

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in Cranston City Hall Council Chambers by Chairperson Dean Perdikakis on **Wednesday, March 12, 2025, at 6:30 pm**. Also present were Joy Montanaro, Kenneth Filarski, Ivy Swinski, Carlos Zambrano, 1st alternate Anthony Mastantuono, and 2nd alternate Mario Carlino.

The following matters were heard before the Board:

OLD BUSINESS

Ward 3

DR. JOYCE MARTIN (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board for permission to convert an existing mixed-use building into a Rooming, boarding house at **1040 Cranston Street**; A.P. 7, lots 754,755, and 756; area 14,254 sf; zoned C5. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variances; Sections 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses. Application filed on 12/10/2024. Attorney John O. Mancini, Esq.

This application was **withdrawn** at the request of the applicant.

NEW BUSINESS

Ward 5

JESUS COLON (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board to construct a new single-family dwelling on an under-sized lot previously merged for zoning at **0 Whiting Street**, A.P. 12, lot 2890; area 4,736 sf; zoned A6. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. Application filed 1/22/2025.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Zambrano, the Board voted unanimously to approve the variance as presented on March 12, 2025.

The Board made their decision based on 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
 - Minimum lot area required: 6,000 SF
 - Lot area provided: 4,736 SF
 - Relief needed: 1,264 SF
- A 200ft radius analysis comparable to the test use for determining if substandard lots of record are merged or not merged has shown that the area of subject lot is smaller than the median lot size of 5,941 SF. Therefore, an official determination would most likely show that the two lots are merged under 17.88.010.
- The Board found the 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 other uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
 - The 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.
 - 8 of the buildable and non-merged lots in the immediate block surrounding the proposal are under 6,000 SF, with 7 of them being under 5,000 SF.
 - A GIS analysis of all A6-zoned lots within 400ft of the property showed that:
 - More than 1/3 of those lots are under 6,000 SF
 - 10 lots are under 5,000 SF and 7 of those lots are located on the same block within 200ft of the subject property
 - The median density within 400ft of the subject property is 7.26 units per acre.
 - The properties on the immediate block of the subject property have a median lot size of 4800 SF and a median density of 9.02 units per acre.
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as “*Single Family Residential 7.26 To 3.64 Units Per Acre.*”

- The proposed use (single family residential) is consistent with the FLUM designation.
- The proposed density is 9.2 units per acre and thereby exceeds the prescribed density of the FLUM.
- The Board found that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan support the approval of this Application:
 - Goal H-2: Permit a variety of residential development types to achieve multiple community objectives.
 - Goal H-4: Promote housing opportunity for a wide range of household types and income levels.
 - Policy H-3: Enact flexible development standards that attain desired community objectives, but also provide a wide range of building types, uses, subdivisions, and site plans.
 - Policy H-6: Maintain a varied housing stock, with units of different age, size and type that are affordable to a wide range of incomes.
- The applicant appeared without counsel and described the project which is a single family home
- There were no objectors to the application

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staffs 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 Section 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Ward 1

P&P REALTY, LLC and HSM INVESTMENTS, LLC have filed an application to allow a laundromat use in an industrial zone at **1420 Elmwood Avenue**, A.P. 4, lot 2616; area 1.97ac; zoned M2. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses. Application filed 1/25/2025. John J. Garrahy, Esq.

Chairman Perdikakis recused himself with a conflict. Vice- Chair Montanaro presided over this matter

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr. Mastantuono, the Board voted unanimously to **approve** the variance with conditions as presented on March 12, 2025.

The conditions are:

1. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant to submit a class one site plan showing ingress, egress, appropriate ADA parking spaces and ADA access to the building by the public

The Board made their decision based on the following findings of fact:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:
 - 17.20.030 – Schedule of Uses
 - Laundromats are not permitted in the M-2 district. They are only permitted in commercial districts.
- The Board found this Application in consideration of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any other uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
 - The property and the surrounding area are commercial and industrial in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.
 - The property is surrounded by commercial uses (commercial day care, bowling center, grocery stores).
 - a laundromat is compatible with similar uses typically reserved for industrial areas.

- The existence of a laundromat would not impact existing or potential future industrial uses on nearby M-2 zoned properties. The proposal to convert the building to this use would not prohibit future redevelopment of this property to an industrial use.
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as “*Industrial.*”
 - The Comprehensive Plan is silent on the specific use of laundromats.
 - The Comprehensive Plan does not provide a description of the FLUM designation of “Industrial”.
 - Policy LU-11 states that commercial land retail activities should not intrude into industrial zones. As laundromats are considered a commercial use in the Zoning Ordinance, one can infer that that the proposed use is not compatible with the FLUM designation of “Industrial”.
- The Board found that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to residential (re)development support the approval of this Application:
 - Goal ED-2: Attract capital into the Cranston area and expand the City’s economic base.
 - Policy ED-23: Revitalize underused areas of the City for uses that are in keeping with the needs and values of the community.
- The Board found that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to residential (re)development do not support the approval of this Application:
 - Policy LU-11: Prevent the intrusion of commercial land retail activities into industrial zones, particularly those that might lead to strip commercial development. However, mixed-use commercial office and industrial parks and auxiliary commercial activities that serve the needs of an industrial park should not be discouraged.
- While the proposed use is inconsistent with the FLUM designation, it addresses the inconsistency in the following ways:
 - The proposal is consistent with the general character of the area and will not restrict any future industrial development on the subject property or neighboring properties.
 - The proposal is an adaptive reuse project of an underutilized property aligning with Comprehensive Plan Goal ED-2 and Policy ED-23.

The applicant described the project and the business plan at the property.

There was testimony from the business owners next door who were supportive of the project

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the 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 Sections 17.92.010 Variance; 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses.

Ward 3

HEIDY C. PAZ (OWN/APP) has filed an application to request permission to alter a previously granted variance to construct a single-family dwelling on an under-sized lot exceeding the allowable height at **175 Farmington Avenue**, A.P. 8, lot 1022; area 4,500 s.f.; zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. Application filed 2/12/22. No attorney.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to continue the matter to the April 9, 2025, meeting.

Stanley Pikul
Secretary, Zoning Boards

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM
