

Berry, Joshua

From: Brian Malachowski <brianmalachowski234@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 9:57 PM
To: Aniece@aniecegermain.com; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrisaplauskas@gmail.com; citizensofcranston@aol.com; dukefarina@cs.com; ferriforcranston@gmail.com; Berry, Joshua; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; Pezzullo, Jason; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; mike@favilaw.com; nicoleforcranston@gmail.com; reillyforcranston@gmail.com; sstycos26@gmail.com
Subject: It's the same bad Costco plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

As you're all aware the plan to develop Mulligans Island in to a Costco was resubmitted last week. It's the same exact plan. None of the deficiencies that have been pointed out before have been addressed. Their plan does not align with concepts of smart development, water run off threatens homes and a large retail development will destroy the local residential neighborhoods.

I'd like to think that their ham fisted attempt to look gracious by gifting land to the city is not even worth addressing but I suppose we are required to play this game.

The simple facts are

- developing the golf course in to residential properties has always been listed as a future part of this plan
- Michael DiGuiseppe does not do residential development. His plan was always to sell all of the land to a management company and other developers once the Costco is built. That is his business model
- Mike has also steadfastly refused to mention that the homes nearest to the Costco in his plan are only ~300 feet from the side of the building. Note it's not the property lines that are ~300 feet away but the actual homes. Children's bedrooms will be 300 feet from the loading dock and trash compactor.

Their gifting of the land is nothing but a holy Mary PR play. Clearly you all recognize that whether you'll admit it publicly or not.

This was a bad plan several months ago, has not changed and is still a bad plan today. Many of you have publicly stated that this was a bad plan. Seeing as the plan has not changed I'm sure none of your opinions have changed.

While this plan deserves to fail on its merits there is another issue at play with this proposal.

We are not dealing with honest or trustworthy actors. At the site walk through Michael DiGuiseppe stood in front of all of you and lied to your faces. He said...

- the state DOT has approved the plan to move the communications tower. That was a lie. RIDOT has not approved any part of his plan
- that he has agreement to move the cemetery. That was a lie. The Cemetery Commission has given no such approval

- that the Costco won't be seen from the surrounding neighborhoods. Those of you that took the opportunity to walk the site know just how absurd a comment that was to make

- when council woman Vargas asked how close were the nearest homes to the building he said there is 18 acres of space behind the Costco. But the nearest homes are about 300 feet to the side of the building

After all that they push for multiple continuances and then drop their "new" plans only two weeks before the next planning commission meeting. Not to mention one of those two weeks is Thanksgiving!

If the man is willing to stand and front of you and lie then he does not get the benefit of the doubt on the timing of his plan vs the December meeting. They are trying to sneak this through during the holidays and they are more than happy to hide behind zoom calls.

Knowing that he will look you in the eye and not be truthful I'm not sure why anyone would trust or believe anything in this proposal. It also remains incomplete.

There is no agreement in place to move the cemetery

The state has not agreed to move the telecommunications tower

This plan deserves to fail on its merits. But more importantly why would the city choose to do business with this man? I'm sure that in all of your personal and professional lives that you choose to not associate or work with people who are dishonest and cannot be trusted. I don't see how this is any different.

It's a bad plan being offered by a bad partner.

Vote this thing done and let's move on from this nonsense.

Thank you

Brian Malachowski

Berry, Joshua

From: mcnally802@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Pezzullo, Jason; Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: Upcoming Cranston Land Sale

Hi Jason and Josh,

Thank you to both of you for getting back to me. The proposed Mulligan's location is also inconsistent with existing zoning, surrounding land uses and the comprehensive plan.

Hopefully the developers will be able to find a site in Cranston that is consistent with existing zoning, land uses and the comprehensive plan, so that Costco can open its doors in our City.

Thanks,
Rachel

On Tue, Oct 13, 2020 at 9:52 AM Pezzullo, Jason <jpezzullo@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Hi Rachel, the State Land in the middle of Howard Industrial Park is zoned M-2 Heavy Commercial. Any proposed big box development within this complex for a highway commercial use would be considered a nonstarter on its face. It is inconsistent with existing zoning, surrounding land uses and the comprehensive plan. A large-scale manufacturing park is not complementary for any large-scale retail establishments. At this time, there are no discussions to entertain this idea. If you want to talk more about this, give me a call at 780-3222.

Jason

From: mcnally802@gmail.com [mailto:mcnally802@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2020 2:03 PM
Subject: Upcoming Cranston Land Sale

Hello,

I recently learned of the state property in Cranston that is being auctioned by the State of RI.

The 16.9 acre parcel is located in an industrial area and does not directly abut any residential neighborhoods.

As we all know, the proposed Costco development is not a good fit for the current site they are eyeing. A warehouse style/big box development may be a better fit in an industrial area.

As previously discussed, Cranston residents are not against Costco as a business, but it needs to be in a location that doesn't detract from or harm existing neighborhoods, businesses and infrastructure.

It may be advantageous to explore the suitability of this parcel for the Coastal Partners LLC project. Have they been contacted to discuss if this would work?

Here is a link to the website for more information about the property and auction process.

http://www.sjcorio.com/corio/auctions/state_ri_donaldprice/donaldprice_auction_details.html?fbclid=IwAR3WbN6mlsgrUGAGTIPIQZBITTL2hw773n_xBrGUQP2jjorAP8h-pC4B7ew

Thank you,

Rachel

--

Rachel McNally
REALTOR
Matt Patty Team, Keller Williams Realty
www.findmydreamhome.net
401-226-8419

Berry, Joshua

From: mcnally802@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2020 2:03 PM
Subject: Upcoming Cranston Land Sale

Hello,

I recently learned of the state property in Cranston that is being auctioned by the State of RI.

The 16.9 acre parcel is located in an industrial area and does not directly abut any residential neighborhoods.

As we all know, the proposed Costco development is not a good fit for the current site they are eyeing. A warehouse style/big box development may be a better fit in an industrial area.

As previously discussed, Cranston residents are not against Costco as a business, but it needs to be in a location that doesn't detract from or harm existing neighborhoods, businesses and infrastructure.

It may be advantageous to explore the suitability of this parcel for the Coastal Partners LLC project. Have they been contacted to discuss if this would work?

Here is a link to the website for more information about the property and auction process.

http://www.sjcorio.com/corio/auctions/state_ri_donaldprice/donaldprice_auction_details.html?fbclid=IwAR3WbN6mlsgrUGAGTIPIQZBITTL2hw773n_xBrGUQP2jjorAP8h-pC4B7ew

Thank you,
Rachel

Berry, Joshua

From: Lyn Kasyan <linear.coolk21@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 8:21 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: Proposed Development of Mulligan's Island Property

Thank you, Mr. Berry. I appreciate your response.

Sincerely,
Lynne Kasyan

On Wed, Sep 2, 2020 at 9:33 AM Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Ms. Kasyan,

Thank you for your well-considered comments. They have been received, will be incorporated into the record and will be forwarded to the Plan Commission and Ordinance Committee/City Council as part of their deliberation.

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP

Senior Planner

City of Cranston, City Planning Department

869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910

P: (401) 780-3139

From: Lyn Kasyan [mailto:linear.coolk21@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:59 PM
To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>
Subject: Proposed Development of Mulligan's Island Property

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing to communicate my opposition to the proposed Costco and gas station development on the property where Mulligan's Island Golf and Entertainment currently exists, at 1000 New London Ave, Cranston. I am not opposed to this type of development in another part of the city. There are other locations in Cranston where a Costco, along with an adjacent gas station, would be suitable for building. The Mulligan's Island property and location are not conducive for a Costco, any other big box retail development or heavy commercial use.

Approximately 20 years ago, all of the surrounding neighborhoods were engaged in this same opposition against a proposed big box store to be developed on this land. In order to protect our surrounding neighborhoods, we were given promises by the City and State of RI with regard to the Open Space "cornfields" rezoning; to be redesignated as a special Mixed Planned Use District (MPD) for a recreational facility and limited economic development. Intense commercial development and heavy commercial use were never the intent or long term goal of this special MPD designation.

My opposition to this, or any similarly proposed development on the Mulligan's Island property, is also about maintaining the current quality of life for all residents of the many beautiful neighborhoods within the area. Residents in one or more of the surrounding neighborhoods will experience the following negative impacts if this proposed development is approved:

1. Home property values will decrease
2. Significant increase in traffic on all surrounding, already over-capacity roads (which will include constant, countless tractor trailers needed for deliveries)
3. Item #2 will a) contribute to the worsening of deteriorating surrounding roads; b) cause significant traffic through residential neighborhoods to avoid traffic lights or because of a new, proposed one; c) considerably increase the already difficult ability to exit our neighborhoods onto these roads
4. 24-hour noise pollution, including from deliveries and idling by tractor trailers
5. Dusk-to-dawn light pollution
6. Increased, continuous air pollution (e.g., tractor trailers delivering and continuously idling, many commercial dumpsters behind buildings, exhaust from on-premise cooking by Costco)
7. Continuous, close view of big commercial structure(s) from residents' properties
8. Storm run-off into neighborhoods and residents' yards due to property grade and significant amount of blacktop
9. Rodent problems from commercial dumpsters

10. Local and small businesses (many owned by residents living in the surrounding neighborhoods) may go out of business; retail is already saturated in this area

To date, the Costco developer has made false statements, including, but not limited to: having received DOT approvals; that the proposal meets the minimum required by law even though there are pieces missing; proximity of deliveries to residents' properties; permission to move a cemetery; neighborhoods won't see the 162,000 SF building from their properties; he's just building a Costco and that any other phases are not his job. However, all proposed zone changes for this development are part of the decision-making process for the city. Also, a 22-acre buffer is meaningless with a heavy commercial development of this magnitude and doesn't cover every adjacent neighborhood. Going forward, we cannot trust comments or promises he makes.

Since the current owner(s) of Mulligan's Island has been determined to sell the property for which he/they paid only \$500,000, there are other entities that are much more suitable/viable for that property, within its current zoning. The property could be used for a different type of recreational facility or recreational use, or a community organic farm site (no chemical pesticides or chemical fertilizers would be used), or a mixture of entities such as these, just to name a couple. Big box stores and other heavy commercial use do not belong on this site. In opposing this or similarly proposed developments for the Mulligan's Island property, I'm asking that promises made years ago be upheld - to protect our surrounding neighborhoods in order to maintain their character, as well as their residents' quality of life.

Respectfully,

Lynne Kasyan

Hilltop Drive / Oak Hill Terrace

Berry, Joshua

From: Kelsey Casey <kcasey710@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 10:23 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: Costco Development Concerns

Good morning Mr. Berry,

I apologize for the delay in my response to your question. We have been deciding on in-person or virtual learning for our daughter going into Kindergarten.

To answer your question, I feel that the only suitable development for the Mulligan's Island location would be one that is in accordance with the current zoning on the land. To change the zoning would be detrimental to our neighborhood and our city. I am not against Costco coming to Cranston, but the Mulligan's Island site is just not conducive to such an enormous project.

I look forward to other ideas from you, the Cranston Planning Department, and our elected officials.

