

Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Beth Ashman, MCP, AICP
Planning Director

Steven Frias
President

Robert Coupe
Vice-President



Thomas Barbieri
David Exter
Kathleen Lanphear
Lisa Mancini
John Colasante

Frank Corrao P. E.
Public Works Director

CITY PLAN COMMISSION

City Hall – 3rd Floor, Room 309
869 Park Avenue – Cranston, RI 02910

MINUTES

CITY HALL – 3rd FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER 6:30PM – TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Commission President Frias called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Commission President Steven Frias, Robert Coupe, David Exter, Kathleen Lanphear, Lisa Mancini, Frank Corrao and John Colasante.

- Thomas Barbieri was not present

The following members of the City Planning Department were in attendance: Beth Ashman, Planning Director; Jonas Bruggemann, Assistant Planning Director; Brianna Valcourt, Senior Planner; and Jamie Ray, Planner Technician. Stephen Marsella, Esq. was present as solicitor for the city.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- August 4, 2026

MOTION: Motion to approve the minutes of August 4, 2026, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

- Commissioner Corrao arrived shortly after this vote

SUBDIVISIONS/LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS

- **“30 Pomham Street”** **PUBLIC HEARING**

Administrative Subdivision/Unified Development Review

Proposal: Applicant seeks to reconfigure three existing lots, each of which has 3,200 sf, into two lots. The proposed lots will both contain 4,800 sf. An existing single-family dwelling will remain on proposed Parcel B and a new single-family dwelling is proposed for the currently vacant Parcel A.
Zoning District: B-1 (Single/Two-Family Residential)

AP 7, Lots 1263, 1264, and 1262

30 Pomham Street

Mark Spirito, appeared on behalf of the application. Attorney Kevin Heitke, subsequently joined the meeting remotely on behalf of the applicant.

The Commission President Frias noted that a prior application had been submitted within the preceding year and had proposed a more intensive development. The Solicitor advised that the Commission first needed to determine whether the current application represented a material change in circumstances from the previously denied application before considering the merits. Attorney Heitke explained that the current proposal had been created in response to neighborhood feedback. In contrast to the previous proposal of developing three separate houses on the three existing record lots, the applicant proposes consolidating the property into two approximately 4,800-square-foot lots, thereby reducing the overall intensity of the development. Attorney Heitke stated that the applicant was seeking to create a less congested configuration

that would be more consistent with surrounding development.

At the request of Commission President Frias, the applicant agreed to a condition prohibiting further subdivision of the property for the purpose of creating another dwelling. The Commission voted to find that the current application represented a material change from the prior application and could proceed for consideration on its merits.

MOTION: Motion to find that this application represents a substantial change from the prior application made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

Senior Planner, Brianna Valcourt presented an overview and analysis of the proposal within the Spectacle neighborhood. She explained that the proposal would reconfigure three existing record lots into two lots. The surrounding area is predominantly developed with single- and two-family residential uses. Although both proposed lots would require relief from the 6,000-square-foot minimum lot area, the proposed pair of 4800-square-foot lots would be more consistent with surrounding development than the 6400 sf and 3200 sf buildable lots that would result from the application of the merger provision to these substandard lots of record.

Ms. Valcourt noted that the proposed development would remain consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and applicable future land use designation. Access could be provided through a modified driveway and new curb cut, and the proposed configuration would remain compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Staff recommended approval of the requested dimensional variances and the administrative subdivision. Staff clarified that two separate votes are required: one on the variances and one on the subdivision, and that conditions could be attached to the variance approval. The variances requested are 1) that Parcel A be granted zoning relief to have a minimum lot area of 4800 sf where 6000 is required and 2) that Parcel B, with the existing single-family house, be granted zoning relief to have a minimum lot area of 4800 sf where 6000 sf is required.

Public comment:

- Allen Queen, 8 Marlborough Street, spoke in support of the application. Mr. Queen stated that he lives adjacent to the property and approves of the proposed development.

