recommended Transportation Improvements and Figure I-G: Zoning Change Recommendations.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

2. Recommended Transportation Plan

The recommended transportation plan for Clifton neighborhood sets forth guidelines for the future management and improvement of the study area's transportation system. The guidelines were developed from nominal group responses received at the first public meeting in the neighborhood and refined by the review of the neighborhood Task Force, meetings with the City of Louisville Public Works Department representatives and review of existing conditions in the area. The recommended transportation plan is an application of the goals and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan targeted toward solving problems and issues in the Clifton neighborhood.

The recommended transportation plan consists of a set of guidelines, a future transportation map, and detailed maps for each of the problem intersections in the neighborhood.

Once the recommended plan is approved by the Board of Aldermen, it will be used to formulate budgets for general revenue fund ward specific allocations and Community Development Block Grant allocations. Proposed city-wide programs and plans affecting Clifton will be reviewed in relation to the neighborhood plan. Further, the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA) may include the plan's recommendations in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

a. Transportation Guidelines

Pedestrian Facilities

1. Construct the pedestrian access facilities shown on Figure II-H.
2. Public and private investment in sidewalk maintenance and repair is encouraged. Informing residents about legal requirements for maintenance is also encouraged.
3. Commercial areas are encouraged to comply with regulations concerning handicapped access in any repairs or reconstruction of sidewalks.
4. Work with the Kentucky School for the Blind to monitor the pedestrian improvements they need and to ensure adequate maintenance of existing facilities.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Alternatives & Recommendations

Traffic Safety

5. Add steep streets in the area to the City's priority list for snow removal and sanding.
6. Improve hazardous intersections. (See Figure II-I.)
7. Add stop signs or traffic barriers, create one-way street couples, or lower speed limits or widen streets where traffic safety hazards exist.

Inappropriate Use

8. Work with businesses to reduce truck traffic in inappropriate areas and restrict trucks to main thoroughfares.
9. Seek cooperation of the Crescent Hill neighborhood in solving the problems of cars cutting through an alley south and parallel to Frankfort Avenue between Ewing Avenue and Peterson Avenue.

Parking

10. Limit on-street parking to allow safer traffic flows on narrow streets where alternative parking exists.
11. Require the provision of adequate parking as a part of new development.

Appearance

12. Utilities should restore streets to their original condition (including brick streets) after work in the area as required by the Department of Public Works. Property owners should notify the Public Works Department (625-3111) whenever they spot improper asphalt repaving over a brick road or alley way.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Implementation

This section of the Clifton neighborhood plan identifies agencies responsible for implementing the transportation guidelines listed in the previous section and the estimated cost of proposed improvements where known, and potential funding sources.

1. Pedestrian Facilities

Guidelines 1, 2 and 3 concern the provision and maintenance of pedestrian facilities. Figures II-E and II-H provide locational information about where specific facilities are needed or problems needing correction exist.

a. Construction of New Sidewalks

Task Force members have placed a high priority on provision of sidewalks. Some areas lack sidewalks and Figure II-H shows the location of the missing sections. A portion of the sidewalks identified on this map are being considered for FY 88-89 construction (roughly 1,000 linear feet of sidewalk along parts of North Clifton, Sycamore Avenue and State Street) and other areas are suggested for inclusion in the FY 89-90 budget. A sidewalk has been recommended for the unbuilt right-of-way of Ewing Avenue connecting to Grinstead Drive.

Funding sources include the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG's), General Fund commitments from the City of Louisville, Aldermanic discretionary funds and federal grant sources related to provision of specialized pedestrian facilities for handicapped persons under the Transit Program for the Elderly and Handicapped [Section 16 (b) (2)1 of the Urban Mass Transit Act.