Thank you,
Kelsey Casey



Virus-free. www.avast.com

On Wed, Aug 12, 2020 at 12:41 PM Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Mrs. Casey,

Thank you for your comments on the project. This email is confirming that they have been received, will be made part of the record, and will be forwarded to the Plan Commission and City Council/Ordinance Committee.

It's helpful to have the context of your family history in the area and its relationship with the land uses. If you would like to share what type(s) of development you think would be agreeable, I'd be curious to hear your thoughts.

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP

Senior Planner

City of Cranston, City Planning Department

869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910

P: (401) 780-3139

From: Kelsey Casey [mailto:kcasey710@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 10:24 AM

To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>

Subject: Costco Development Concerns

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing to express my strong concerns with the proposed development at Mulligan's Island on New London Avenue. The negative impacts this project will have on our neighborhoods and the City of Cranston are far greater than any benefit it might have for the city.

The traffic on New London Avenue is a huge concern. The existing intersection at New London Avenue and Howard Avenue is always extremely busy. The poor signage in this area also causes people to cut through our neighborhoods at a high rate of speed and make illegal u-turns. Adding this proposed development will certainly increase the traffic in an already congested and difficult traffic area.

Trucks and noise are certainly a characteristic of a warehouse club. Trucks will be making deliveries 24 hours a day, including refrigerator trucks, that based on the plans are approximately **150 feet** from my house, not my property line, **MY HOUSE!** This proposed site is so close to neighborhoods, Brayton Park softball fields and our new Oak Hill Playground. Non-stop truck deliveries just do not make sense for this area.

The proposed development overall is unfit for this area of Cranston. Unlike any other commercial developments of this scale in our city, this will be right next to residential neighborhoods. In my opinion, this development does not fit with the character of our city. We have lived in this city our entire lives and would hate to have to leave our home if this development is approved. More than likely our house value will decrease and so will the quality of life in our beloved neighborhood of Oak Hill Terrace.

We spoke to a gentleman in the Garden Hills neighborhood just last week that is from the NY/CT area and he has personally seen what a Costco can do to an area in a short amount of time. He said the area quickly becomes run down, property values decrease and the amount of rodents increase exponentially. The City of Cranston has worked hard to maintain beautiful developments such as Garden City and Chapel View just down the road, to add a Costco would be a turn in the opposite direction that I feel would be detrimental to our city.

My family has history in this city, in that my great-aunt and uncles' home was once the only house in the entire area. My great-uncle was the head of the prison at the time and the entire surrounding area was just cornfields. My parents tell me the stories of the cornfields all the time. To think that our city would allow us to progress from just cornfields, to a beautiful green space that Mulligan's Island provides and then take a quick turn to a Costco commercial

development just does not make any sense. I am not against development on the current Mulligan's Island site, but whatever development is proposed there needs to make sense for our area and maintain the character of our city.

When my husband and I first purchased this home in 2013, I was a bit concerned over the prison being so close, but I could appreciate the green space that Mulligan's Island provided as a buffer. A space that was developed as such, specifically to maintain that buffer between the prison and our neighborhoods. Costco plus other commercial buildings would no longer act as a suitable buffer.

Thank you for your time in hearing my concerns and it is my hope that you prevent this type of development in our city.

Sincerely,

Kelsey N. Casey

76 Hilltop Drive

Cranston, RI 02920



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Berry, Joshua

From: Catherine Pantano <cpantano50@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:00 PM
Cc: Barbara Creedon
Subject: Costco plan at Mulligan's Island

Dear Cranston Elected Officials and Candidates:

My name is Barbara Creedon and I live at 29 Ledgewood Drive in the Oak Hill Terrace neighborhood of Cranston. I have lived in Oak Hill Terrace for over 45 years. It is a wonderful neighborhood; close to everything but yet, a quiet and peaceful area. I am writing this note because of the many concerns I have about the proposed Costco development at the Mulligan's Island location.

I understand that Costco could be beneficial for our city of Cranston by providing many jobs as well as much needed tax revenue. However, I strongly feel that this particular location (Mulligan's Island) is not the place where this "big box store" should be built. It is much too close to this Oak Hill Terrace neighborhood and many other surrounding residential areas.

The developer claims that deliveries would be far away from neighborhoods and that the building would not be seen from any neighborhoods. That is a false claim. If you look at the drawing of where this Costco building along with the proposed gas station would be, you can see how very close it is to homes in our neighborhood and would certainly be seen from residents' backyards, especially in the fall and winter. The proposal also shows a 700+ cars parking area with lots of lighting. I am very concerned about the water runoff that would spill into our area and adversely affect our homes as well as the intrusive lighting this kind of development would produce. A big box store such as this does not belong near residential areas.

An additional concern I have is the proposed new intersection near Brayton Avenue which would cause even more congestion and traffic on an already busy road.

I urge you to block this Costco project to preserve the nature of our residential area and neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Barbara Creedon

bcreedon@cox.net

Berry, Joshua

From: Lyn Kasyan <linear.coolk21@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 8:59 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Proposed Development of Mulligan's Island Property

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing to communicate my opposition to the proposed Costco and gas station development on the property where Mulligan's Island Golf and Entertainment currently exists, at 1000 New London Ave, Cranston. I am not opposed to this type of development in another part of the city. There are other locations in Cranston where a Costco, along with an adjacent gas station, would be suitable for building. The Mulligan's Island property and location are not conducive for a Costco, any other big box retail development or heavy commercial use.

Approximately 20 years ago, all of the surrounding neighborhoods were engaged in this same opposition against a proposed big box store to be developed on this land. In order to protect our surrounding neighborhoods, we were given promises by the City and State of RI with regard to the Open Space "cornfields" rezoning; to be redesignated as a special Mixed Planned Use District (MPD) for a recreational facility and limited economic development. Intense commercial development and heavy commercial use were never the intent or long term goal of this special MPD designation.

My opposition to this, or any similarly proposed development on the Mulligan's Island property, is also about maintaining the current quality of life for all residents of the many beautiful neighborhoods within the area. Residents in one or more of the surrounding neighborhoods will experience the following negative impacts if this proposed development is approved:

1. Home property values will decrease
2. Significant increase in traffic on all surrounding, already over-capacity roads (which will include constant, countless tractor trailers needed for deliveries)
3. Item #2 will a) contribute to the worsening of deteriorating surrounding roads; b) cause significant traffic through residential neighborhoods to avoid traffic lights or because of a new, proposed one; c) considerably increase the already difficult ability to exit our neighborhoods onto these roads
4. 24-hour noise pollution, including from deliveries and idling by tractor trailers
5. Dusk-to-dawn light pollution
6. Increased, continuous air pollution (e.g., tractor trailers delivering and continuously idling, many commercial dumpsters behind buildings, exhaust from on-premise cooking by Costco)
7. Continuous, close view of big commercial structure(s) from residents' properties
8. Storm run-off into neighborhoods and residents' yards due to property grade and significant amount of blacktop
9. Rodent problems from commercial dumpsters
10. Local and small businesses (many owned by residents living in the surrounding neighborhoods) may go out of business; retail is already saturated in this area

To date, the Costco developer has made false statements, including, but not limited to: having received DOT approvals; that the proposal meets the minimum required by law even though there are pieces missing; proximity of deliveries to residents' properties; permission to move a cemetery; neighborhoods won't see the

162,000 SF building from their properties; he's just building a Costco and that any other phases are not his job. However, all proposed zone changes for this development are part of the decision-making process for the city. Also, a 22-acre buffer is meaningless with a heavy commercial development of this magnitude and doesn't cover every adjacent neighborhood. Going forward, we cannot trust comments or promises he makes.

Since the current owner(s) of Mulligan's Island has been determined to sell the property for which he/they paid only \$500,000, there are other entities that are much more suitable/viable for that property, within its current zoning. The property could be used for a different type of recreational facility or recreational use, or a community organic farm site (no chemical pesticides or chemical fertilizers would be used), or a mixture of entities such as these, just to name a couple. Big box stores and other heavy commercial use do not belong on this site. In opposing this or similarly proposed developments for the Mulligan's Island property, I'm asking that promises made years ago be upheld - to protect our surrounding neighborhoods in order to maintain their character, as well as their residents' quality of life.

Respectfully,

Lynne Kasyan
Hilltop Drive / Oak Hill Terrace

Berry, Joshua

From: Brian Malachowski <brianmalachowski234@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 8:53 PM
To: Aniece@aniecegermain.com; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrisaplauskas@gmail.com; citizensofcranston@aol.com; dukefarina@cs.com; dylanzelazo@gmail.com; ferriforcranston@gmail.com; Berry, Joshua; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; larry@warnerforcranston.com; mike@favilaw.com; nicoleforcranston@gmail.com; parchetto@ccri.edu; paulbucciforward6@gmail.com; reillyforcranston@gmail.com; sstycos26@gmail.com
Subject: Costco continuance
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I am assuming that during next week's planning meeting that when the developer behind the proposed redevelopment of Mulligans Island requests a continuance that the city is not allowed to deny their request. I can't of any other reason or justification for why the city would choose to continue to engage with this developer.

This is a man who stood in front of our community, our neighbors and each of you and spewed blatantly false information with a shred of remorse or shame. All of you have heard this before but to recap...

Michael DiGuiseppe said....

- the state DOT has approved the plan to move the communications tower. That was a lie. RIDOT has not approved any part of his plan

- that he has agreement to move the cemetery. That was a lie. The Cemetery Commission has given no such approval

- that the Costco won't be seen from the surrounding neighborhoods. Those of you that took the opportunity to walk the site know just how absurd a comment that was to make. (so this excludes **Mike Favicchio** who is refusing to speak with residents from his own ward about our concerns and most certainly would not allow himself to be bothered with something like taking a short walk and having to actually look at their homes)

And this list of falsehoods could just go on and on with him ignoring his responsibility to include drainage considerations in his plan, his luring about there being 22 acres between the Costco and residential homes (the homes are 400ft away), etc....

But the point is that Michael DiGuiseppe and the attorneys supporting his proposal are either:

1. Staggeringly incompetent
2. Arrogantly assuming that they do not have to bother meeting all the minimum requirements for this type of proposal because our city leaders are going to just rubber stamp it

So on Monday he will get his continuance and come with an updated plan for October. But I can't imagine that after the approach he took with the initial proposal that the city would choose to move forward with him. At

best we'd be dealing with an actor that is stupid and at worst an actor that has no respect for our city or city council.

To say this another way if some sort of extremist group came to the city with a seemingly viable plan to develop that land I'm sure we'd have to let them go through the application process but it'd be voted down because the group behind the plan is not someone the city would want to partner with.

There are obvious degrees of differences between that analogy and Michael DiGuiseppe/John Bolton but the principle is the same. At this point no matter how good a plan they put on paper how could any of you trust them? Any reasonable person would assume that they are not going to be honest with the city and not likely to follow through on their promises.

They had their shot. They stood in front of you and lied. Give them whatever due process is required to submit their new plan but then reject them as partners that are not a good fit for our community. That land is obviously valuable, there will be other suitors. So why shouldn't we reject a party that is dishonest and wait for a future proposal from a group that the city can partner with confidently?