MOTION: Motion to approve the requested variances, subject to a condition prohibiting future subdivisions of these lots, made by Commissioner Corrao. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lanphear and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

MOTION: Motion to approve the subdivision made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

SUBDIVISIONS/LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

▪ **“80 Phenix Avenue”**

PUBLIC HEARING

PRELIMINARY PLAN/Unified Development Review - Minor Subdivision

Proposal: To subdivide the parcel into four (4) lots. The existing four-family dwelling will remain on an undersized lot of 11,272 sq ft. A new lot of 8,000 sq ft will be created on Phenix Avenue for a two-family dwelling. Two (2) new lots of 6,000 sq ft will be created on Bolton Street for single family dwellings.

Zoning District: B-1 (Single- and Two-Family Residential)

AP 12, Lot 129

80 Phenix Avenue

Commissioners Robert Coupe and Lisa Mancini recused themselves from consideration of this application due to property interests in the surrounding area. A quorum remained.

Attorney Robert Murray, 21 Garden City Drive, spoke on behalf of the applicant, Dante Calise. The proposal requires dimensional relief for the existing four-family dwelling and frontage relief for the two proposed Bolton Street lots. Attorney Murray noted that the existing four-family dwelling would remain on a lot smaller

than the amount otherwise required for a four-family use but would retain eight parking spaces, or two spaces per dwelling unit.

Attorney Murray also discussed proposed conditions concerning stormwater management, driveway and curb-cut dimensions, and the existing wall along Phenix Avenue. He requested that the Commission not impose a specific condition requiring removal or reduction of the wall, arguing that the cited zoning provision may not apply and that the issue could instead be addressed during building permit review. He stated, however, that the applicant would work with the appropriate City officials to address any public safety concerns involving visibility and access.

The Commission discussion focused on the visibility at driveway locations, pedestrian and vehicular safety on account of the location of the stone wall. The Commission also discussed the adequacy of parking and the configuration of the proposed lots. Staff, represented by Ms. Valcourt, reported that the proposal was generally consistent with the surrounding residential area and future land use designation. Staff noted that the proposed development would include three new driveways and two new curb cuts, in addition to an existing curb cut. Staff also determined that the proposed plan provides the required parking. Staff recommended approval of the subdivision and requested variances, subject to conditions addressing stormwater management, and the width of the wall opening around the driveways.

Commissioner Lanphear raised the issue and the Commission discussed whether the proposed single-family lots should be restricted to single-family use in the decision. The Solicitor advised that, with the applicant's agreement, the Commission could condition its approval on the proposed homes remaining single-family dwellings, particularly because the Commission's density analysis and Comprehensive Plan consistency determination were based on single-family development. The Commission also discussed whether the wall should be specifically conditioned. Public Works Director Frank Corrao indicated that he did not recommend requiring a blanket removal of 10 feet of wall on each side of the driveway because that could result in an unnecessarily extensive removal. Instead, he recommended addressing visibility to the maximum practical extent while preserving the existing wall where possible. The Solicitor confirmed that applicable zoning requirements could continue to be enforced during subsequent permitting.

MOTION: Motion to approve the requested variances, subject to a condition stating that the single-family homes will remain single-family homes, made by Commissioner Corrao. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lanphear and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

MOTION: Motion to approve the subdivision made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Corrao and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

▪ “Ordinance # 07-20-01”

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL

Recommendation of the City Plan Commission on an amendment to the Cranston Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 17 of the Cranston Code of Ordinances) which proposes to create various new standards for land development including regulations for impervious surfaces, stormwater mitigation, riparian buffers and off-street parking facilities.

Mr. Bruggemann presented the staff analysis. He explained that the ordinance would improve water quality, promote stormwater infiltration, reduce runoff, provide wildlife habitat, and establish objective site-design standards. He noted that stormwater management was particularly important because runoff from smaller residential developments may not be subject to the same RIDEM permitting requirements applicable to larger development projects, while still contributing runoff to the City's municipal separate storm sewer system.

