

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in the Council Chambers, Cranston City Hall by Chairperson Dean Perdikakis on **Wednesday, October 14, 2026, at 6:30 pm.** Also, present were Ivy Swinski, Carlos Zambrano, Kenneth Filarski, 1st Alternate Anthony Mastantuono, 2nd Alternate Mario Carlino, and 4th Alternate Justin McCarthy.

*The following matters were **not** heard before the board:*

WARD 3

JENNY CLEMENT (OWN) AND JOSHUA DEBROSSARD (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing single-family dwelling on a lot with reduced frontage and setbacks previously merged by zoning at **75 Gladstone Street**, AP 7 Lot 875; area 6,536 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.64.010 - Off-Street Parking. Application ZBR-26-37 filed 07/29/2026. Attorney Andrew Cormier, Esq.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Filarski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the November 12, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

WARD 3

JENNY CLEMENT (OWN) AND JOSHUA DEBROSSARD (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new two-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage previously merged by zoning at **0 Gladstone Street**, AP 7 Lot 874; area 7,173sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.060 - Required Yards Not to be Used by Another Building; Section 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements. Application ZBR-26-27 filed 06/02/026. Attorney Andrew Cormier, Esq.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Filarski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the November 12, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

The following matters were heard before the board:

OLD BUSINESS

WARD 3

PATE LAKAY ENTERPRISE LLC (OWN) AND STEVEN GILBERT(APP) have applied to the Board for permission to operate a restaurant in an existing legal, non-conforming building with no off-street parking and to install new wall signage exceeding the allowable size and total area at **357 Dyer Avenue**, A.P. 8, lot 2798; area 3,535 sf; zoned C4. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variations; Sections 17.72.010 – Signs; Section 17.64.010 – Off-Street Parking. Application ZBR-26-38 filed on 07/30/26. Attorney John J. Garrahy, Esq.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Zambrano the Board voted unanimously to approve this application as presented on October 14, 2026.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:

- 17.72.010 – Signs
- 17.64.010 – Off-Street Parking

Relief Sought:

C-4 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Off-Street Parking	21 Spaces	0 Spaces	21 Spaces
Wall Sign Size	30 sf	87.4 sf	57.4 sf

Staff Analysis:

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

The Board found this project compatible with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- The subject property is extremely constrained by the fact that the entire lot is covered by the footprint of the existing building and there are no associated parking lots for this lot. This makes off-street parking requirements impossible to comply with. However, there are many reasons to believe that granting a parking variance would allow consistency with the surrounding area and comprehensive plan.
 - This property is in an area that is served by customers from both Providence and Cranston. There is significant residential density that surrounds it, which potentially incentivizes foot traffic to this location. Additionally, multiple transit lines serve this area.
 - The building is located in a small commercial area surrounded by a dense, walkable neighborhood whose residents are the primary customers it serves. The area was constructed pre-automobile and consequently, most businesses have minimal or no off-street parking. The lack of parking incentivizes customers to access the area on foot or by the transit lines that serve the area. There is also ample on-street parking on Dyer Avenue and Farmington Avenue for loading and customer parking. If on-street parking or loading become a concern, on-street parking management strategies can be employed by the Department of Public Works to manage parking and loading in the area.

ADDITIONAL BOARD FINDINGS

Attorney John Garrahy presented the application, the testimony of zoning and building code consultant Michael McHugh, on behalf of the Applicant, with respect to the reasons for the relief sought and presented a parking lease agreement between the applicant and the owner of 355 Dyer Avenue, securing an additional 16 off-street parking spaces.

There was no other testimony either for or against the project

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief 17.92.010 - Variance; Sections 17.72.010 – Signs; Section 17.64.010 – Off-Street Parking.

PHILLIPE LAFRENAYE (OWN) AND JOVANI TORRES (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing three-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage and setbacks previously merged by zoning at **118 Maplewood Avenue**, AP 7 Lot 3234; area 5,000 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements. Application ZBR-26-43 filed 08/07/2026. No Attorney.

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr. Filarski the Board voted unanimously to approve this application as presented on October 14, 2026.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations (frontage, side and front yard setbacks, lot sizes)
- 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements (multifamily lot size)
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers

Relief Sought:

Existing Three-Family Dwelling at 118 Maplewood Avenue:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	14,000 sf for Three-Family Dwellings	5000 sf	9000 sf

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

Minimum Side Setback	8 ft	5 ft	3 ft
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two substandard lots of record	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at 0 Maplewood Avenue:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	6,000 sf for Single-Family Dwellings	5000 sf	1000 sf
Minimum Lot Frontage	60 ft	50 ft	10 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback	25 ft	16 ft	9 ft
Minimum Side Setback	8 ft	5 ft	3 ft
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two substandard lots of record	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

Density and Lot Size Data:

Number of residential lots within 200’:	40 Lots (54 Units)**
Number of residential lots smaller than proposed in the application:	10 Lots**
Number of residential lots equal to proposed in the application:	4 Lots** (5,000 SF)
Number of residential lots larger than proposed in the application:	26 Lots**
** NOT Including Subject Lots	

Existing subject parcels density:	13.06 U/a
Proposed subject parcels density:	17.42 U/a
200’ Radius density:	10.12 U/a
Neighborhood Zone density:	8.7 U/a

The Board found this project compatible with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

The application was for a single family structure and any additional relief would need board approval

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting variance, the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010-Variances; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