Thanks
Brian Malachowski

Berry, Joshua

From: Catherine Pantano <cpantano50@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 8:14 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Letter to Cranston Elected Officials and Candidates 2020: Costco

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Berry:

Mario & Catherine Pantano

[35 Ledgewood Drive](#)

[Cranston, RI 02920](#)

401.463.6739

mpantano49@gmail.com

cpantano50@gmail.com

August 18, 2020

Dear Cranston Elected Officials and Candidates:

My wife and I have lived in our home in Oak Hill Terrace since 1975. When our real estate agent first showed us the house we immediately fell in love with the home and the neighborhood. Oak Hill Terrace is like an oasis of well kept homes surrounded by towering oaks and mature maple trees. It's not a shortcut to anywhere. If you're in the plat for any reason it is because you live here or know somebody who does. We like it that way.

Thirteen years ago the neighborhood came together to ward off a developer who wanted to build a "big box store" on the same site now in question. With the help of some local politicians our homeowners group successfully fought off the developer's plan to go forward with the project. In the process we were told that greenspace would be preserved and our quality of life would not be affected.

Now we are threatened with a new "big box" project which will forever ruin our "oasis" if the project is allowed to go forward. Increased traffic, intrusive lighting, noise and water runoff will no doubt take away much of the charm of our neighborhood will adversely affect home values.

We appreciated the opportunity to see the Costco walk-through livestream but weren't able to hear a thing because of wind and poor microphone placement.

We urge you to vote to block this project and the impact it would have on our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Cathy and Mario Pantano

Berry, Joshua

From: Pauline DeRosa <pjderosa@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:52 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: Mulligan's Island

Thank you Joshua! I will make the changes in my records.

Pauline

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 21, 2020, at 11:00 AM, Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Ms. DeRosa,

Thank you for your comments. They have been received, will be incorporated into the record and will be forwarded to the Plan Commission and Ordinance Committee/City Council as part of their deliberation.

FYI – when ‘replying to all’ I received a notification that the emails you had for Councilman Brady and Councilman Stycos are no longer valid. I have corrected the emails in my response and have listed them below:

Brady – brady4cranston@gmail.com

Stycos- sstycos26@gmail.com

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP
Senior Planner
City of Cranston, City Planning Department
869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910
P: (401) 780-3139

From: Pauline DeRosa [mailto:pjderosa@verizonnet]
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>; Aniece Germain <aniece@aniecegermain.com>; ChrisPaplauskas@gmail.com; Edward Brady <EBrady@Cranstonri.org>; 'John Donegan' <JohnDoneganForCranston@gmail.com>; Ken Hopkins <khopkins7878@gmail.com>; 'Lammis J. Vargas' <Lammis.vargas@gmail.com>; Michael Farina <dukefarina@cs.com>; Michael Favicchio <mike@favilaw.com>; Stycos, Steven <SStycos@CranstonRI.org>
Cc: cranstonneighbors2020@gmail.com
Subject: Mulligan's Island
Importance: High

‘Cranston Crossing’ will:

- Be built in close proximity to residential homes
 - Require vast areas of blacktop
 - Have major traffic impacts to the surrounding communities
 - Be emitting both noise and light pollution
 - Cause runoff
- (Costco, along with its fuel station will also pose a safety hazard)

All the above are in opposition to what the Developer claims.

The surrounding neighbors to Mulligan’s Island have been justifiable in their opposition to this proposal For so long they have enjoyed the tranquility of their ‘tucked away’ neighborhood. A substantial number of residents had been left out of the notification process because they reside outside the 400ft. buffer zone. Totally unacceptable. The City Council was in discussion last year about expanding the buffer zone from 400ft to cover a radius of 500ft. to 1,000ft., thereby including a wider range of residents who would be impacted by any large development The discussion needs to continue and be resolved in favor of an expansion

In addition, how many homes will be built in the proposed residential portion and will it be a ‘cluster’ development? Let’s not forget what was mentioned in the narrative – a telecommunications tower.

Will it loom over the abutting properties? What are the plans for access to fire equipment? The plans show only one point of ingress/egress with a traffic signal. Will this part of New London Ave. become another Rte 2?

What are the plans for the historical cemetery that happens to be in the same location of the proposed Costco Warehouse. Where will it be relocated and should it be relocated? These questions need thorough assessment by the City Council and Planning Commission.

A Costco Warehouse is not an acceptable development for Mulligan’s Island, a pristine, quiet green space. Open space that we believed the City was striving for. We know a promise was made in 1992 to “limit economic opportunities” in that parcel. The City needs to identify other appropriate locations for this type of development.

We cannot allow the developer to ‘bulldoze’ over Mulligan’s Island to justify the need for monies to pour into our tax coffers.

The City Council needs to use the power bestowed upon them by their constituents to act on their behalf. Use it wisely and vote to oppose the development called ‘Cranston Crossing’.

Sincerely,
Pauline DeRosa
Founder

Berry, Joshua

From: Pauline DeRosa <pjderosa@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Berry, Joshua; Aniece Germain; ChrisPapluskas@gmail.com; Edward Brady; 'John Donegan'; Ken Hopkins; 'Lammis J. Vargas'; Michael Farina; Michael Favicchio; Stycos, Steven
Cc: cranstonneighbors2020@gmail.com
Subject: Mulligan's Island
Importance: High

'Cranston Crossing' will:

- Be built in close proximity to residential homes
- Require vast areas of blacktop
- Have major traffic impacts to the surrounding communities
- Be emitting both noise and light pollution
- Cause runoff
(Costco, along with its fuel station will also pose a safety hazard)

All the above are in opposition to what the Developer claims.

The surrounding neighbors to Mulligan's Island have been justifiable in their opposition to this proposal. For so long they have enjoyed the tranquility of their 'tucked away' neighborhood. A substantial number of residents had been left out of the notification process because they reside outside the 400ft. buffer zone. Totally unacceptable. The City Council was in discussion last year about expanding the buffer zone from 400ft to cover a radius of 500ft. to 1,000ft., thereby including a wider range of residents who would be impacted by any large development. The discussion needs to continue and be resolved in favor of an expansion.

In addition, how many homes will be built in the proposed residential portion and will it be a 'cluster' development? Let's not forget what was mentioned in the narrative – a telecommunications tower. Will it loom over the abutting properties? What are the plans for access to fire equipment? The plans show only one point of ingress/egress with a traffic signal. Will this part of New London Ave. become another Rte 2?

What are the plans for the historical cemetery that happens to be in the same location of the proposed Costco Warehouse. Where will it be relocated and should it be relocated? These questions need thorough assessment by the City Council and Planning Commission.

A Costco Warehouse is not an acceptable development for Mulligan's Island, a pristine, quiet green space. Open space that we believed the City was striving for. We know a promise was made in 1992 to "limit economic opportunities" in that parcel. The City needs to identify other appropriate locations for this type of development.

We cannot allow the developer to 'bulldoze' over Mulligan's Island to justify the need for monies to pour into our tax coffers.

The City Council needs to use the power bestowed upon them by their constituents to act on their behalf. Use it wisely and vote to oppose the development called 'Cranston Crossing'.

Sincerely,

Pauline DeRosa

Founder

Garden City Alliance

Berry, Joshua

From: Dan DeCesaris <ddecasaris826@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: Mulligan's Island / Costco

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thank you Josh, much appreciated. I also appreciate the Planning Department being very open with everything since this process began.

Dan

On Thu, Aug 20, 2020 at 2:32 PM Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Dan,

Thank you for your comments. They have been received, will be incorporated into the record and will be forwarded to the Plan Commission and Ordinance Committee/City Council as part of their deliberation.

I can't see any possible way that your comments would have any impact on engineering work you do in the City, but I can appreciate you being sensitive to that issue.

Also, just FYI, we still haven't received any new information from the applicant.

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP

Senior Planner

City of Cranston, City Planning Department

869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910

P: (401) 780-3139

From: Dan DeCesaris [mailto:ddecesaris826@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:15 PM
To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>
Subject: Fwd: Mulligan's Island / Costco

Josh

Please see e-mail below which I originally sent to the City Council. I'm in an awkward position, because as an engineer - I work on these types of developments in the City often. However, this proposed development is unique in that it directly affects me and my investment in the City. I'd appreciate consideration of my letter below when preparing your staff recommendations for this proposal.

Thank you.

Dan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Dan DeCesaris <ddecesaris826@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 20, 2020 at 12:07 PM
Subject: Mulligan's Island / Costco
To: <dukefarina@cs.com>, <sstycos26@gmail.com>, <khopkins7878@gmail.com>, <lammis.vargas@gmail.com>, <johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com>, <brady4cranston@gmail.com>, <chrissaplauskas@gmail.com>, <mike@favilaw.com>, <aniece@aniecegermain.com>
Cc: Matt Reilly <reillyforcranston@gmail.com>, <paulbucciforward6@gmail.com>, <nicoleforcranston@gmail.com>, <dylanzelazo@gmail.com>, <ferriforcranston@gmail.com>, <parchetto@ccri.edu>, <larry@warnerforcranston.com>, <citizensofcranston@aol.com>, <nmattesq@yahoo.com>, <ba2020@allanfung.com>

Honorable City Council Members:

I am writing to express my concerns relative to the Coastal Partners Development at the existing Mulligan's Island site on New London Avenue. I'd like to preface this letter by stating that I am a registered Professional Civil Engineer in the State of RI and have significant experience with these types of developments throughout the State. Given this is what I do for a living, I was initially hesitant to send this letter for fears it could be used against me later. However – this development will impact my family, the investment I've made in

Cranston and the investment I've made in my home. I live at 48 Hilltop Drive in Oak Hill Terrace, within the 400-ft notification radius, and will be directly impacted by this development.

The presentation made by Mr. Michael DiGuiseppe (the developer) at the "Site Walk" on August 11, 2020 was startling to say the least. There were numerous inaccuracies that I want to bring to everyone's attention, because to me the developer came across as quite arrogant and minced words to make things sound better than they are. He particularly concerned me when he asked for private, closed door meetings with several members of the City Council.

I cannot stress this point enough – the developer stated numerous times "I'm just building a Costco, I'm not responsible for the other development on the site". This just is not true; his application is for this entire property. He is basically subdividing it into numerous smaller parcels, all of which will be able to be further developed based on their underlying zoning designation (which HE is proposing), as defined in the Code Amendment for this MPD. So, he builds a Costco – which in and of itself does not belong on this property – then he sells off these other parcels, which can be developed by anyone who can build anything allowed by right! So, these parcels designated as C-4 can be further developed into a tavern or a car wash or a nightclub – or one of the many uses allowed by right in a C-4 zone.

The developer took a stab at Cranston Neighbors for Smart Development – claiming he's "heard a lot about smart development" in the last few weeks; and that this "proposal fits his definition of smart development". He claims his building (again, only the Costco – no consideration to the other commercial developments proposed) take into consideration the neighbors by placing the loading docks and trash compactors away from the neighborhoods. Again, just not true – the loading docks and trash compactors are literally 200-ft from Oak Hill Terrace, and the perimeter access road – which ALL the trucks will use – is merely 60-ft from Oak Hill Terrace! No consideration was given to the neighborhoods!