Mr. Bruggemann stated that after reviewing the ordinance and the input from development professionals he is recommending simplifying the impervious-surface provisions by retaining an overall maximum impervious surface standard while eliminating separate front- and rear-yard calculations. Staff also recommended applying a minimum pervious surface requirement specifically to substandard lots of record rather than creating separate requirements by zoning district. Additional staff recommendations included

retaining a 15 percent landscaping requirement for nonresidential development, allowing certain green stormwater infrastructure and planters to count toward landscaping requirements; requiring stormwater mitigation for smaller residential development; moving the recording of operation and maintenance information to the certificate-of-occupancy stage; removing the proposed riparian-buffer provisions because RIDEM has more stringent requirements and primary regulatory authority; and allowing qualifying pervious pavement and similar materials to count toward pervious-surface requirements. Staff concluded that, with the recommended amendments, the ordinance would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the general purposes of zoning, including protection of public health, safety, and welfare, orderly development, natural-resource protection, and stormwater and water-quality management.

Commission Discussion:

Commission President Frias began the discussion by thanking Councilwoman Graziano for introducing the ordinance. He thanked the Planning Staff for their work on the ordinance. He also thanked land use attorney Robert Murray for putting together public comment from engineers and other planning professionals related to their concerns about the ordinance. He indicated that the staff took most of their concerns. He also noted that in this time on the Commission stormwater and flooding has been one of the three major concerns of residents in raise in relation to developments. The Commission discussed the definitions of pervious and impervious surfaces, including the treatment of permeable pavers and other porous materials. Staff clarified that the ordinance would recognize qualifying porous materials consistent with RIDEM standards. The Commission also discussed application of the ordinance to existing structures when a property is subdivided. The Solicitor explained that, under the proposed language, a subdivision involving an existing primary structure or parking area could require all resulting lots to be brought into compliance with the stormwater provision. Commissioner Corrao expressed concern regarding the potential cost and practical implications of applying new requirements to existing commercial and industrial properties. The Commission also discussed the consequences of failing to meet the proposed requirements and confirmed that zoning relief could be sought where appropriate.

Public Comment:

- Bridget Graziano, 191 Wentworth Avenue, addressed the Commission in support of the ordinance and thanked the Commission and Planning Department for their consideration. Councilwoman Bridget Graziano stated that recent zoning proposals affecting B-1 and B-2 properties and smaller lots had prompted her concern that impervious-surface impacts were not being adequately addressed. She emphasized that the City's efforts to increase housing and affordable housing should also account for environmental impacts associated with increased development. Councilwoman Graziano stated that she had reviewed comments submitted by engineers representing development interests and believed the staff's revisions appropriately incorporated many of the useful suggestions. She expressed support for the staff's recommended amendments and encouraged the Commission to move the ordinance forward. Councilwoman Graziano also submitted an impervious-cover map for Cranston for inclusion in the record.
- Robert Murray, 21 Garden City Drive, spoke regarding the ordinance and thanked Councilwoman Graziano and Planning Department staff for their work. Mr. Murray explained that he had circulated the proposed ordinance among engineers, surveyors, consultants, and other professionals involved in development and compiled their comments for the Commission. He stated that the comments were intended to provide practical experience from professionals who regularly work with stormwater regulations at the local, state, and federal levels. Mr. Murray's principal concern was the provision requiring an existing structure or parking area to be brought into compliance when a portion of a property is subdivided. He stated that this could create significant and potentially unintended costs for existing commercial and industrial properties that were not otherwise proposed to be altered. He cited a previous subdivision involving a trucking terminal and shopping-center development along Plainfield Pike as an example of a situation in which an existing large facility could potentially be required to undertake additional stormwater improvements solely because a portion of its property was being subdivided. Mr. Murray stated that he believed the provision could discourage housing and economic development, particularly where existing structures would be required to undertake expensive stormwater improvements despite no proposed changes to those structures. He also asked the Commission to reconsider the 2,000-square-foot threshold contained in the off-street parking provisions, noting that engineers had questioned whether the threshold was too low and had referenced larger thresholds used elsewhere. Finally, Mr. Murray raised concerns regarding the ordinance's proposed effective date of final adoption. He requested consideration of a future effective date to provide developers, architects, engineers, and surveyors with sufficient time to understand and incorporate the new requirements into

