

Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Committee Chairman
Director of Planning



John Ireland
Fire Department

David Rodio
Building Official

Nick Capezza
Engineering Division

Stephen Mulcahy
Traffic Safety Division

DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Cranston City Hall
869 Park Avenue, Cranston, Rhode Island 02910

DRAFT MINUTES 9:00 AM, WEDNESDAY, February 2, 2022 TELECONFERENCE

Chairman Pezzullo called the Development Plan Review Committee meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. on Zoom.

The following members were in attendance for the meeting: Chairman Jason Pezzullo, Nick Capezza, Carl Santucci, Franklin Paulino, Stan Pikul, John Ireland, and Stephen Mulcahy.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Douglas McLean, Principal Planner; and Alex Berardo, Planning Technician.

Also attending: Atty. John Mancini, Brady Carlucci, and Jim Waterman for Washville Carwash.

1. "Montecatini Properties / Domain Realty" * Pre-Application / Jurisdictional

Location: 846 Oaklawn Avenue – AP 15/2, Lot 361
Zoning District: C-3 General Business
Owner/applicant: Domain Realty LLC, 800 Oaklawn Avenue, Cranston, RI 02920
Proposal: The applicant proposes to convert single-family residence into a commercial / retail establishment consistent with the recently changed Comprehensive Plan designation and zone change.

Chairman Pezzullo said that the applicant, Frank DiZoglio, asked for a continuance to the next regular DPR meeting so that he could finalize his revised plans. The matter was continued to the February 16th meeting.

2. "Washville Carwash" * Pre-Application

Location: 1312 Oaklawn Ave., AP 15, Lots 26 and 1481
Zoning District: C-4 Highway business
Owner/applicant: Washville Carwash (LANCRAN 2018 LLC) / MaryJo Greczy
Proposal: The applicant proposes to construct a new carwash facility with associated parking, vacuum pumps, and landscaping.

Atty. John Mancini, representing the applicant (Jim Waterman of Washville Carwash, who was also in attendance), gave the presentation. He said the applicants were seeking to build a car wash on the site, which is zoned C-4. Atty. Mancini said the parcel would be subject to a minor subdivision later because the 1.5-acre car wash site is part of a larger lot. He also said the most important element to be reviewed, in his opinion, was how the site plan proposes to handle vehicle queuing.

Project engineer Brady Carlucci presented the proposal. He said that the location of the curb cut on Oaklawn Avenue is in accordance with RIDOT's plan for revisions to the curb cut. Cars would be stacking along the Bateman Avenue side of the parcel to enter the car wash. Vacuum stalls and handicapped parking would be located on the opposite side of the building; landscaped buffers for screening and sound mitigation would be located north and west of the parking area.

Jim Waterman of Washville Carwash provided some context for the business itself. He said Washville currently had locations in Long Island and in Maine, but was looking to expand into Southern New England

and New Hampshire. He said each Washville location could employ up to 15-20 people, with 2-5 working during any given shift, and expressed an intent to be a good neighbor to the residential abutters.

Chairman Pezzullo asked the members for comments. Committee members posed questions on the following aspects of the proposal:

