

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in Auditorium at Cranston Highschool East by Chairperson Dean Perdikakis on **Wednesday, April 8, 2026, at 6:32pm**. Also, present were Vice-Chairperson Joy Montanaro, Carlos Zambrano, Ivy Swinski, Kenneth J. Filarski, 1st Alternate Anthony Mastantuono, 2nd Alternate Mario Carlino and 4th Alternate Justin McCarthy.

The following matter was not heard before the board:

Ward 1

PRAISE TABERNACLE (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board for permission to construct a freestanding sign with double-sided LED message center within the corner setback at **330 Park Avenue**; A.P. 4, lot 150; area 52,272 sf; zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.72.010(P)- Signs; 17.20.100.(A) - Corner visibility; Application ZBR-26-1 filed 01/12/2026. Attorney Daniel Flaherty, Esq.

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

The following matters were heard before the board:

Ward 3

DALIA P. MERCADO (OWN) ANTONIO TIMARCHI (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing two-family dwelling on an undersized lot previously merged by zoning at **3 Fountain Avenue**, AP 8 Lot 2802; area 3200sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements; 17.88.010 Substandard lots of record and lot mergers. Application ZBR-26-5 filed 01/15/2026.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 0 Fountain Avenue.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski. and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the May 13, 2026 meeting at the request of the applicant. The continuance was to allow the applicant the ability to provide additional information regarding parking.

Ward 3

DALIA P. MERCADO (OWN) ANTONIO TIMARCHI (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot previously merged by zoning at **0 Fountain Avenue**, AP 8 Lot 1534; area 3200sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements; 17.88.010 Substandard lots of record and lot mergers. Application ZBR-26-4 filed 01/15/2026.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 3 Fountain Avenue.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski. and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the May 13, 2026 meeting at the request of the applicant. The continuance was to allow the applicant the ability to provide additional information regarding parking.

Ward 5

ROBERT A RICCI, THOMAS A RICCI, RICCI HOLDINGS, LLC, BRENDA A. PICCIONE, JOSEPH A PICCIONE, AND SIENNA PICCIONE (OWN) JMMC CONSTRUCTION CORP. (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage previously merged by zoning at **0 Clemence Street**, AP 12 Lot 569; area 5268sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements; 17.88.010 Substandard lots of record and lot mergers. Application ZBR-26-8 filed 03/02/2026. Attorney John O. Mancini, Esq.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 66 Clemence St.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Zambrano, the Board voted unanimously to approve this application as presented on April 8, 2026. Mr. Mastantuono recused himself from this matter.

The Board made their decision after considering the following findings of fact:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations
- 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	6,000 sf for Single-Family Dwellings	5268 sf	624 sf for the proposed single-family
Minimum Lot Size	8,000 for Two-Family	5376 sf	2624 sf for the two-family
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two lots	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

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

- The Board found that the neighborhood median lot size in the Thornton B-1 zone is 5000 sf. The subject lots (5268 sf & 5375 sf), fit the dimensions of lot sizes in the area.
- The Board found that the median lot size in the 200-foot radius is 5570.5 sf. This is only marginally larger than the 5268 sf & 5375 sf subject lots.
- The density of all the lots in the 200-foot analysis is currently 10.18 units per acre. With the addition of an extra unit as proposed, the density would increase to 10.51 units per acre. This falls below the FLUM density of 10.89 units per acre.
- As highlighted in this image below, the subject property is the only vacant lot on this block. The proposed single-family dwelling would follow the development patterns in the neighborhood.

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

Ward 5

ROBERT A RICCI, THOMAS A RICCI, RICCI HOLDINGS, LLC, BRENDA A. PICCIONE, JOSEPH A PICCIONE, AND SIENNA PICCIONE (OWN) JMMC CONSTRUCTION CORP. (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing two-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced setbacks, previously merged by zoning, at **66 Clemence Street**, AP 12 Lot 568; area 5,376 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements; 17.88.010 Substandard lots of record and lot mergers. Application ZBR-26-9 filed 03/02/2026. Attorney John O. Mancini, Esq.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 0 Clemence Street.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Filarski, the Board voted unanimously to **approve** this application as presented on April 8, 2026. Mr. Mastantuono recused himself from this matter.

The Board made their decision after considering the following findings of fact:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations
- 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	6,000 sf for Single-Family Dwellings	5268 sf	624 sf for the proposed single-family
Minimum Lot Size	8,000 for Two-Family	5376 sf	2624 sf for the two-family
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two lots	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

The Board made their decision after considering the following findings of fact:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations
- 17.20.090 – Specific Requirements
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	6,000 sf for Single-Family Dwellings	5268 sf	624 sf for the proposed single-family
Minimum Lot Size	8,000 for Two-Family	5376 sf	2624 sf for the two-family
Substandard lots of Record and Lot Mergers	A "substandard lot of record" is a lot which does not satisfy one or more dimensional requirements set forth in Section 17.20.120, but which was shown on a plat or deed recorded prior to January 1, 1966 or an approved plat recorded after January 1, 1966 which has otherwise been legally created and which has not been altered to become more nonconforming since its creation, except by approval of the city plan commission.	Unmerging of the two lots	Variance from the substandard lots of record and merger provision.