projects. He specifically referenced ongoing development activity at Garden City Center and the potential effect of the new requirements on projects that may not yet have vested rights.

The Solicitor advised that complete and approved applications generally retain vested rights under the applicable existing regulations, but acknowledged that projects still undergoing review could potentially be affected by the new ordinance. The Solicitor recommended that the ordinance have a future effective date rather than taking effect immediately upon adoption, allowing professionals time to adjust project designs and procedures. Staff explained that the 2,000-square-foot threshold was based substantially on a similar provision in the Cumberland zoning ordinance.

MOTION: Due to the findings that the ordinance is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance; upon a motion made by Commissioner Lanphear and seconded by Commissioner Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted 7-0 to forward a positive recommendation on the Ordinance to the City Council subject to implementation of the following changes to the Ordinance:

1. Simplification of the table in Section 17.22.010(A) by removing maximum impervious surface coverage requirements for front and rear yard.
2. Removal of the pervious surface coverage requirements from the table in Section 17.22.010(A) and adding a subsection that requires substandard lots of record to contain a minimum pervious surface coverage of 1,000 square feet.
3. The recording of the operations and maintenance manual could be required prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy rather than “upon the installation of a stormwater system” so as not to create a unique deadline.
4. Removal of proposed § 17.22.030 entitled “Riparian Buffers” as RIDEM requirements are more specific and restrictive than the regulations proposed in this ordinance.
5. Removal of proposed § 17.64.010(3) because RIDEM endorses pervious pavement for parking as a low impact development tactic.

SUBDIVISIONS/LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS

- **“425 Hope Road”** **PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL**
PRE-APPLICATION – Comprehensive Permit
Proposal: To remove a single-family structure and construct 12 residential units of which three (3) units (25%) will be deed-restricted affordable. The development is comprised of eight (8) single-family detached structures and two (2) two-family structures with access to public water and sewer. The development will require adjustments for front and rear setbacks.
Zoning District: A-80 (Single-Family Residential, 80,000sf)
AP 28, Lot 1
425 Hope Road

The Commission conducted a public informational review of a proposed subdivision and comprehensive permit application for approximately 5.5 acres at 425 Hope Road. Commission President Frias clarified that no vote would be taken and that the purpose of the meeting was to receive an overview of the proposal, provide preliminary Commission feedback, and hear public comments.

Chris Duhamel, P.E., P.L.S., of DiPrete Engineering, 2 Stafford Court, appeared with property owners Len Iannuccilli, David Iannuccilli, and Ken Kazarian; Attorney Patrick Coyne of Adler Pollock & Sheehan; and architect Donald Powers of Union Studio. The applicant proposed a comprehensive permit development consisting of 12 residential units, including affordable housing and housing intended to serve an older demographic. Mr. Duhamel explained that approximately two acres of the property consist of wetlands, leaving approximately 2.6 acres of suitable area. Based on the applicant's interpretation of the applicable state comprehensive permit provisions, the site could potentially accommodate up to 14 units, but the applicant is proposing 12 units.

