

## **Surrounding neighborhood's opposition/position paper on the Church of Scientology application**

### **RZ09 – 001 5395 Roswell Road Summary of the Objectors' Case**

#### **Main Grounds of Objection**

1. Parking provision is totally inadequate for the use proposed, which would be much more intensive than the current zoning for "office only". To approve an application with such inadequate parking would create a dangerous precedent for other sites.
2. Increased traffic from such an intensive use of the site would create more hazardous conditions at an already dangerous intersection, for which no improvement is currently planned. The absence of any traffic study seems surprising.
3. The way in which the physical condition of the building and surrounds has been allowed to deteriorate since purchase by the applicant in 2005, represents a lack of commitment to the local community
4. The risks of further intensification of the use (and hence of the parking deficit and of the traffic hazards) if the application is approved. This is particularly so, if other organizations connected with the church are brought onto the site, as seems likely.
5. Protection of neighborhoods is an important principle of the policies of the City Council, and this application if approved would have the opposite effect.

#### **The Objectors:**

- agree that the Parking Ordinance formula for a church is inappropriate for a sanctuary which is less than 5% of total floor space
- agree with the original Staff determination that the parking requirement should be based on the aggregate of mixed uses – this produces a substantial deficit
- cannot accept the rationale for adopting the conclusions of the applicant's parking study of Nashville to support a parking requirement of 3 spaces per 1000 sq. ft., which is the same as if the whole building were an office building.
- attach considerable significance to the schedule submitted by the applicant which shows that 45% of the four floors (if the basement were enclosed) would be "assembly areas", sanctuary, classrooms, conference room and public bookstore. These are much more intensive uses than offices, generating more traffic.
- do not accept that off-site parking (however secured by a legal agreement) can be a substitute for adequate on-site parking to Ordinance standards
- regard any attempt to "cap" the numbers on site at any one time as being in practice unenforceable and likely to lead to endless problems of enforcement. The cap proposed by the applicant is anyway much higher than the parking could sustain.
- do not agree that Approval Conditional for three floors is appropriate and seek a Denial

#### **The Objectors Ask the Planning Commission to Take Account of**

- The Statement of Case submitted by the Objectors' Attorney. This demonstrates the flawed reasoning of many of the applicant's arguments.
- The Community Requested Conditions, but only if approval is recommended.
- The strength of support for the objections. 13 Civic and Homeowners' Associations have submitted formal letters of objection, and other Associations are in the process of formulating their objections. 500 citizens of Sandy Springs have either written letters of opposition or signed petitions against the proposal.

Robin M Beechey (Willow Glen Condominium Assoc.), Patty Burns (Roundhill Condominium Assoc.); Jane Kelley (High Point Civic Assoc.), Susan B. Yeosock (Lake Forrest Summit Community Assoc.)