The developer claimed many times that you will not be able to see this Costco from the surrounding neighborhoods, using the driving range netting poles as reference. I implore you to visit each of the surrounding neighborhoods – because despite the trees being fully leaved, you can see the poles and we will see the Costco from all surrounding neighborhoods. Forget the fact that 6-months out of the year, these deciduous trees will not have leaves. I again remind you – this is relative to the Costco building only, this completely ignores all the other commercial/residential areas proposed on the site!

A question was presented relative to the size of the buffer, to which the developer responded, "it's 22 acres". Another grossly inaccurate statement. The buffer is 50-ft wide, consisting of deciduous trees infilled with new trees that will take 10 years to attain growth enough to provide substantial screening. His 22-acre buffer is the portion of the parcel being designated as A-8. So again, when he sells this off for a profit – a new developer can squeeze in 50 residential lots (with impervious houses, impervious driveways, impervious roadways). That is quite the bastardization of the word "buffer".

I question this approval process overall. This developer technically does not need a RIDEM permit, a RIDOT permit, any utility permits, etc. in order to change this MPD. How is that possible? How can we be assured that this development will not have any negative environmental impacts without completely understanding development throughout the entire parcel? How can we be assured this development will not flood these

adjacent neighborhoods without a hydrologic assessment? How can we understand impacts on groundwater mounding when turning 650,000 square feet of grass into pavement and buildings? He claims he has the support of RIDOT relative to the intersection – of course he does! He is paying \$2 million dollars to improve RIDOT’s dilapidated infrastructure! And DOT’s “support” should in no way be construed to mean DOT has approved or will approve this project and/or the new intersection via the Physical Alteration Permit Application process.

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Cranston notes that “the ‘cornfields site’ was designated as an area which would allow ‘limited economic opportunities’ focusing on recreation [the ‘cornfields’ were subsequently developed into a golf complex].” This achieved a primary goal of the 1992 Comprehensive Plan; and this was known by Mr. Friedman when he purchased the property at a discount. I support development in the City of Cranston. However, comp plans and zones exist for a reason – for smart planning and to control urban sprawl; this proposal is the epitome of urban sprawl. I encourage the City to work with the developer to find a suitable location for Costco; the tax impact, the job creation, etc. will be welcomed in Cranston. This proposed location is not suitable. A big box at this location will destroy the quality of life of the entirety of Ward 6 and the ramifications will be felt throughout the City.

Thank you all for taking the time to read and listen.

Dan DeCesaris

48 Hilltop Dr.

(401) 741-5484

Berry, Joshua

From: Dan DeCesaris <ddecesaris826@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:15 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Fwd: Mulligan's Island / Costco

Josh

Please see e-mail below which I originally sent to the City Council. I'm in an awkward position, because as an engineer - I work on these types of developments in the City often. However, this proposed development is unique in that it directly affects me and my investment in the City. I'd appreciate consideration of my letter below when preparing your staff recommendations for this proposal.

Thank you.

Dan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Dan DeCesaris <ddecesaris826@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 20, 2020 at 12:07 PM
Subject: Mulligan's Island / Costco
To: <dukefarina@cs.com>, <sstycos26@gmail.com>, <khopkins7878@gmail.com>, <lammis.vargas@gmail.com>, <johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com>, <brady4cranston@gmail.com>, <chrispapluskas@gmail.com>, <mike@favilaw.com>, <aniece@aniecegermain.com>
Cc: Matt Reilly <reillyforcranston@gmail.com>, <paulbucciforward6@gmail.com>, <nicoleforcranston@gmail.com>, <dylanzelazo@gmail.com>, <ferriforcranston@gmail.com>, <parchetto@ccri.edu>, <larry@warnerforcranston.com>, <citizensofcranston@aol.com>, <nmattesq@yahoo.com>, <ba2020@allanfung.com>

Honorable City Council Members:

I am writing to express my concerns relative to the Coastal Partners Development at the existing Mulligan's Island site on New London Avenue. I'd like to preface this letter by stating that I am a registered Professional Civil Engineer in the State of RI and have significant experience with these types of developments throughout the State. Given this is what I do for a living, I was initially hesitant to send this letter for fears it could be used against me later. However – this development will impact my family, the investment I've made in Cranston and the investment I've made in my home. I live at 48 Hilltop Drive in Oak Hill Terrace, within the 400-ft notification radius, and will be directly impacted by this development.

The presentation made by Mr. Michael DiGuseppe (the developer) at the "Site Walk" on August 11, 2020 was startling to say the least. There were numerous inaccuracies that I want to bring to everyone's attention, because to me the developer came across as quite arrogant and minced words to make things sound better than they are. He particularly concerned me when he asked for private, closed door meetings with several members of the City Council.

I cannot stress this point enough – the developer stated numerous times "I'm just building a Costco, I'm not responsible for the other development on the site". This just is not true; his application is for this entire

property. He is basically subdividing it into numerous smaller parcels, all of which will be able to be further developed based on their underlying zoning designation (which HE is proposing), as defined in the Code Amendment for this MPD. So, he builds a Costco – which in and of itself does not belong on this property – then he sells off these other parcels, which can be developed by anyone who can build anything allowed by right! So, these parcels designated as C-4 can be further developed into a tavern or a car wash or a nightclub – or one of the many uses allowed by right in a C-4 zone.

The developer took a stab at Cranston Neighbors for Smart Development – claiming he’s “heard a lot about smart development” in the last few weeks; and that this “proposal fits his definition of smart development”. He claims his building (again, only the Costco – no consideration to the other commercial developments proposed) take into consideration the neighbors by placing the loading docks and trash compactors away from the neighborhoods. Again, just not true – the loading docks and trash compactors are literally 200-ft from Oak Hill Terrace, and the perimeter access road – which ALL the trucks will use – is merely 60-ft from Oak Hill Terrace! No consideration was given to the neighborhoods!

The developer claimed many times that you will not be able to see this Costco from the surrounding neighborhoods, using the driving range netting poles as reference. I implore you to visit each of the surrounding neighborhoods – because despite the trees being fully leaved, you can see the poles and we will see the Costco from all surrounding neighborhoods. Forget the fact that 6-months out of the year, these deciduous trees will not have leaves. I again remind you – this is relative to the Costco building only, this completely ignores all the other commercial/residential areas proposed on the site!

A question was presented relative to the size of the buffer, to which the developer responded, “it’s 22 acres”. Another grossly inaccurate statement. The buffer is 50-ft wide, consisting of deciduous trees infilled with new trees that will take 10 years to attain growth enough to provide substantial screening. His 22-acre buffer is the portion of the parcel being designated as A-8. So again, when he sells this off for a profit – a new developer can squeeze in 50 residential lots (with impervious houses, impervious driveways, impervious roadways). That is quite the bastardization of the word “buffer”.

I question this approval process overall. This developer technically does not need a RIDEM permit, a RIDOT permit, any utility permits, etc. in order to change this MPD. How is that possible? How can we be assured that this development will not have any negative environmental impacts without completely understanding development throughout the entire parcel? How can we be assured this development will not flood these adjacent neighborhoods without a hydrologic assessment? How can we understand impacts on groundwater mounding when turning 650,000 square feet of grass into pavement and buildings? He claims he has the support of RIDOT relative to the intersection – of course he does! He is paying \$2 million dollars to improve RIDOT’s dilapidated infrastructure! And DOT’s “support” should in no way be construed to mean DOT has approved or will approve this project and/or the new intersection via the Physical Alteration Permit Application process.

The 2010 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Cranston notes that “the ‘cornfields site’ was designated as an area which would allow ‘limited economic opportunities’ focusing on recreation [the ‘cornfields’ were subsequently developed into a golf complex].” This achieved a primary goal of the 1992 Comprehensive Plan; and this was known by Mr. Friedman when he purchased the property at a discount. I support development in the City of Cranston. However, comp plans and zones exist for a reason – for smart planning and to control urban sprawl; this proposal is the epitome of urban sprawl. I encourage the City to work with the developer to find a suitable location for Costco; the tax impact, the job creation, etc. will be welcomed in Cranston. This proposed location is not suitable. A big box at this location will destroy the quality of life of the entirety of Ward 6 and the ramifications will be felt throughout the City.

Thank you all for taking the time to read and listen.

Dan DeCesaris
48 Hilltop Dr.
(401) 741-5484

Berry, Joshua

From: Debi Sullivan <debisullivan90@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 12:31 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Development of Costco at of Mulligan's Island

Deborah A Sullivan
42 Hilltop Drive
Cranston RI 02920
401-474-1980
Debisullivan90@gmail.com

August 17, 2020

Dear Mr Berry,

On August 11th, I participated in the livestream site walk at Mulligan's Island. I found it very difficult to hear any the speakers and also stay on the website. It took me several times to connect, the website froze several times, and the sound quality was extremely poor. Needless to say, I was frustrated and disappointed.

What I was able to decipher was some concerning facts stated by the developer.

Namely:

The 22 acre buffer zone isn't a buffer. Rather he has plans to develop a high density residential complex. Which very will be multiple housing units.

Deliveries will not be far from the neighborhoods. Rather the loading dock, trash compactors, all utilities, entry road to proposed housing will ABUT the neighborhood of Oak Hill Terrace. I cant even imagine the rat population that will thrive on and near the trash only to migrate to the neighborhoods. Also the trucks that arrive at night will run to keep the refrigerators active causing noise during the night.

Developer claimed that neighborhoods won't see the building - another inaccuracy. The Building sets atop a hill and will be visible from all surrounding neighbors. The red balloons he posted were clearly visible from neighbors yards. During the fall and winter there will be absolutely no vision barrier.

He claimed that he was granted permission by the Cranston Historical Cemetery Commission to move the cemetery and has contracted a company to do so. I would truly hope you have evidence of that approval agreement from the cemetery commission.

He also claimed that he has the complete assurance from RIDOT to add another traffic light and construct a main entrance to Costco at the Brayton Avenue location. Again, I hope you have evidence of that approval and have reviewed the impact study.

There has been no environment impact studies done and no drainage plan has been provided. Without the developer providing studies and approvals, there seems to be big gaps in his application

The developer stated multiple times that he's "just building a Costco" and the later phases are "not his job." The fact is, all proposed zone changes that are part of the MPD become part of the law of the city. So even if they "aren't his proposal"; they are part of the decision-making process for the city.

I truly hope that the Planning Commission readily sees the negative impact of the Costco development on this site. Kindly forward my concerns to all members of the Planning Commission.

Deborah Sullivan

Berry, Joshua

From: Hannah Dean <hmdean1024@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 11:55 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Re: NO Costco

236 Deerfield rd Cranston RI

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 17, 2020, at 9:14 AM, Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

>

Berry, Joshua

From: Rebecca DeCesaris <rdecesaris4211@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 9:55 AM
To: dukefarina@cs.com
Cc: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Proposal
Attachments: Bottom of Laura Circle.JPG; Top of Laura Cir1.JPG; Top of Laura Circle.JPG; Front yard Laura Circle.JPG; Oak Hill Terrace backyard.JPEG

Mr Farina,

I just wanted to follow up on our previous conversations regarding the Costco proposal, I have some additional concerns after the site walk. I watched the site walk via livestream which had extremely poor volume. From what I could hear, I noticed several inaccuracies that I would like you to take into consideration while reviewing this proposal.