Architect Donald Powers presented the conceptual design. He described a compact cottage-style

community consisting of single-family and duplex units, ranging from 1,500 to 1,700 square feet. Each dwelling would include a first-floor primary bedroom and a single-car garage, with additional parking provided in front of the garages. The concept included a small community green, a mail/community pavilion, sidewalks connecting to the Chafee Athletic Complex, and approximately 10 visitor parking spaces. Mr. Powers stated that the architectural character was inspired in part by the Oaklawn Historic District and local architectural traditions. He presented examples of similar cottage developments designed by Union Studio and explained that the purpose of the pre-application review was to obtain Commission and public feedback before advancing the proposal.

Commission Comments:

Commission President Steven Frias questioned the applicant's calculation of the maximum development yield under the comprehensive permit statute. He noted that, based on his preliminary understanding, the 2.6-acre suitable area could potentially result in a lower yield than the 12 units proposed. He also expressed the belief that infrastructure and other excluded areas should be excluded, and therefore the yield may be only about 6 units. He advised the applicant to confirm the calculation with its legal and engineering team. Commission President Frias also requested documentation confirming adequate sewer capacity and noted that sewer capacity could be a significant consideration for development in Western Cranston.

Commission President Frias noted the substantial traffic generated by the Chafee Athletic Complex, particularly on Saturday mornings and during sporting events, and indicated that a traffic impact analysis would likely be necessary. He noted that the applicant may need to consider traffic-control improvements depending on the findings.

Commission President Frias also advised the applicant to consider the 2024 Comprehensive Plan and the potential interpretations of the recently amended state comprehensive-permit provisions. He also noted that the property had historically been viewed as a potential extension of the recreational complex and suggested that the applicant consider that context.

The Commission also discussed the existing house and whether it may have historic significance. The applicant indicated that the current concept contemplated demolition of the existing dwelling. The applicant stated that the potential historic significance would need to be evaluated.

Public Works Director Frank Corrao asked about stormwater management, road ownership, and the site's high water table. Mr. Duhamel stated that the proposed internal roadway would be private, with an approximately 20-foot-wide main road and an 18-foot-wide one-way entrance. He stated that stormwater would be managed on site in accordance with RIDEM and City requirements, including analysis of the 100-year storm, with no proposed discharge to Hope Road.

Public Comment:

- Alex Mohr, 435 Hope Road, stated that his property abuts the proposed development. Mr. Mohr explained that his approximately 140-year-old farmhouse had historically been part of a larger agricultural property and that he and his wife purchased the property approximately 12 years ago in part because of the A-80 zoning and its agricultural and rural character. Mr. Mohr identified traffic as a significant concern, particularly pedestrian traffic associated with Hope Highlands School and the Chafee Athletic Complex. He supported the request for a traffic impact analysis. Mr. Mohr also expressed concern regarding stormwater runoff and the potential effect on a stream behind the property, which he stated had historically been used as a trout-fishing stream. He requested greater consideration of setbacks and a stronger vegetated buffer between the proposed development and his property. He also questioned whether the proposed private roadway would be adequate for emergency vehicles, including ladder trucks.
- James Erb, 50 Hope Road, stated that he lives near the bottom of Hope Road and experiences traffic congestion during both weekday mornings and sporting events. He described Hope Road as a regional thoroughway serving Cranston, West Warwick, Scituate, Coventry, and surrounding areas. He expressed concern that the existing roadway network could not accommodate the additional traffic. He recommended traffic, environmental, infrastructure, and fiscal analyses before any future approval.
- John Davia, 1660 Pippin Orchard Road, stated that his family had lived on Pippin Orchard Road for approximately 40 years and had selected the area because of its safety and quality of life. He expressed concern that the proposed development would alter the character of the area.
- Michael Baccarie, 1730 Pippin Orchard Road, stated that his family had lived in the area for approximately 45 years. He described the neighborhood as a private community and identified traffic and speeding as his primary concerns. He stated that the existing traffic conditions were already severe

and concluded that he did not believe the proposed development was feasible.

