

I have received and reviewed Beltline SAP applications for 807 and 803 Forrest Street. The copies that received did not include case numbers, so I don't know what those are. Both of these applications pertain to a single project that spans two existing lots. I do not understand why this was not the subject of a single SAP application. My comments on the project as a whole are as follows:

(1) The reuse of the existing structure is clearly in keeping with the purpose and intent specified by section 16-36.002(6). This provides justification for the administrative variations required by the position of the building on the lot and the extent of the existing fenestration.

(2) The proposed use is relatively low in intensity, traffic generation, and physical scale relative to what could be permitted by the underlying zoning. It would also appear to have operational hours consistent with the adjoining MRC-2-C district of which it is not a part. This provides a significant measure of public protection for the residents of the adjoining single-family neighborhood, which is also a needed justification for administrative variations.

(3) The parking directly in front of the building does not appear to be necessary as there is room for an additional space in the row of spaces along the east side of the property. Relocating this space, would eliminate the need for an administrative variation and permit a street-scape more in keeping with the overlay requirements and intents.

(4) The alley easement along the west side of the property has a curb cut very close to one of the two proposed for this project. Currently the easement is an unpaved alley that serves both the site of this project and a single-family residence to its east. If this project were to make use of the existing curb cut in lieu of (or along with) the one proposed, the alley could be improved over some of its extent and serve as an improved amenity for the residence as well as reducing the total number of curb cuts along Forrest Street and permitting more pervious surface to be added to the project (i.e. a win-win).

(5) Storm water runoff is a problem for this site and the adjoining sites along the north side of Forrest Street. It is not clear how this project might affect the problem. There is an implied discharge easement associated with the dry streambed along the alley easement running east/west at the rear of this site and several adjoining sites. The project proposes to deal with storm water through the use of pervious pavement. As an alternative, an above-ground water detention feature (swale) might be added on the lot to the east of the project area. I think that this is under the same ownership as the two lots proposed for this project. It does not seem to be large enough to lend itself to a stand-alone economically viable use under the current I-1 zoning. I do not know what the owners plan for this lot.

(6) Forrest Street is the only east/west street in Berkeley Park that does not have a neighborhood marker sign along Howell Mill. The southwest corner of this project would be an excellent place for one of these, which could be installed at the expense of the Berkeley Park Neighborhood Association (BPNA) if the property owner is agreeable to

this.