The first that stuck out to me is when the developer said " If you can't see the poles then you won't see the Costco." The fact is that everyone that lives in the neighborhoods surrounding this property can see the poles, and everyone could see the red balloons they used to mark the corners of the building. In actuality those building corners would be much higher. I have included various pictures attached to this email with pictures from the surrounding area, there will be more to come.

The developer spoke about a 22 acre buffer zone between Costco and the neighborhoods. This is entirely inaccurate, the buffer to Laura Circle and Beekman Ave will eventually be filled with residential and there is no buffer at all between Oak Hill Terrace and this property. The closest house is 393 feet away from the building, once you take into account the access road there is no buffer at all save for a few trees that won't have leaves 7 months out of the year.

The developer stated multiple times that the additional phases of development were "not his job". I was part of a small group of neighbors in which he presented these plans before filing. He made it clear that he would ONLY be building the Costco and the gas station, he appears to refuse to answer questions about these other parcels. However, the MPD proposal means that those changes proposed in the phases become part of the law of the City. So even if he is not building them, they are still part of the ordinance and decision making process of the City. All the questions should be answered for that decision to be made.

The developer spoke about the building being oriented so it would be minimal disruption to neighbors. According to the plans, the loading dock and trash compactor is adjacent to Oak Hill Terrace and extremely close to that house that is only 393 feet away from the building.

The developer said that Costco has a policy in which any trucks arriving overnight must turn their engines off while they wait for the morning. We trust that every truck driver will do this? Who enforces this rule? When they arrive in the winter, they don't keep the engine running for heat? What about refrigerated trucks? They need something running to keep everything cool while they wait. These trucks will be idling right next to Oak Hill Terrace which has the least amount of buffer than any other of the neighborhoods.

The developer answered a question about green space that I could not hear, but his answer was " we can build them a playground if they want" If this developer had researched this area at all before choosing this location,

he would realize that the Oak Hill Playground is 220 ft away from a future commercial parcel that he refuses to answer questions on. In addition, the Brayton Ave playground is directly across the street.

The developer stated that home values will not depreciate, has he consulted with a real estate appraiser to determine this? If so, where are the results of that study?

There are still a large number of questions that remain unanswered. Where is the traffic study? What is the plan for drainage? Are we to simply go on the word of this developer that basements won't be flooded or backyards become swampy? From what I understand, any detailed discussion of those plans will not be discussed until after the Council votes on this proposal.

I understand due to limitations with the live stream that this could not be a true site walk. Did you walk the site after the meeting? What were your thoughts on the location of the building corners to Oak Hill Terrace?

We received the letter you sent to our homes, I appreciate you addressing the concerns of your constituents. The tendency to say "in its current form" does bother me, there is no scenario in which a Costco is suitable for that site....in any form. A big box development does not belong this close to residential, I agree that responsible, "smart" development is needed for that location. Especially since that MPD was created to protect the neighborhoods and Mulligan's was approved to serve as an appropriate buffer. I urge you to help the developer find a more suitable location in Cranston to build this on.

Thank you once again for your time,

Rebecca DeCesaris
48 Hilltop Drive
401-741-2010



Front Yard Laura Circle



Oak Hill Terrace Backyard



Top of Laura Circle



Bottom of Laura Circle

Berry, Joshua

From: Hannah Dean <hmdean1024@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 6:26 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: NO Costco

Hello,

Living in a relatively close proximity of Mulligans island has always meaning to myself and my family. Replacing it with another shopping center when we have so many in a short radius doesn't make sense. We don't need any more commercial buildings and especially ones that will interfere with so many Cranston residents.

Sent from my iPhone

Berry, Joshua

From: Megan Kasperek <megkas9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 1:51 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Cranston Neighbors for Smart Development

Good afternoon Mr. Berry -

I participated in the livestream of the site walk of the proposed Costco development last week. I wanted to let you know my concerns with the site walk.

First of all, I attended virtually and the quality of the sound was unacceptable. I could only hear every third word or so between the background noise and poor quality of the sound system. This made the meeting very frustrating to follow. What also made the meeting frustrating was how the developer misconstrued many facts during his presentation.

He kept claiming there would be a buffer zone between the development and our neighborhood (Oak Hill Terrace), but the plans show a high-density residential area proposed for that land. There would be no buffer zone and certainly no green space left.

He also claimed that this "buffer zone" would reduce noise. However, this cannot be true. Our neighborhood can hear the names of prisoners being announced over the intercom system from the ACI on a daily basis. The ACI is further away than the proposed development. We are guaranteed to hear the delivery trucks, traffic, and construction coming from the proposed site.

The developer continued to claim that our neighborhood won't see the building. However, we could see the balloons from our neighborhood even with all of the leaves on the trees! Imagine what we will see when the leaves fall from the trees!

I'm also concerned that the developer has not gained DOT approval for all of the traffic changes that are required for this proposed project even though he claimed the DOT unanimously approved the project.

Finally, there have been no impact studies done. No traffic, drainage, or environmental study have been conducted which goes to show the many holes with this application!

Once again, this project is not "smart" for Cranston and needs to be stopped!

Megan Kasperek
132 Hilltop Drive

Berry, Joshua

From: deltatherm@verizon.net Steve Votta <deltatherm@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 1:11 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Development Proposal at Mulligan's Island

Dear Mr. Berry,

Please be advised that my wife Mary and I are adamantly opposed to the proposal for the Costco development at the Mulligan's Island site. We believe that this property should be left as a recreational buffer between the Howard Complex, prison, and Oak Hill Terrace neighborhood.

We also believe at the very least, this application, which seems to have many deficiencies according to reports we have received, should be held until the many people who are opposed can attend meetings in person, and not have to rely on virtual meetings, which seems to be a tactic of the developer.

As the head of the Planning Commission, we hope you will do everything in your power to block this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration,

Stephen and Mary Votta
21 Rose Hill Drive
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920

Berry, Joshua

From: Leah <lthov@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 12:31 PM
To: dukefarina@cs.com; mike@favilaw.com; sstycos26@gmail.com; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrisaplauskas@gmail.com; aniece@aniecegermain.com
Cc: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello-

I hope this email finds you well. I wanted to share with you my opposition to the Costco proposal, along with the proposed further commercial and residential developments.

I think that the Costco development as currently proposed would adversely affect the quality of life for many, not just for the neighborhoods that directly abut the proposal, but including my neighborhood in Garden Hills as well as all who travel along New London Ave. and Route 5 with both the view, the traffic and environmental impacts that would be created from these proposals. The roads are already compromised and I would want a thorough traffic impact study completed to ensure that the level of service doesn't diminish. I fear especially the fast food establishment at the start of the driveway would create a backup on to Howard Ave.

My ideal would be that Mulligan's remains, as it is a perfect use for the area, allowing for open space to remain while providing recreational opportunities to the Cranston and RI community. I would even love to see them increase their recreational opportunities for them to prosper, whether that means seeing if they could offer a winter-time function. I realize that you are not in the business of necessarily keeping businesses versus dealing with applications that come before you, but I wanted to tell you of my feelings.

The proposed zoning change is suspect to me, asking for residential and not even really showing full plans for what that would mean at this time. I also question who would want to purchase a home sandwiched between a Costco and a prison. I also don't understand how a change can even be approved when the original intent was to create a buffer to the neighborhoods.

I participated on the site walk over facebook and was able to hear about half of the discussion, as between masks and wind, it was difficult to hear. What also was raised from this site walk was the idea of drainage. While I don't know the true extent of the drainage structures as they currently operate, I would imagine that with so much green space, water has places to go. With so much impervious areas being proposed, how will all of that water be handled properly, as to not affect current neighborhoods or roadways?

As my elected officials, I plead with you to do the right thing and not allow this proposal to go through. While bringing in new businesses is always welcomed, this is NOT the correct location for such a development. Once this is built, it can never be undone and the adverse effects will have a ripple effect, including I fear, good residents leaving the area.

Thank you,
Leah Thovmasian Hill
75 Sweetbriar Dr (Garden Hills)

Berry, Joshua

From: Resnick, Joann
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 10:27 AM
To: Berry, Joshua; Pezzullo, Jason
Subject: FW: Planning

From: info@cranstonri.org [mailto:info@cranstonri.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 10:44 PM
To: Resnick, Joann <jresnick@CranstonRI.org>
Subject: Planning

Your
Name: David Graziano

Your Email
Address: dgraziano@gmail.com

Email
Subject: Costco development

Email
Message: Please take this message as a firm statement on my frustration surrounding the consideration of the Costco development off New London Ave. We are a city that is being overrun by development. Continuing to allow corporation after corporation to build net new facilities does us no good. Why aren't we offering incentives for redevelopment of existing land (Citizens) and areas that are already full of impermeable ground cover. As a resident I firmly disagree with any action to approve this dev.

Berry, Joshua

From: cindyb3738@aol.com
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 8:19 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Proposed Mulligans Development

As a neighbor and Cranston resident for many years I am writing to express grave concerns about the development that is proposed for the Mulligans site. The scope of the project far exceeds “smart” development for that site. The traffic issues that would result are significant especially in an area where traffic issues already exist. Additionally the noise would greatly affect the surrounding neighborhoods. There is also concern about water runoff once you pave so much open space. This could result in flooding for the closest neighbors. All in all this is a poorly designed plan that far exceeds what is realistic for that property. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Cynthia Brown

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail
Get the new AOL app: mail.mobile.aol.com

Berry, Joshua

From: mcnally802@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 10:39 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Cc: Pezzullo, Jason
Subject: Re: Cranston Crossing

Thank you for your response.

On Thu, Aug 13, 2020 at 10:22 AM Berry, Joshua <JBerry@cranstonri.org> wrote:

Hi Rachel,

Thank you for your comments. They will be incorporated into the record and will be forwarded to the Plan Commission and Ordinance Committee/City Council as part of their deliberation.

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP

Senior Planner

City of Cranston, City Planning Department

869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910

P: (401) 780-3139

From: mcnally802@gmail.com [mailto:mcnally802@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>; Pezzullo, Jason <jpezzullo@CranstonRI.org>
Subject: Cranston Crossing

Hello,

I wanted to contact you regarding my concerns from last night's presentation. During the self-guided site walk portion of the meeting, it was evident how close the proposed development would be to the existing neighborhoods.

As you know, there are many concerns regarding this project. More were brought to light last night during the inaccurate information that was presented.

The developer stated that the poles on the golf course can't be seen from the neighborhoods. In addition to the daily sight of those poles from all of the neighborhoods, even the balloons used to mark the perimeter of the building were visible to your constituents last night. Keep in mind that all of those trees are bare for a good part of the year, which will lead to even more visibility.