- Ron Bucci, 1750 Pippin Orchard Road, stated that the proposed development abuts his approximately four-acre property. He expressed concern about the loss of the rural character for which he believed residents were paying taxes to maintain. Mr. Bucci referenced other nearby developments and expressed concerns about stormwater detention, snow storage, drainage, and the site's high water table. He also described Hope Road and the surrounding roadway network as unsafe because of speeding and traffic volumes, referencing a prior fatal crash in the area.
- Frank Zaino, 225 Laten Knight Road, stated that he had been a Cranston resident for approximately 62 years and had longstanding familiarity with the area. He described the surrounding land as historically agricultural and environmentally sensitive and referenced wetlands and the Zaino Swamp. Mr. Zaino expressed strong opposition to placing a high-density residential development on the property, particularly given the wetlands and nearby brook. He questioned the purpose and capacity of existing water and sewer infrastructure and stated that portions of the area continue to rely on private wells.
- Frederick Duquette, 16 Country View Drive, stated that zoning regulations should be considered in light of their underlying purposes, particularly public safety and compatibility among neighboring uses. He noted that the proposed development site is located in an A-80 district adjacent to areas with different zoning and argued that existing zoning patterns had historically been intended to coordinate traffic, schools, development intensity, and neighborhood character. Mr. Duquette stated that state housing requirements should not automatically override local planning considerations and expressed concern that the proposed density did not fit the character of Western Cranston.
- Sonia Meysembourg, 30 Roberts Avenue, Fiskeville, focused primarily on traffic and the cumulative effect of multiple approved developments in Western Cranston. She questioned whether a future traffic study would account for other approved developments, including approximately 44 houses in Fiskeville and approximately 22 recently constructed homes along Pippin Orchard Road and Laten Knight Road. Ms. Meysembourg stated that traffic studies should evaluate the broader cumulative impact rather than treating each development as an isolated project. She described existing congestion as severe enough to cause residents to use alternative streets as cut-through routes and urged the Commission to consider the overall transportation network.
- Lorraine Rafaelian, stated that she had owned 425 Hope Road for approximately 40 years and had appeared before the Commission numerous times regarding potential development of the property. She explained that prior proposals had generally been denied because of wetlands and the site's A-80 zoning, which historically contemplated approximately one dwelling per two acres. She acknowledged the need for affordable housing but stated that she did not believe 12 units were appropriate for the property and expressed concern about the cumulative effects on traffic and wetlands.
- Paul Livoli, 1770 Pippin Orchard Road, stated that his family had owned the property since the 1970s and had built their home in 1985 because of the area's rural and open character. Mr. Livoli's principal concerns were stormwater and traffic. He stated that his property already experiences standing water near the rear property line during storms and questioned where runoff from the proposed development would be directed.
- David Meysembourg, 30 Roberts Avenue, Fiskeville, stated that he was not opposed to development or progress but believed that development should occur in a manner compatible with the existing community. He stated that he had observed numerous subdivisions in which additional homes were added simply because additional development could be accommodated and urged the Commission to consider whether such development was appropriate.
- Carol Dandeneau, 1485 Phenix Avenue, stated that she had lived in the area since 1971 and had witnessed substantial changes to Western Cranston. She described the former agricultural character of Mystery Farm and expressed concern that continued development had contributed to significant traffic problems. Ms. Dandeneau stated that traffic and vehicle speeds along Phoenix Avenue and at the Hope Road/Phenix Avenue/Wilbur Avenue intersection were already excessive. She expressed strong opposition to the proposal.
- Richard Campopiano, 1640 Pippin Orchard Road, expressed concern regarding the reported seasonal high water table of approximately one to two feet below grade. He stated that portions of his property become extremely wet and difficult to maintain during certain times of year. He requested that the Commission give particular consideration to groundwater conditions, building foundations, and potential

impacts on surrounding properties.