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

- The Board found that the neighborhood median lot size in the Thornton B-1 zone is 5000 sf. The subject lots (5268 sf & 5375 sf), fit the dimensions of lot sizes in the area.

- The Board found that the median lot size in the 200-foot radius is 5570.5 sf. This is only marginally larger than the 5268 sf & 5375 sf subject lots.
- The density of all the lots in the 200-foot analysis is currently 10.18 units per acre. With the addition of an extra unit as proposed, the density would increase to 10.51 units per acre. This falls below the FLUM density of 10.89 units per acre.
- As highlighted in this image below, the subject property is the only vacant lot on this block. The proposed single-family dwelling would follow the development patterns in the neighborhood.

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

Ward 2

ROSE MARLEY, LLC AND MATTHEW A. REAY (OWN/APP) have applied to the Board for permission to install new wall signage exceeding the allowable size and total area at **529 Reservoir Avenue**; A.P. 6 Lot 821; area 42,491sf, zoned C4. Applicants seek relief by 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.72.010- Signs. Application ZBR-26-10 filed 03/09/26. Attorney Robert D. Murray, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to **approve this application as presented on April 8, 2026.**

The Board made their decision after considering the following findings of fact:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.72.010 – Signs

The applicant has recently obtained a permit for a freestanding sign with an area of 112 square feet. They are now applying for a variance to install new wall signs that exceed the maximum wall sign area and the total sign area requirements in the C-4 Zone. The Applicant proposes two wall signs that each have an area of 106.5 square feet.

17.72.010(5) – Sign Code Relief Sought:

C-4 Zone	Allowed	Proposed	Relief Sought
Total Sign Area - Freestanding Sign - Wall signs (2)	300 sf	325 sf	25 sf
Wall Sign Maximum Area	30 sf	213 sf	183 sf

- The Board found this application compatible with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
- Signs should be appropriate for the scale of the site and building that they are advertising. The building is very large (approximately 10,000 square feet), which requires larger signage to maintain consistency with the building size.
 - The proposed signs are similar in size to the existing signage used by the previous tenant.
 - The total sign area relief is minimal. The applicant only exceeds the requirement by 25 square feet (8%), which shows efforts to minimize non-compliance with regulations.
 - The applicant testified about the project and also testified that he was aware of the conditions of the prior approval for a LED sign and would adhere to those conditions, specifically the message being static with no animation

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

Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Section 17.72.010- Signs.

Ward 1

PRAISE TABERNACLE (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board for permission to construct a detached structure to be used as a youth center exceeding the allowable lot coverage and within the front yard setback at **330 Park Avenue**; A.P. 4, lot 150; area 52,272 sf; zoned A6. Applicants seek relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Section 7.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations Application. ZBR-26-11 filed 03/11/2026. Attorney Robert D. Murray, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski., the Board voted unanimously to **deny** the 4.06ft setback request and **approve** the lot coverage variance, with Conditions.

Conditions:

1. Basement shall not be occupied and shall be used for storage only
2. No vehicle access into the building

The Board made their decision after considering the following findings of fact:

Findings of Fact

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations

Dimensional Relief Sought:

A-6 Zone	Required	Proposed Condition	(Existing)	Relief Sought
Maximum Lot Coverage	30%	37.8%		7.8%
Minimum Front Setback	25 Feet	20.94		4.06 Feet

The Applicants stated reason for requesting relief:

The Applicant desires to construct a youth center behind the existing church that would front on Sunset Terrace. The building would be used to host activities that are now being held in the church that has limited space. No off-street parking would be affected. The front of the youth center would maintain the same setback along Sunset Terrace that follows the side of the church that fronts on Park Avenue.

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

- The proposed building will allow Praise Tabernacle to increase the quality of their charitable mission in the community, without creating significant changes to the site or to their existing services.
- The Board found that the applicant did not prove the necessity for the setback request or all the elements for this Board to grant that variance and that was a reason for the partial denial
- Maximum building coverage on the lot is 30% in the A-6 Zone. While religious uses are allowed in this zone, the primary use is intended to be detached single-family residential. In the nearby C-2 zone, which is designed for commercial uses, the maximum lot coverage is 60%. Even B-2, another residential zone, has a maximum lot coverage of 50%. This shows that a request for 37.8% lot coverage is extremely reasonable. A variance is required due to the low-density residential zoning designation of the subject lot.
- The applicant has stated that net-runoff on the site will not increase as a result of new impervious surfaces.
- The applicant put forth its experts and there was testimony both for and against the project by the public

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

Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance for lot coverage only, the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Section 7.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Stanley Pikul
Secretary, Zoning Board

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 PM