The cost per linear foot of sidewalk varies by the topography, existence of rock close to the surface, and the need for cutting into rock faces, as would be necessary in areas along Haldeman Avenue and State Street at Brownsboro Road. In less constrained areas sidewalks can be installed for approximately \$23.50 per linear foot. There are approximately 20,000 feet of new sidewalk proposed for the neighborhood which would cost approximately \$470,000 to install plus any costs associated with rough terrain.

b. Sidewalk Reconstruction and Maintenance

Existing sidewalks in the neighborhood contain numerous tripping hazards. Figure II-E shows the location of these problem areas as noted during the Planning Commission staff's field survey of the neighborhood. Low hanging branches, vegetation that blocks sidewalks and grass that overgrows the sidewalks are problems throughout the neighborhood and pose especially difficult hazards for visually impaired, elderly and handicapped persons. Rough pedestrian facilities at the railroad crossings are also a problem.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Implementation

The Clifton Community Council should help inform residents of the neighborhood about the problems with sidewalk maintenance and, in locations where tripping hazards exist, encourage the property owners to seek repairs. If the tripping hazard is "cited" by the Public Works Department a property owner residing at the cited location may seek a forgivable loan (explained in greater detail in Appendix II) for the cost of the repairs. owners of commercial structures can seek a reduced interest rate loan for repairs of citable (by Public Works Department inspectors) hazardous/tripping conditions. More detail on this program is also provided in Appendix II.

The streetscape plan for Frankfort Avenue commercial area should incorporate sidewalk and curb replacement recommends_ tions. This may involve surface treatment that creates a unifying element for the commercial area or incorporates "historic" materials such as brick or cobblestone.

c. Handicapped Access

The streetscape improvements recommended for the Frankfort Avenue commercial area should incorporate handicapped access facilities as required by law. Further, to the extent possible, the design plan should incorporate special facilities for blind and visually handicapped persons. These include audio signals, curb cut and wheel chair ramps with warning strips, braille signage, and guided hand rail or audio walkways in hazardous or heavily traveled areas. The development of these facilities should be an integral part of the development of the overall commercial areas streetscape plan. Federal funding assistance should be pursued for the cost of these facilities. In the absence of direct grants Community Development Block Grants should be sought as a source of funding.

Representatives of the blind community in the Clifton neighborhood attended the public meetings and participated on the Task Force. The strong emphasis on better sidewalk maintenance and construction in the transportation section reflects concerns that they described to the Task Force. Another aspect of having special audio facilities to assist blind and visually impaired individuals in the neighborhood is the need for timely maintenance. The plan suggests the City of Louisville Public Works Department develop a procedure to quickly handle maintenance needs and that it publicize the contact phone number in the blind community. As more facilities are added in the area the frequency of maintenance problems will likely increase.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Implementation

2. Traffic Safety

Traffic-safety related improvements have been suggested by the task force to correct deficiencies in the areas. These conditions were identified by a survey of the neighborhood residents and an analysis of high accident locations prepared by the Engineering section of the City of Louisville Department of Public Works. Accident data was provided by the Louisville Police Department. The City of Louisville Works Department will be the primary agency responsible for implementing transportation guidelines 4, 5, and 6.

a. Intersection Improvements

The engineering section of the City of Louisville Public Works Department identified six problem intersections having ten or more accidents during 1987 and 1988. Table II-3 identifies the problem locations and Figure II-1 shows the location.

The staff of the engineering section of the City of Louisville Public Works Department prepared detailed analysis of the six intersections and made the following recommendations.

***Frankfort Avenue and Mellwood Avenue**

- Install an "All Red" condition in the traffic signals timing in order to provide sufficient time for the intersection to clear. This will help alleviate the frequent disregard of the traffic signal at this location.
- Relocate the stop bar for eastbound Frankfort Avenue and other existing pavement markings.
- There are also several problems due to poor design standards for the original curb cuts for the businesses located on the corners of this intersection. Reducing the number of curb cuts or relocating them could improve conditions.

***Brownsboro Road and Mellwood Avenue**

- Installation of two (2) signs to indicate: "Right Turn Lane Must Turn Right", on Mellwood Avenue.
- Re-mark the stop bars and crosswalks at this location.

***Frankfort Avenue and Pope Street**

- The fire signal at this location is due for modernization in 1989. The City of Louisville Works Department is currently seeking approval to use State funds for this project. The modernized signal will normally operate with flashing yellow indications for Frankfort Avenue traffic, and with flashing red indications for Pope Street traffic. Upon preemption, the indications would transfer to steady reds in all directions. These changes should create safer conditions.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Implementation

***Ewing Avenue and Brownsboro Road**

- The Works Department has received approval from the State for the installation of pedestrian signals for this intersection. The signals will provide a safer situation for pedestrians.
- Re-mark the stop bars and the new crosswalks.