NEW BUSINESS

WARD 3

PHILLIPE LAFRENAYE (OWN) AND JOVANI TORRES (APP) have amended their application to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage and setbacks previously merged by zoning at 0 Maplewood Avenue, AP 7 Lot 3237; area 5,000 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements. Application ZBR-26-36 filed 06/10/2026. Attorney John J. Garrahy, Esq. Continued from September 09, 2026, with amendment.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to approve this amended application as presented on October 14, 2026.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations (frontage, side and front yard setbacks, lot sizes)
- 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements (multifamily lot size)
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers

Relief Sought:

Existing Three-Family Dwelling at 118 Maplewood Avenue:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	14,000 sf for Three-Family Dwellings	5000 sf	9000 sf
Minimum Side Setback	8 ft	5 ft	3 ft
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two substandard lots of record	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at 0 Maplewood Avenue:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	6,000 sf for Single-Family Dwellings	5000 sf	1000 sf

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

Minimum Lot Frontage	60 ft	50 ft	10 ft
Minimum Front Yard Setback	25 ft	16 ft	9 ft
Minimum Side Setback	8 ft	5 ft	3 ft
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two substandard lots of record	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

Density and Lot Size Data:
Number of residential lots within 200’: 40 Lots (54 Units)**
Number of residential lots smaller than proposed in the application: 10 Lots**
Number of residential lots equal to proposed in the application: 4 Lots** (5,000 SF)
Number of residential lots larger than proposed in the application: 26 Lots**
** NOT Including Subject Lots

Existing subject parcels density: 13.06 U/a
Proposed subject parcels density: 17.42 U/a
200’ Radius density: 10.12 U/a
Neighborhood Zone density: 8.7 U/a

The Board found this application compatible with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

BOARD FINDINGS

Attorney John Garrahy presented the application with amendment reducing relief sought from a proposed two-family dwelling to a newly proposed single-family dwelling along with the testimony of zoning and building code consultant Michael McHugh, on behalf of the Applicant, with respect to the reasons for the relief sought.

There was no other testimony either for or against the project

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting variance, the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010-Variances; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

WARD 3

DARAVICHET CHEY (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board for permission to convert the first floor of a legal, non-conforming mixed-use building into a beauty salon at 88 Gansett Avenue, AP 7 Lot 2034 & 2035;

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

area 6,637 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section17.20.030 – Schedule of Uses. Application ZBR-26-44 filed 08/11/2026. No Attorney.

On a motion made by Mr. Mastantuono and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to approve this application as presented on October 14, 2026.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:

- 17.20.030 – Schedule of Uses

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Schedule of Uses	Salon Use is not Permitted in the B-1 Zone	Change 1 st Floor (unit 1) into a salon from residential	Use Variance

The Board found this project compatible with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential and commercial in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- The subject property is currently identified as mixed use by the tax assessor. However, the tax assessor’s card revealed that the first floor of this building was converted into office space in 1968. They also noted that the building appears to currently be used for fully residential uses.
 - This application is essentially asking for relief to restore a mixed-use structure back to its status as mixed-use.
- Gansett Avenue is a hub for commercial activity, with primarily small, local businesses lining the street to the South and along Cranston Street to the North featuring compatible neighborhood uses such as restaurants, cafes, and a variety of retail and personal service establishments including salons. A small salon would fit the character of the neighborhood.
- Parking requirements for both the proposed salon business and the remaining residential use are satisfied by the proposal

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting variance, the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010-Variances; Section 17.20.030 – Schedule of Uses.

WARD 4

ERIC COX (OWN/APP) has filed an application to request permission to construct a fence exceeding the maximum allowed height at **26 Herod Street**, A.P. 19, Lot 160; area 8,022; zoned A12. Applicant sees relief per 17.92.010 – Variance; Sections 17.124.010 Fences and walls. Application ZBR-26-46 filed on 09/10/26. No Attorney.

On a motion made by Mr. Mastantuono and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted 4-1 to approve this application as presented on October 14, 2026. Mr. Zambrano voted nay on the approval.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:

- 17.124.010 – Fences and walls

Minutes for Wednesday October 14, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Fence Height	6 Feet	8 Feet	2 Feet

Applicant Narrative:

The 12-foot tall 8 ft wide arborvitaes have been planted by former owners back in the mid to late 1960s. The arborvitaes have reached end of cyclic life of 60 years. They are encroaching on the neighbors’ yards by 3 feet. If trimmed back to the property line, there will be a few things that will happen. The trees will get diseased and attract more termites from dying limbs and stumps. The intent is to put up 8ft high fence in place of the 12-foot arborvitaes and keep the same privacy that have been at this location for 60 years.
Note: placement of proposed fence - from front corners of house to side property lines - follow side property lines back and along rear property line to enclose back yard.

The Board accepted Staff analysis as a finding

Staff has reviewed this Application in consideration of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- The proposed fence will enclose the back yard of the property. Aging trees will be replaced by a new fence, maintaining the current level of privacy between neighboring backyards.
 - The fence will be mostly blocked from view from the street.
- The proposed fence is replacing a previous fence that encroached on an abutter’s property.
 - The proposed fence will correct an encroachment issue, therefore improving the neighborhood.

BOARD FINDINGS

Owner/applicant presented to the Board letters of support from abutting neighbors at 20 Herod Street and 32 Herod Street.

There was no other testimony either for or against the project.

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.124.010 Fences and walls.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM

Stanley Pikul
Secretary, Zoning Board