

October 13, 2021

Mr. George W. Watson III
Robinson & Cole LLP
One Financial Plaza
14th Floor
Providence, RI 02903

Re: Request for dimensional variances
70 Virginia Avenue
(A.P. 101, Lot 349)
Providence, Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Watson:

At your request, I have inspected the real estate referenced above in order to render an opinion as to what, if any, impact the granting by the City of Providence Zoning Board of Review of certain dimensional variances to the property would have on surrounding properties. In addition I have reviewed the plans submitted and the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Providence.

The subject property is located in what was formerly known as the ManuCenter section of the City, between Allens Avenue and Eddy Street. The area historically was developed with industrial manufacturing uses, starting in the 1920's until the 1980's. Since the early 2000's many of the properties have been converted to office and service uses. Most properties are well maintained.

The subject property consists of a 6,720± square foot parcel of land located at 70 Virginia Avenue, Providence, Rhode Island. It is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Virginia Avenue and Georgia Avenue. The site was formerly a substation site. The site is mostly vacant with the exception of an existing 5 foot fence. The site is located in a Light Industrial (M1) District.

The applicant (National Grid) is proposing to install a new battery storage facility on the site, which is permitted, but requires a dimensional variance to install an 8 foot fence (6 foot permitted) in order to meet both National Grid's safety policies and the National Electric Safety Code.

After completing my inspection and review, it is my opinion that the hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not the general characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposed height of the fence is required to meet safety policies and national standards.

It is my opinion that the hardship is not a result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire to realize greater financial gain. The applicant is proposing to develop the site with a permitted use and the proposed height is to protect both the facility and the public at large and not to make a greater financial gain. Denial would amount to more than a mere inconvenience as the applicant would not be able to meet safety standards. The requested relief is the least relief necessary as the height proposed is the minimum height that is required to meet the standards and comports with the rest of the fencing on the site.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that the granting of the proposed relief will not have a negative impact on the value, use and or enjoyment of the surrounding properties, based upon the fact that the use is a permitted use and the variance is only being sought to meet safety standards.

Respectfully submitted
SWEENEY REAL ESTATE & APPRAISAL



Thomas O. Sweeney, SIOR