***Ewing Avenue and Frankfort Avenue**

- Problems in this area are due to poor design standards for the original curb cuts for the businesses located at this intersection. The curbs on northbound Ewing Avenue have recently been reconstructed.

***Brownsboro Road and Jane Street**

- The sight distance at this location is adequate. No improvements are suggested at this time.

b. Ice and Snow Hazard Areas

Steep, north-facing streets, intersecting with Brownsboro Road are prone to ice and snow hazards during winter months. A lack of sunlight creates a colder surface than exists on flat areas or those with some sun exposure. The task force recommends that the Works Department add these streets shown on Figure II-H, to their priority list for snow removal and sanding.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Implementation

3. Traffic Control

Several minor traffic control measures are endorsed by the neighborhood plan guidelines. The Public Works Department is responsible for implementing the proposals in this section of the transportation plan. Most involve relatively minor expenditure, however, two would require substantial funding.

a. Truck Routes

Signage should be installed that identifies the following streets as truck routes: Mellwood Avenue, Brownsboro Road, Frankfort Avenue, Payne Street and Ewing Avenue between Payne Street and Brownsboro Road. Signs prohibiting through truck traffic should be posted on William, Pope and State Streets, Haldeman Avenue and elsewhere in the neighborhood where problems may arise in the future. (The Louisville/Jefferson County Truck Route Study does not support the posting of truck routes, only streets where trucks are prohibited. Refer to Appendix IV, KIPDA letter).

In combination with the signage program, an outreach program between the Clifton Community Council and the businesses generating the inappropriate truck traffic should be initiated to explain the concerns that residents have with the trucks on residential streets and truckers could be advised to use more appropriate routes. Copies of the Louisville/Jefferson County Truck Route Study preferred alternative routes map can also be distributed at this time. Continued violations should be cited under the existing ordinances.

It should be noted that the restrictions only apply to through traffic. Trucks that have no alternative for access to a commercial, industrial or institutional use activity, residential moving vans and delivery trucks are not included.

b. One-Way Streets

An alley adjacent to the CSX railroad on the north side between Pope Street and Stoll Avenue is suggested for one-way east designation. Sight distance at the railroad overpass on Pope Street is inadequate; westbound traffic on this alley cannot safely enter the intersection. North Jane Street between Sycamore Avenue and the entrance to the apartment complex and Oxford Center behind Kroger is recommended for one-way north designation. The street's narrow width, irregular surface and steepness make it difficult to negotiate.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation – Implementation

c. Street Widenings

Two streets are recommended for widening by the Clifton neighborhood plan. New Main Street between Frankfort Avenue and South Bellaire Avenue is very narrow and problems are caused by parking on unpaved front portions of lots and on both sides of the street. Some modification has already occurred near Frankfort Avenue on the northeast parking perpendicular to New Main on the CSX railroad right-of-way.

The second street recommended for widening is Bickel Lane between Saunders Avenue and Ewing Avenue. This street serves as access to the Crescent Springs Condominiums. The pavement width is inadequate (12 feet in the area west of the unbuilt right-of-way of South Keats Avenue and 24 feet east of there). The sections with 12 foot widths should be widened.

d. Parking Limitations

On-street parking should be limited at the intersection of Bickels Lane and Saunders Avenue on both streets to allow turns.

New developments in the Clifton area should include provision of adequate parking. Reuse of existing structures and expansions when a change in use will generate demand for over three parking spaces should also provide an adequate number of spaces. A copy of Article 10 of the Zoning District Regulations is included in Appendix II. Responsibility for determining parking adequacy rests with the Planning Commission in situations involving zoning changes. The City of Louisville Construction Plan Review and Permits section of the Inspections, Permits and Licenses Department is responsible for ensuring that expansions and new uses of existing structures have adequate parking.

e. Alley Cut-Through

An alley running parallel to Frankfort Avenue between Ewing Avenue and Peterson Avenue is being utilized as a cut-through to bypass the stop sign and light at the two streets intersections with Frankfort Avenue. This site is located in Crescent Hill but the problem is in part generated by Clifton traffic. The Clifton neighborhood will support the Crescent Hill neighborhood's suggestions for ending this problem.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation – Implementation

4. Maintaining Stone Curbs, Brick Streets and Alleys

Public utilities and the City of Louisville Works Department should make every effort to retain and restore stone curbs and brick streets and alleys to their original condition after any work that disturbs them.