Online Public Comment:

- Annette Bourne, 51 Community Drive, stated that she had previously provided technical assistance to municipalities throughout Rhode Island regarding comprehensive permits and was familiar with the challenges associated with housing development. Ms. Bourne acknowledged the concerns expressed by neighbors regarding change and traffic but stated that she was encouraged by the proposed design and the involvement of architect Donald Powers. She described the proposal as similar to a cottage-court development and stated that the compact design could provide a suitable housing option for older residents while incorporating affordable units. Ms. Bourne emphasized the statewide and local need for additional housing and noted that many Cranston households face significant housing-cost pressures. She encouraged the Commission and residents to consider housing needs citywide rather than solely on individual neighborhood impacts. She also highlighted the City's ongoing Comprehensive Plan process and noted that circulation and transportation planning would be an important component of that effort.
- Drake Patton, 684 Natick Avenue, stated that the proposed project was more attractive than many other developments presented to the City but expressed concern regarding the environmental capacity of Western Cranston. She stated that the area is already experiencing drainage and flooding issues and argued that the natural environment should be considered alongside traffic, sewer, and other infrastructure constraints. Ms. Patton expressed concern that continued development could exceed the capacity of the area's natural systems and urged the Commission to consider long-term environmental sustainability, including the impacts on future generations.

Applicant Response:

Chris Duhamel thanked the Commission and members of the public for their comments and stated that the applicant team would take the feedback under advisement.

David Iannuccilli, an applicant/property representative residing in East Greenwich, stated that the development team had extensive experience with similar projects and appreciated the concerns raised by residents. He acknowledged that the presentation had identified significant issues requiring additional work, particularly traffic and other infrastructure considerations.

Mr. Iannuccilli stated that the team would consider alternative approaches, including a substantially smaller development with only two new homes and potentially a use that could complement the recreational facilities across Hope Road. He found it a little disturbing to hear about the amount of traffic. He indicated that the team would evaluate the options before moving forward.

No action was taken on the 425 Hope Road proposal, consistent with the informational nature of the pre-application review.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW – PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Planner Technician, Jamie Ray, presented the proposal to allow a new café to operate with no off-street parking and oversized wall signs. Staff presented a positive recommendation.

Commissioner Robert Coupe supported a positive recommendation, noting that the building's configuration makes on-site parking effectively impossible and that denial of relief could leave the building vacant. He also noted that the surrounding neighborhood has historically relied on on-street parking.

MOTION: Motion to send a positive recommendation to the zoning board made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Corrao and the motion passed with a (6-1) vote.

- Commissioner Lanphear voted no on the motion.

TILAK VERMA (OWN) AND BRIAN SHULL (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to construct an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above an existing garage within the front and side setbacks at **2 Kensington Road**, AP 2 Lot 909; area 25,159sf, zoned A12. Applicants seek relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Planning Department staff, represented by Jamie Ray, explained that the staff recommendation was for no recommendation because the listed variances appeared inapplicable to an ADU constructed within an existing footprint. Staff believe the project can proceed without a variance. Staff could not identify the referenced 15-foot limitation within the zoning provisions applicable to this specific situation.

The Solicitor advised that, because an application had been filed and was before the Commission, the Commission should provide a recommendation even though the applicant intended to seek clarification from the Building Official.

MOTION: Motion to send a positive recommendation to the zoning board made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

PHILLIPE LAFRENAYE (OWN) AND JOVANI TORRES (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing three-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage and setbacks previously merged by zoning at **118 Maplewood Avenue**, AP 7 Lot 3234; area 5,000 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 -Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

PHILLIPE LAFRENAYE (OWN) AND JOVANI TORRES (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new two-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage and setbacks previously merged by zoning at **0 Maplewood Avenue**, AP 7 Lot 3237; area 5,000 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Substandard Lots of Record and Lot Mergers; Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

The Commission reviewed the application to unmerge two approximately 5,000-square-foot lots, retain an existing three-family dwelling on one lot, and construct a new two-family dwelling on the other. The applicant requested relief from lot size and setback requirements. Staff explained that the surrounding Laurel Hill neighborhood contains a wide range of lot sizes and a substantial number of two- and three-family dwellings. Staff also noted that the proposed parking layout had been reviewed by Traffic Safety Manager Stephen Mulcahy and was found to comply with applicable regulations.