He also stated that the graves there are currently "covered in golf balls." Upon walking out to the graveyard, I didn't see any golf balls there. What I saw was a sad, unkempt cemetery with knocked down gravestones that hasn't been maintained. Those buried there should not suffer further indignity by being moved to build a warehouse store. I spoke with members of the Historic Cemetery Commission who were in attendance and they certainly don't seem to support that idea.

The "22 acres" of buffer space was referenced several times. That "buffer space" is zoned for future development that is part of the MPD. That statement was a gross misrepresentation of this proposal.

In addition, the proposal currently shows 3 retail stores. We were informed last night that Mr. Friedman would hold onto one of the parcels in the MPD which is proposed as C4 zoning. That would definitely be at least 1 more retail store with that zoning.

Mr. DiGuiseppe mentioned the possibility of building a playground if that's what people want. If he were familiar with the City, he would know there is already a playground at the edge of the property. In addition to a second playground and ball field directly adjacent to where he plans his new intersection.

He also claimed the intersection had the approval and blessing of the RIDOT. Upon reviewing the July 16 memo from the Pre-App Meeting to see if I had previously missed something, I was unable to find that information.

Run-off and flooding were discussed last night. How can the developer promise there will be no issues? Have environmental impact studies been done regarding how to guarantee that won't be an issue and to determine where the water will go since it can't be absorbed by ledge or asphalt parking lots?

None of us are anti-Costco, but this site is NOT the proper location for it. Please uphold the promises made to Cranston residents when the original MPD was created in order to protect the quality of life and residents of our City.

Thank you,

Rachel

--

Rachel McNally
REALTOR
Matt Patty Team, Keller Williams Realty
www.findmydreamhome.net
401-226-8419

Berry, Joshua

From: mcnelly802@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Berry, Joshua; Pezzullo, Jason
Subject: Cranston Crossing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I wanted to contact you regarding my concerns from last night's presentation. During the self-guided site walk portion of the meeting, it was evident how close the proposed development would be to the existing neighborhoods.

As you know, there are many concerns regarding this project. More were brought to light last night during the inaccurate information that was presented.

The developer stated that the poles on the golf course can't be seen from the neighborhoods. In addition to the daily sight of those poles from all of the neighborhoods, even the balloons used to mark the perimeter of the building were visible to your constituents last night. Keep in mind that all of those trees are bare for a good part of the year, which will lead to even more visibility.

He also stated that the graves there are currently "covered in golf balls." Upon walking out to the graveyard, I didn't see any golf balls there. What I saw was a sad, unkempt cemetery with knocked down gravestones that hasn't been maintained. Those buried there should not suffer further indignity by being moved to build a warehouse store. I spoke with members of the Historic Cemetery Commission who were in attendance and they certainly don't seem to support that idea.

The "22 acres" of buffer space was referenced several times. That "buffer space" is zoned for future development that is part of the MPD. That statement was a gross misrepresentation of this proposal.

In addition, the proposal currently shows 3 retail stores. We were informed last night that Mr. Friedman would hold onto one of the parcels in the MPD which is proposed as C4 zoning. That would definitely be at least 1 more retail store with that zoning.

Mr. DiGuiseppe mentioned the possibility of building a playground if that's what people want. If he were familiar with the City, he would know there is already a playground at the edge of the property. In addition to a second playground and ball field directly adjacent to where he plans his new intersection.

He also claimed the intersection had the approval and blessing of the RIDOT. Upon reviewing the July 16 memo from the Pre-App Meeting to see if I had previously missed something, I was unable to find that information.

Run-off and flooding were discussed last night. How can the developer promise there will be no issues? Have environmental impact studies been done regarding how to guarantee that won't be an issue and to determine where the water will go since it can't be absorbed by ledge or asphalt parking lots?

None of us are anti-Costco, but this site is NOT the proper location for it. Please uphold the promises made to Cranston residents when the original MPD was created in order to protect the quality of life and residents of our City.

Thank you,
Rachel

Berry, Joshua

From: Kelsey Casey <kcasey710@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Development Concerns

Dear Mr. Berry,

I am writing to express my strong concerns with the proposed development at Mulligan's Island on New London Avenue. The negative impacts this project will have on our neighborhoods and the City of Cranston are far greater than any benefit it might have for the city.

The traffic on New London Avenue is a huge concern. The existing intersection at New London Avenue and Howard Avenue is always extremely busy. The poor signage in this area also causes people to cut through our neighborhoods at a high rate of speed and make illegal u-turns. Adding this proposed development will certainly increase the traffic in an already congested and difficult traffic area.

Trucks and noise are certainly a characteristic of a warehouse club. Trucks will be making deliveries 24 hours a day, including refrigerator trucks, that based on the plans are approximately **150 feet** from my house, not my property line, **MY HOUSE!** This proposed site is so close to neighborhoods, Brayton Park softball fields and our new Oak Hill Playground. Non-stop truck deliveries just do not make sense for this area.

The proposed development overall is unfit for this area of Cranston. Unlike any other commercial developments of this scale in our city, this will be right next to residential neighborhoods. In my opinion, this development does not fit with the character of our city. We have lived in this city our entire lives and would hate to have to leave our home if this development is approved. More than likely our house value will decrease and so will the quality of life in our beloved neighborhood of Oak Hill Terrace.

We spoke to a gentleman in the Garden Hills neighborhood just last week that is from the NY/CT area and he has personally seen what a Costco can do to an area in a short amount of time. He said the area quickly becomes run down, property values decrease and the amount of rodents increase exponentially. The City of Cranston has worked hard to maintain beautiful developments such as Garden City and Chapel View just down the road, to add a Costco would be a turn in the opposite direction that I feel would be detrimental to our city.

My family has history in this city, in that my great-aunt and uncles' home was once the only house in the entire area. My great-uncle was the head of the prison at the time and the entire surrounding area was just cornfields. My parents tell me the stories of the cornfields all the time. To think that our city would allow us to progress from just cornfields, to a beautiful green space that Mulligan's Island provides and then take a quick turn to a Costco commercial development just does not make any sense. I am not against development on the current Mulligan's Island site, but whatever development is proposed there needs to make sense for our area and maintain the character of our city.

When my husband and I first purchased this home in 2013, I was a bit concerned over the prison being so close, but I could appreciate the green space that Mulligan's Island provided as a buffer. A space that was developed as such, specifically to maintain that buffer between the prison and our neighborhoods. Costco plus other commercial buildings would no longer act as a suitable buffer.

Thank you for your time in hearing my concerns and it is my hope that you prevent this type of development in our city.

Sincerely,

Kelsey N. Casey
76 Hilltop Drive
Cranston, RI 02920



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Berry, Joshua

From: Rebecca DeCesaris <rdecesaris4211@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 9:46 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Mulligan's Island Proposal

I am a resident of Oak Hill Terrace and a parent of 2 young children in the Garden City School District. My neighborhood will be directly affected by the proposed redevelopment of Mulligan's Island. I have many concerns regarding this proposal both as a neighbor to this property and as a proud citizen of Cranston.

My concerns as a neighbor; the noise, lights, environmental impact and the traffic that a development of this size would cause. I chose my house based not only on the school system, but the proximity to everything while still providing a private, quiet backyard and quiet streets my kids can ride their bikes on. Mulligans provided a comfortable buffer between my house and the Pastore Complex. The balance of green space and light commercial had appeal to me.

If this project is approved, my backyard will be filled with the sounds of 7-10 trailer trucks a day and trash compactors constantly running; further, the night sky would be lit up with the parking lot emergency lights. The rodents that come along with a development will be in our neighborhoods and the runoff rain that a built up blacktop creates will constantly flood the surrounding homes on all sides. The traffic delays/congestion and the neighborhood cut through for those trying to avoid this traffic is a HUGE concern for me and the safety of my children. Changing the traffic pattern and installing a light to "control" everything will have impacts all the way down New London Ave and spill onto Oaklawn; all while passing the Oak Hill Playground that hosts hundreds of children a day. This development would ultimately undo that great investment in this area. The proposed traffic patterns would have effects down to the Providence Street and Rt 2 merge; which is already a busy and at times dangerous area.

I know the developer attempted to address these issues at the Site Walk on 8/11 – however, no details were provided. Nothing but blanket statements that these things would be addressed. How is the Plan Commission and the City Council supposed to make a sound decision without any detail? And further – the site walk was no “site walk”. The developer did not want to walk this site with the Commissioners and the Council because it would be obvious how close this building is to all the adjacent neighborhoods.

My concern as a proud citizen of Cranston is that we already do not have many green spaces. I understand that Mulligans is motivated to sell, however, I believe it is in the City's best interest to find the right type of proposal for this land. This project is just not it. I am not against any development on this land, just this specific type of development. Ideally I would love to see this used as a recreation area for the youth of Cranston. The City is lacking in that area and the few areas we do have are severely overcrowded. I realize this is not a reality for Cranston right now though. If development must happen on this land, I believe there is a balance that can be found. A large warehouse box store, that will draw crowds from statewide, is not the answer to an already busy area. I am not against Costco coming to Cranston – this is not the correct location for it.

Thank you,

Rebecca DeCesaris

48 Hilltop Drive

401-741-2010

Berry, Joshua

From: Jenna Bouchard <jenna2265@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 9:35 AM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Concerned Citizen Re: Proposed development on New London Avenue

Jennifer Bouchard
66 Hilltop Drive
Cranston, RI 02920
401-480-7026
jenna2265@gmail.com

August 12, 2020

Dear Senior Planner Joshua Berry,

I am writing to express my deep concern with the proposed development at the Mulligan's Island site on New London Avenue. The project's negative impacts far outweigh any benefits for the city as currently proposed.

Traffic on New London Avenue is a major concern. The stretch of New London Ave between the Warwick border and Howard Avenue does not allow for lights and intersections due to the high speed and blind curves. Additionally, poor signage often leads traffic to the New London Avenue spur road to Oaklawn Avenue, resulting in neighborhood cut-throughs, illegal u-turns, and delays. Adding a development that will significantly increase traffic, along with the challenges of the design of the road will lead to years of traffic problems that will plague the city and deter any positive future development.

Trucks and noise are a hallmark of a warehouse club that is envisioned by the project. Tractor-trailers will be making deliveries 24 hours a day, including in refrigerator trucks. In a part of the city that is so close to neighborhoods, and parks including the Brayton Park softball fields and the new Oak Hill Neighborhood Playground, non-stop truck traffic for deliveries just doesn't make sense.

The proposal to have the largest scale possible just doesn't make sense for this part of Cranston. Unlike other major developments, the commercial property would be right next to residential neighborhoods. This is unlike any other type of development in the city and just doesn't fit with the character of Cranston. During the August 11, 2020 site walk through, I was able to see the red balloons placed at what would be the corners of the Costco building from my backyard. Having a visual representation of where this development could be located is frightening.