- Oaklawn Ave curb cut – Mr. Capezza asked whether the applicant had met with RIDOT and knew a firm timeline for when the curb cut would be moved. Mr. Carlucci said the applicant intended to hold a pre-application meeting with RIDOT in the near future. Mr. Capezza then asked what the applicant would do if RIDOT decided not to modify the curb cut for several years; Mr. Carlucci said alternate site plans exist which only differ from the ones submitted to DPR in the location of the curb cut. Mr. Capezza wanted to compare the existing and proposed curb cuts.
- Architectural design – Mr. Mulcahy asked whether the barn-style architecture shown in the elevation drawings was part of Washville's corporate brand; Mr. Carlucci confirmed that it was.
- Hours of operation – Mr. Capezza asked when the facility would be open. Mr. Waterman said the hours would be 8:00am to 7:00pm, Monday through Saturday, closing at 6:00pm on Sundays.
- Water usage – Mr. Capezza asked how much water the facility would use per day and whether it would be recycled. Mr. Waterman said water usage will vary day-to-day based on how many customers pass through the car wash, but they plan to recycle 60% of their water on-site.
- Noise impacts – Mr. Capezza asked if the applicant had conducted any studies on the noise impacts of the project. Mr. Waterman said they have data for the decibel output of all equipment and are prepared to mitigate noise impacts through multiple means, such as using the quietest dryers available in the industry and closing the doors of the building closed when warranted by weather.
- Employees on site and ADA parking – Mr. Mulcahy asked how many people would be employed specifically at this Washville location and where they would park. Mr. Waterman said this location would be an express facility as opposed to full-service, so there would likely be just two employees at a time. He noted the employee parking area was located in the top-left corner of the lot as shown on the site plan. Mr. Mulcahy also asked where ADA-accessible parking would be located; Mr. Waterman said it would be near the door to the office at the rear of the site.
- Vacuum access – Mr. Mulcahy asked whether the vacuums would be operable after business hours; Mr. Waterman said they would not.
- Sidewalks on street frontage – Mr. Mulcahy voiced his belief that sidewalks should be provided along all street frontage on the site and said he would be interested to see whether RIDOT's plans correspond with his statement.
- Bateman Avenue curb cut – Mr. Mulcahy asked if the applicant had considered how the removal of an ingress/egress point on Bateman Avenue would impact their site design, as it would probably require a variance to create a curb cut as close to the intersection as they were proposing. Mr. Carlucci said they hadn't. Mr. Pikul agreed that the curb cut would require a variance, but he said he didn't think the row of vehicle stacking that provided for fewer than six would require a variance. Mr. Mulcahy also noted that a RIPTA bus stop was already located at the corner of Bateman and Oaklawn.
- Light poles – Mr. Pikul asked if the symbols on the site plan just above the top corners of the lot represented light poles. Mr. Carlucci said he would have to re-confirm because the plan indicated that the light poles were not on the applicant's property. Mr. Capezza advised conducting a Class 1 survey to review the northern boundary of the property.
- Signage – Mr. Pikul asked where the signage was shown on the site plan; Mr. Carlucci said there would only be wall-mounted signs, with the exception of small direction-indicator signs to aid in traffic flow.

- Snow removal – Mr. Pikul asked where snow would be stored. Mr. Carlucci indicated that their plan would be to pile it into the landscaped buffer.
- Dumpster – Mr. Pikul asked how the dumpster would be screened; Mr. Carlucci said it would be enclosed and the enclosure would resemble the design treatments of the larger building.
- Heating equipment – Mr. Ireland asked what heating equipment the applicant intended to use. Mr. Waterman said there would be infrared natural gas-fired heaters in the bay itself, radiant tube heat in the entrance and exit pads, and on-demand electric hot water heater for the restroom. He said all heaters would be located in the mechanical room with other equipment, and that the room would be locked. Mr. Ireland suggested leaving a key safe in the building in case the Fire Dept. needed to access the room in case of emergency. Mr. Ireland also asked whether there would be any laundry equipment on-site; Mr. Waterman said no.
- Large Vehicle Access – Mr. Ireland asked whether anything would impede large vehicles, such as ambulances, from entering the site; Mr. Waterman said no to both.
- Landscaping, buffer, and tree plantings – Mr. Santucci said he would like to see more site area than the minimum 15% devoted to landscaping because he felt that landscaped areas were too often small and treated only as snow storage areas. He also asked that mature trees be planted.

Principal Planner Douglas McLean then offered a few staff comments. He noted that the building's layout as shown in the floor plans is flipped, when compared to its layout in the site plans. He said that the Committee has the authority to require a 25-foot landscaped buffer (as opposed to the currently proposed 20-foot buffer) at its discretion when the proposed use is of a higher intensity than abutting uses. He asked if the applicant had spoken with RIDEM; Mr. Carlucci said they hoped to meet with RIDEM in the next two weeks. Returning to the light poles, Mr. McLean asked if they would be used for the car wash. Mr. Carlucci said no, as their understanding was that the property line separated the lights from the rest of the site. Mr. McLean then asked if they had considered removing the pavement and light poles off the residential property. He also advised removing the abutting commercial site from the site plan. Finally, Mr. McLean said staff would want to see the RIDOT traffic study as well as any state permits, lighting/landscape/signage plans, and a noise study.

Chairman Pezzullo reiterated that landscaping and noise studies would need to be conducted and said they would be peer-reviewed as well. He also agreed that a 25-foot buffer would be appropriate. He then opened the meeting to public comment.

Gina Bogda, of 6 Sweet Meadow Drive, was the only member of the public to speak. She echoed the Committee's comments on the need for traffic and noise studies. She said the intersection of Oaklawn and Bateman is already very busy, and among the people she knows who live near car washes, noise is usually cited as the biggest impact.

Atty. Mancini said the applicants would submit a lighting plan, signage plan, noise study, landscaping plan, and all state approvals. He said he didn't assume that a traffic study was necessary but would be happy to provide one if the Committee requires it.

Upon motion made by Mr. Pikul and seconded by Mr. Mulcahy, the Development Plan Review Committee unanimously voted to conclude the pre-application meeting at 10:01 a.m.