5. Redesign of Curb Cuts

The presence of property line to property line curb cuts detracts from the safety of Frankfort Avenue. Unlimited access has occurred because repavings without curb reconstructions eliminated many of the curbs or rendered them useless. The design plan for the Frankfort Avenue commercial area should address reinstalling operable curbs and limiting site access to appropriate locations as determined through Public Works review. Future repaving operations should allow for the loss of curbs and correct unsafe access situations. Milling the roadway before repairing could minimize curb loss.

6. Alley Maintenance

City ordinance 12, series 1980, requires owners of property to be responsible for controlling litter to the middle of the streets and alleys that abut their property. Other ordinances prohibit placing trash out for pick-up in bags because animals may scatter it. Clifton Community Council should publicize these ordinances through their neighborhood newsletter.

Educational efforts could be followed by organizing neighborhood work days, when volunteers focus on cleaning up the alleys and trimming trees, or by initiation of a concentrated clean-up effort as suggested under Land Use Implementation part (b): Collective Actions by Neighborhood Residents. Persistent, localized litter problems may require enforcement action. The environmental inspection division of the city's Housing Department will inspect for litter problems and issue citations to violators. If the problem is not corrected, the city will clean the site and place a lien on the property. This is a no cost implementation measure that can be implemented in the short range.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan Transportation - Priorities

This section of the transportation plan for Clifton neighborhood establishes priorities assigned for each of the transportation guidelines. Four classifications are used: highest priority, high, medium or low priority. The priorities given each recommendation are based on the importance to the neighborhood that the Task Force assigns each element balanced against the availability of funds, programs and costs involved. Some projects receive higher ratings because the funds are currently available or can be more easily implemented. As tasks are accomplished on this list, new projects will move up to higher priorities and other projects will be added. Periodic re-evaluation is recommended in light of available funds programs, new problems and completion of old projects. The Clifton Community Council can schedule this as an annual budget review process that can be undertaken prior to the City of Louisville budget's development to allow projects to be included in the City's budget.

The following table presents the guideline recommendations of the plan and priorities assigned by the Task Force in March and April of 1989. The guidelines rather than the implementation measures were given priorities. Implementation measures will change as new programs, agencies, changing conditions and new techniques to address problems become available. The guideline recommendations should change only gradually, as changes occur in the character of the neighborhood.

1989-1990 Clifton Neighborhood Plan

Transportation - Priorities

Transportation Guideline

Implementation Measure

(Highest Priority)

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 4. | Work with the Kentucky School for the Blind to monitor the pedestrian improvements they need and to ensure adequate maintenance of existing facilities. | D.1, D.2 |
| 5. | Add steep streets in the area to the City's priority list for snow removal and sanding. (Care should be taken when brick streets are involved). | D.2 |
| 2. | Public and private investment in sidewalk maintenance and repair is encouraged. Informing residents about legal requirements for maintenance is also encouraged. | D.1 |
| 5. | Construct the pedestrian access facilities shown on Figure II-H Incorporate handicapped facilities and those serving the unique needs of the blind and visually impaired in any construction project. | D.1 |

(High Priority)

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 12. | Require utilities to restore streets to original condition (including brick streets) after work in the area. | D.4 |
| 6. | Improve hazardous intersections. (See Figure II-I.) | D.3 |
| 8. | Work with businesses to reduce truck traffic in inappropriate areas and restrict trucks to main thoroughfares. | D.3 |
| 6. | Require the provision of adequate parking as a part of new development. | D.1,D.3 |

(Medium Priority)

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 3. | Commercial areas are encouraged to comply with regulations concerning handicapped access in any repairs or reconstruction of sidewalks. | D.1 |
|----|---|-----|

(Low Priority)

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 9. | Seek cooperation of the Crescent Hill neighborhood in solving the problems of cars cutting through an alley south and parallel to Frankfort Avenue between Ewing Avenue and Peterson Avenue. | D.3 |
| 7. | Add stop signs or traffic barriers, create one-way street couples, or lower speed limits or widen streets where traffic safety hazards exist. | D.3 |
| 10. | Limit on-street parking to allow safer traffic flows on narrow streets where alternative parking exists. | D.3 |