The property line of Mulligan's Island is already so close to the structure of my home. Further developing this land would diminish the small buffer currently in existence between my home and other homes in the neighborhood with the potential Costco development. In addition to this, I have concerns about the wildlife that call this area home. Drastically developing this land area will disrupt what little ecosystem available to these animals. Not to mention, the growing tick population (which is particularly an issue with the wooded area of Mulligan's Island being within mere feet of my home structure) becoming more of a menace if this land were to be developed. For these aforementioned reasons, I am particularly concerned about the quality of life for myself and my young family if this development receives approval.

Thank you for hearing my concerns and it is my hope that you prevent this type of development in our city. Additionally, I look forward to hearing your opinions on the future use of this open space.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Bouchard

Berry, Joshua

From: Lynn Austin <lfa@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 9:39 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Development

I would like you to be aware that my stance as a property owner on Laura Circle is to disapprove this permit request. Please consider the long term affects to our City, community, surrounding property values and environment and vote no.

Thank you!
Lynn Austin

Sent from my iPhone

Berry, Joshua

From: Brandon Casey <brcasey05@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 9:22 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Costco Development Concerns

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Joshua,

I am writing to express my strong concerns with the proposed development at Mulligan's Island on New London Avenue. The negative impacts this project will have on our neighborhoods and the City of Cranston are far greater than any benefit it might have for the city.

The traffic on New London Avenue is a huge concern. The existing intersection at New London Avenue and Howard Avenue is always extremely busy. The poor signage in this area also causes people to cut through our neighborhoods at a high rate of speed and make illegal u-turns. Adding this proposed development will certainly increase the traffic in an already congested and difficult traffic area.

Trucks and noise are certainly a characteristic of a warehouse club. Trucks will be making deliveries 24 hours a day, including refrigerator trucks, that based on the plans are approximately **150 feet** from my house, not my property line, **MY HOUSE!** This proposed site is so close to neighborhoods, Brayton Park softball fields and our new Oak Hill Playground. Non-stop truck deliveries just do not make sense for this area.

The proposed development overall is unfit for this area of Cranston. Unlike any other commercial developments of this scale in our city, this will be right next to residential neighborhoods. In my opinion, this development does not fit with the character of our city. We have lived in this city our entire lives and would hate to have to leave our home if this development is approved. More than likely our house value will decrease and so will the quality of life in our beloved neighborhood of Oak Hill Terrace.

We spoke to a gentleman in the Garden Hills neighborhood last week that is from the NY/CT area and he has personally seen what a Costco can do to an area in a short amount of time. He said the area quickly becomes run down, property values decrease and the amount of rodents increase exponentially. The City of Cranston has worked hard to maintain beautiful developments such as Garden City and Chapel View just down the road, to add a Costco would be a turn in the opposite direction that I feel would be detrimental to our city.

When my wife and I first purchased this home in 2013, I was a bit concerned over the prison being so close, but I could appreciate the green space that Mulligan's Island provided as a buffer. A space that was developed as such, specifically to maintain that buffer between the prison and our neighborhoods. Costco plus other commercial buildings would no longer act as a suitable buffer.

Thank you for your time in hearing my concerns and it is my hope that you prevent this type of development in our city.

Sincerely,

Brandon R. Casey
76 Hilltop Drive
Cranston, RI 02920

Berry, Joshua

From: Karen Levesque <bandit3960@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Berry, Joshua; Pezzullo, Jason; cranstonneighbors2020@gmail.com; dukefarina@cs.com; mike@favilaw.com; sstycos26@gmail.com; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrisaplauskas@gmail.com
Subject: Against the Mulligian Island Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I am writing to you today with my concerns and that I am against this HUGE development on Mulligian's Island property. We have lived in the Garden Hills area for 28 years on the Brayton Avenue side and we have seen the many developments and failures on the main roads in this area and the heavy traffic that occurs. Mulligian's Island is in the back of my house, we have only the state buffer woods and Ridge Ave that separates us from New London Avenue traffic. When we sit in our backyard, we can hear the traffic and see the vehicles, tractor trailers and motorcycles etc go by. During the Spring-Fall season the trees are in bloom with leaves that cuts the noise down some, but once the leaves fall we have no protection from the vehicle noise pollution nor do we have any backyard privacy from New London Ave.

We enjoy having Mulligian's Island in the back of us, when they have their music/food truck events we can either go there to watch, eat or sit in our backyard and listen to the music. It offers activities for families to spend time with each other or sport teams somewhere to play golf or volleyball, or practice batting. When they have carnivals we can see the rides light up the night and hear children laughing and yelling on the rides, which is a pleasant sound compared to increase traffic noise. They have a vendor sell Christmas trees and wreaths during the holiday and where there is plenty of room for the children to run around or help the parents look for trees. If Mulligian's cannot keep up on the cost to run this amusement property, why not look for some other developer who can to keep this as a place where people can go to enjoy themselves. We do not have any place close to us like this, there is no amusement parks left in this state, we have only one drive-in, yes there are other places to go in this state, but sometimes you like to stay close to home to unwind and not have to travel far.

If Covid-19 has taught us anything is that we all found our family time to be special again. We had let our work hours and electronics take over our lives with our families and now you want to take away the only family amusement around this area for what a Box store and for other developments that we do not need or want? Will these developers put up noise protection walls along New London Avenue for the homes that are already built there or along the sides of this property from New London Avenue down to Pontiac Avenue for the homes that already reside there?

We have Chapel View shopping plaza, Garden City Shopping Center, Warwick and RI Malls, Route 2 and many small businesses around in this area that are free to shop there. Do we need a large box store named Costco and pay membership fees to be able to walk in it's doors? Another gas station? More Restaurants? More commercial space to fail because the lease is to high to pay? Who would buy a house within this new development knowing that a big box store, a gas station etc. would be in their backyard, never mind trying to sell a house if this new Development is built. We fought to have Harrington Hall to be closed so the pedophiles or other criminals released would not be staying there and that failed, now from 7am-5pm they are free to walk the streets until it is time to go back there for the night. What about the new homes to be built on the same property behind Harrington Hall, how will those families be protected? We aren't all we get is a emergency phone call informing us who got released and their home address is Harrington Hall. If this project is passed and built that will give these people somewhere new to hang or beg for money until it is time to go back to the Hall.

Costco is a big chain store and needs a BIG space to build and Mulligian's Island nor the surrounding property is big enough to handle the customer volume it may bring in. It is the first one in RI, the closest Costco's to us are in Avon, Dedham, and Waltham, all in Massachusetts. That is a big distance to fill for customers who wish to join their store chain within a tiny neighborhood.

Do you or the developers really have any idea of what the heavy traffic volume will cause, road deterioration, pollution from vehicles and tractor trailer trucks, noise and light pollution and the rodents that would be unplaced once the ground is being dug up? Here are some examples to see and think about:

1. Intersection at Chapel View on New London Avenue, there has been numerous accidents at these lights from vehicles speeding through the yellow light or vehicle's stopping under the red light not realizing they are stopped in the middle of the intersection. Traffic coming off of Route 37 trying to merge onto New London Avenue to get out of the lane to turn into Chapel View. There are backups onto the exit at both morning and late afternoon rush hours, also causing a backup on New London Avenue. When there is a holiday traffic is much worse.
2. Intersection at Garden City and Sockanossett Cross Road (not sure of the feet from Chapel View Intersection) during normal hours, rush hour or a holiday, there is heavy traffic that is backed up to the Chapel View intersection. How will the intersection at Garden Hills Drive and Harrington Avenue be any different from these two intersections? You would have vehicles coming off of Route 37, trying to merge over to take a left onto Harrington Avenue where the DMV, Tribunal Court, ACI, State Hospitals, etc. that already has high traffic volume going in and coming out of that street. The letter we received states the developer would put in an additional intersection about 1000 feet from the Harrington Avenue intersection, you and I both know that this will not work because the traffic would be backed up because the lights would not be working together to let enough traffic through. Which means Garden Hills Drive and Brayton Avenue would become cut through's for people who don't want to sit through numerous lights and who's to say tractor trailers won't try these cut through's knowing they should not be on these side roads to begin with.
3. Vehicles coming from Pontiac Avenue will use Sockanossett Cross Road to drive up to Garden City Shopping Center to get onto New London Avenue, which you and I both know there is a backup on Pontiac Avenue intersection at all times of the day. Then you have Pontiac Ave and Harrington Avenue intersection which is a crossover for people who don't want to drive all around to get to New London Avenue, DMV, Courts etc. Are these developers going to install traffic lights on Harrington Avenue, because the stop signs that on in place now will not handle the additional traffic going through on this road.

There are three major roads in this area that already have heavy traffic Oaklawn Avenue, New London Avenue and Pontiac Avenue which all contact from different intersections or highways (95, 37 and 295). How can these small 1 or 2 lane roads hold anymore traffic? Look at Route 2 in Warwick, traffic is heavy on a normal day, then during holidays the traffic is dead stop because the traffic lights can't handle the heavy volume of traffic. Even at the Warwick malls traffic is heavy and look how many intersections and lights they have can't handle the volume.

When they first built Mulligians Island and all the new state buildings they added, our water pressure in our neighborhood went down tremendously, we had to spend money to put a water pump in our house and so did our neighbors, those who didn't install one have to rely on what pressure they have to run their household. What will happen once they add all these new buildings and homes to that property, how will our water pressure be affected then?

I remember when they were building Chapel View, Mulligian's Island, the state buildings or restoring the old buildings, the rodents that lived on these properties had nowhere to go but our backyards. We had or still have foxes, skunks, possums, mice, moles, chipmunks, squirrels, rats, fisher cats, raccoons and many others trying to find new homes. Now they will be digging up fields and buildings again where will these animals go now? Back to our homes once again! I have enough rodents in my yard now I don't need anymore thank you!

What about our taxes? They are so high now, but yet our homes aren't valued to what they should be and now you want to add more developments around us so are values of our homes go down even more? You can only take so much blood from a person's property before it becomes a slum.

I will end here, hopefully you will read this before the meeting at Mulligian's Island tonight, I could go on but I will end here so I can make the meeting.

PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS NEW DEVELOPMENT HAPPEN, WE THE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN THROUGH ENOUGH IN 2020 BETWEEN THIS VIRUS AND OUR GOVERNMENT NOT FIGHTING FOR US....BE OUR GOVERNMENT AND FIGHT FOR US!!!

Thank You,

Karen A Levesque

Berry, Joshua

From: Brian Malachowski <brianmalachowski234@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 10:46 AM
To: Aniece@aniecegermain.com; Fung, Allan; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrispapluskas@gmail.com; dukefarina@cs.com; Berry, Joshua; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; Pezzullo, Jason; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; mike@favilaw.com; sstycos26@gmail.com
Subject: Simple request during tomorrow's walk through
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I have a simple request for tomorrow's Mulligan's Island walk through and public commentary.

Tomorrow we are all going to walking through the site, stopping from time-to-time to listen to the developer and will all be asking them tough questions about their comically flawed plan. I ask that when we stop to have a dialogue with the developer that you make a conscious effort to position yourselves so that you are facing the adjacent houses.

I have a 2 year old daughter whose bedroom is 500 feet away from their proposed 24 hour a day loading dock, trash compactor and parking lot. I'm asking you to at least have the decency to literally not turn your backs on her while you decide whether or not to destroy her home in return for a few bucks.