The Commission expressed concerns regarding the proposed density and its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. Commission President Frias stated that he would not support the application because the proposed density of 21.78 units per acre exceeded both the surrounding neighborhood density and the Future Land Use Map designation.

MOTION: Motion to send a negative recommendation for 118 Maplewood Avenue to the zoning board made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

MOTION: Motion to send a negative recommendation for 0 Maplewood Avenue to the zoning board made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

RAYMOND WILLIS (OWN/APP) has applied to the Board for permission to raze and reconstruct a detached garage with reduced side and rear setbacks at **185 Albert Avenue**; A.P. 2, lot 1682; area 6,962 sf; zoned B1. Applicants seek relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

The Commission reviewed an application to raise and reconstruct an existing detached garage in Edgewood with reduced side and rear setbacks. Staff explained that the proposed garage would be slightly larger than the existing structure but would not further reduce the existing setbacks or increase the degree of nonconformity. The existing garage is in poor condition, and the proposed reconstruction would generally maintain the existing setback conditions.

MOTION: Motion to send a positive recommendation to the zoning board, with the suggestion that less than the requested relief be granted, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Colasante and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

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

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

The Commission reviewed an application to unmerge lots associated with an existing single-family dwelling and a proposed new two-family dwelling. Staff noted that the surrounding neighborhood contains a mix of single-, two-, and three-family dwellings and that the proposed density of approximately 9.53 units per acre is consistent with the Future Land Use Map designation of 10.89 units per acre. Staff therefore recommended a positive recommendation.

During discussion, Commissioners raised concerns regarding the zero side-yard setback and the proposed arrangement whereby parking and access would rely on an easement. The Solicitor raised concerns regarding the practical and public-safety implications of a zero setback, including access for emergency personnel and the ability to maintain the structures. Commissioner Lanphear stated that, unlike an existing nonconforming condition being preserved through a variance, the application would create new lots with severe dimensional constraints. She expressed concern about establishing a precedent for approving newly created lots with zero setbacks and shared driveway access.

MOTION: Motion to send a negative recommendation for 75 Gladstone Street to the zoning board made by Commissioner Corrao. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

MOTION: Motion to send a negative recommendation for 0 Gladstone Street to the zoning board made by Commissioner Corrao. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lanphear and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

APRIL WOODWORTH (OWN) AND JOSEPH VILLAMAN (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to make legal an existing two-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced setbacks at **110 Laurens Street**, AP 5 Lot 192; area 7,600 sf, zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

The Commission reviewed an application concerning an existing two-family dwelling in Auburn that has operated as a two-family dwelling since 1980 and has been taxed as such since 1983. Staff explained that the application was essentially identical to an application approved approximately 20 years earlier. That approval subsequently expired because the required permits or subsequent actions were not completed. Staff noted that the circumstances supporting the prior approval had not materially changed and that the surrounding residential density was greater than the density represented by the existing property.

MOTION: Motion to send a positive recommendation to the zoning board made by Commissioner Corrao. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENTS TO SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

At approximately 10:50 p.m., the Commission determined that insufficient time remained to adequately consider the 2026 state legislation concerning zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations.

MOTION: Motion to continue consideration of the state legislation and related amendments, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Colasante and the motion passed with a (7-0) vote.

CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Planning Director's report was distributed to the Commission. Commissioners were advised to contact the Planning Director with any questions regarding the report.

ADJOURNMENT

Next Regular Meeting | October 6, 2026 at 6:30 p.m. – **Regular Meeting**
City Council Chamber, City Hall, 869 Park Avenue

MOTION: Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Colasante. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (7-0) vote.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:50 p.m.