I'm probably misguided and for some of you it'll likely have no affect against the fluffed up dollar signs they are dangling in front of your eyes but I guess I'm naive enough to think that some of you might see our homes and remember that part of your role is to protect our communities, honor promises made and usher along smart, well thought out growth that aligns with the city's master plan.

Brian Malachowski

Berry, Joshua

From: Pezzullo, Jason
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 3:00 PM
To: Berry, Joshua

<https://www.facebook.com/cranstonneighborsforsmartdevelopment/>

this has the video of hill side drive neighborhood

Berry, Joshua

From: Brian Malachowski <brianmalachowski234@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Cc: Pezzullo, Jason
Subject: Mulligans Island MPD application questions and concerns

Hello Joshua,

I received a letter from the City Plan Commission regarding the upcoming Mulligan's Island site walk. The letter asks for questions, comments and concerns be submitted to you via email for inclusion in the staff recommendations to the City Plan Commission and City Council. Please see the list of questions, comments and concerns below:

1. Noise Concerns

I see nothing in the Pre-App Meeting Summary and Recommendations regarding how this proposed project will fit within the city's existing noise ordinances as detailed in Chapter 8.20 of the Cranston Code of Ordinances (https://library.municode.com/ri/cranston/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CO_TIT8HESA_CH8.20NOCO).

This project calls for both a loading dock and trash compactor to be placed in close proximity to existing residential properties. Specifically from the site maps it appears that the loading dock will be ~200 – 220 feet to nearest residential property line and the trash compactor will be ~220-250 feet to the nearest residential property line.

Table A from section F "Restriction of Noise Upon and Between Premises" details that the maximum allowable sound pressure level (dB(A)) for a commercial premise is 65 dB(A) between 7am and 10pm measured from the property line and 60 dB(A) between 7am and 10pm measured from the property line. This section of the ordinances also specifically states that it is unlawful to emit or cause any noise which leaves the premises on which it originates, crosses a property line and enters onto any other premises in excess of the specified sound pressure levels.

I do not understand how this plan can align with this ordinance based on the proximity of the loading dock, trash compactor, road and parking lot to the adjacent residential property lines.

It is a reasonable assumption that Big Box retail location's loading dock will be serviced by trucks that use Engine Brakes (commonly referred to as Jake Brakes). The leading manufacturer of Engine Brakes (Jacobs Vehicle Systems, Inc.) makes publically available their assessment of the sound pressure level, dB(A), of their breaks. They state that a truck with a properly installed Jake Brake muffler produces a sound at 80-83 dB(A) measured by a distance of 50 feet from the truck and a truck without a muffler produces a sound at 110-115 dB(A) measured at 50 feet from the truck (<https://www.noiseoff.org/document/jake.brake.noise.pdf>). Both sound levels exceed the noise ordinance when measured from ~1/4 of the distance to the residential property lines.

3M and the University of Michigan partnered in 2015 to develop a Sound Level Database of occupational, recreational and military noise sources (<https://multimedia.3m.com/mws/media/8885530/noise-navigator-sound-level-hearing-protection-database.pdf>). I think you will agree that 3M and the University of Michigan represent a neutral, non-biased or politicized source of information. In their database they include the following sources of noise and sound levels:

Truck, 1 ton: 70 dBA

Truck, 5 ton: 73 dBA

Truck, diesel: 84 dBA

Truck, diesel – accelerating: 114 dBA

Truck, heavy: 90 dBA

It is a reasonable assumption that the types of trucks arriving to the proposed Costco's loading dock will meet some or all of those descriptions.

The database also includes sound levels for:

Trash compactor: 74 dBA

Automobile, horn: 120 dBA

Both of which are also above the noise ordinances and will occur in close proximity to residential property lines.

The inability of this proposed project to comply with the City's existing noise ordinances needs to be included as part of the recommendation to the City Plan Commission and the City Council

2. Allowing the applicant to seek approval of the MPD conditioned to the relocation of the cemetery

If this MPD were to be conditionally approved the property value of the surrounding residential properties will immediately plummet. Additionally those homeowners ability to sell their homes will be significantly restricted while they wait for the applicant to figure out a satisfactory relocation of the cemetery. Who would buy a house knowing that a Bix Box retailer may or may not someday be a few hundred feet from their house? Allowing the developer to seek a conditional approval of MDP places an unnecessary harm and easily avoidable hardship on the residents of Cranston.

The timing of when to submit the application was a choice that the applicant was free to make at their discretion. The applicant was under no obligation or requirement to submit their application prior to coordinating a satisfactory plan for relocating the cemetery. Any neutral observer would agree that granting the applicant the ability to seek this conditional approval to the MPD illustrates that the city planning commission and city council have demonstrated a clear bias towards the applicant and prejudice against the surrounding homeowners. Even if we do not consider the legal implications of the demonstrated prejudice the basic principles of fairness dictate that allowing a conditional approval is not right.

3. Lack of information regarding Parcel 3

Little to no detail has been provided regarding the developer's plans for what is marked as Parcel 3 in the proposal. All that is provided is an outline of the parcel that is 50 feet from the nearest residential property. It is unconscionable for the City Plan Commission to approve a zoning change that allows commercial properties to be 50 feet from residential properties without providing any information or details about the plan. If this plan is approved as designed the developer at some point in the future could decide to place dumpsters, industrial equipment (HVAC, trash compactors, etc...) or any other number of things that would surely impact the quality

of life and property value for the families living 50 feet away. It is unimaginable that this plan could be recommended to move forward or approve with this glaring omission.

4. Safety Concerns

At any given time a large number of persons may be inside or around a Big Box retail location. These plans call for a single point of entry for emergency vehicles. There is a clear safety and liability hazard for the city. If the single road allowing access to the Big Box retail location were to be blocked or inaccessible police, fire, rescue will not be able to arrive timely resulting in loss of life, injury, etc... These concerns were echoed by Cranston Fire Chief, Stephen MacIntosh.

5. Traffic Concerns

The Cranston Traffic and Safety Division, RIDOT and RIDOA have all already stated their concerns regarding the traffic implications of this proposal. Their expertise in this area is extremely valuable but it is also clear to area residents that there are already several failed intersections along New London Avenue. Adding a new intersection and increasing the traffic volume will clearly make a bad situation worse.

I understand that a Traffic Analysis and Testimony is required as part of the MPD process.

What is the timing for when that analysis is expected?

Will it be available to all three of the city plan commission, City Council and public prior to the 9/1 hearing on the MPD amendment?

6. Screening

The proposal calls for buildings 35 feet tall and light towers in the parking lot. Both Larry DiBoni, Cranston Director of Economic Development, and the planning department's own comments highlight that the applicant has made no attempt to appropriately screen the new development from existing residential. It is particularly worrisome that an applicant with representation from a third party that has previously supported other developments in Cranston made no attempt to include screening in their proposal. After knowingly and purposefully excluding screen considerations from their initial plan I would expect the city plan commission and city council to not only immediately reject any revised plan that does not correct this omission but also hold the application responsible to the most stringent, allowable screening requirements. This was a clear case of trying to circumvent a required part of the plan and as a resident of the city I'd expect the implications of their actions to be severe.

Thank you

Brian Malachowski

Berry, Joshua

From: Michael Lotti <mrlotti@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 3:13 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Cc: mike@favilaw.com
Subject: Re: Mulligan's Island

Just to inform you there was a company from Massachusetts doing a land Survey at the top of Laura Circle. A little over a month and half ago when a neighbor asked what they were doing. They said surveying to see if a road could possibly be located at the top of Laura Circle. I did hear this second hand and thought nothing of it until I heard about this plan. Either way I'm against the proposal there are better uses for that land if Mulligans Island wants to sell it such as a state of the art fire department and Library with a city owned and run small par 3 golf course or something along that line.

Michael R Lotti

From: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 3:01:33 PM
To: Michael Lotti <mrlotti@hotmail.com>
Cc: mike@favilaw.com <mike@favilaw.com>
Subject: RE: Mulligan's Island

Michael,

Thank you for your comment. It has been received and will be forwarded to the City Plan Commission as part of their review of the MPD proposal.

I do want to point out, at least according to all of the materials submitted thus far as well and via verbal confirmation by the applicant during the pre-application conference, that there is NO proposed thruway into Laura Circle. The proposal is to have a singular public access point through a private road connecting to New London Avenue and Howard Avenue. This is reflected on the application materials which are posted [here](#).

Please let me know if this changes or alters your comment in any way.

Kind regards,

Joshua Berry, AICP
Senior Planner
City of Cranston, City Planning Department
869 Park Ave, Cranston, RI 02910
P: (401) 780-3139

From: Michael Lotti [mailto:mrlotti@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2020 6:29 PM
To: Berry, Joshua <JBerry@CranstonRI.org>
Cc: mike@fivilaw.com
Subject: Mulligan's Island

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Michael Lotti and I have a family with a wife and three children. We have been living at 94 Laura Circle since 2001 and on Rose Hill Drive for 11 years before that. We have been longterm Cranston residents and have enjoyed participating in the Cranston School System and Recreation programs. However, I am very concerned about the new developments of housing and businesses. As I understand, there has been a proposed plan about using the Mulligans Island property to create a thruway into Laura Circle. Our neighborhood is home to multiple different families; many like mine that have been leaving in Laura Circle since the houses were built. The neighborhood attracts families with younger children because of the schools, and the added safety of being like a dead-end neighborhood. Individuals are constantly walking through our neighborhood with happy, playing children in the street and remarking about how safe the neighborhood feels. If there was such a development to be made, many people may dismiss our neighborhood and not want to pay as much for the housing, lowering our property value because of safety concerns and the possible strain on all the cities schools, police, fire and public works.

I will be attending the Joint City Council meeting on August 11th at 5:30 along with some of my neighbors that can make

A resident of 94 Laura Circle and concerned citizen of Cranston.

Thank you for reading and stay safe,

Berry, Joshua

From: Michael Lotti <mrlotti@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2020 6:29 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Cc: mike@favilaw.com
Subject: Mulligan's Island

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Michael Lotti and I have a family with a wife and three children. We have been living at 94 Laura Circle since 2001 and on Rose Hill Drive for 11 years before that. We have been longterm Cranston residents and have enjoyed participating in the Cranston School System and Recreation programs. However, I am very concerned about the new developments of housing and businesses. As I understand, there has been a proposed plan about using the Mulligans Island property to create a thruway into Laura Circle. Our neighborhood is home to multiple different families; many like mine that have been leaving in Laura Circle since the houses were built. The neighborhood attracts families with younger children because of the schools, and the added safety of being like a dead-end neighborhood. Individuals are constantly walking through our neighborhood with happy, playing children in the street and remarking about how safe the neighborhood feels. If there was such a development to be made, many people may dismiss our neighborhood and not want to pay as much for the housing, lowering our property value because of safety concerns and the possible strain on all the cities schools, police, fire and public works.

I will be attending the Joint City Council meeting on August 11th at 5:30 along with some of my neighbors that can make

A resident of 94 Laura Circle and concerned citizen of Cranston.

Thank you for reading and stay safe,