

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 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room 309  
869 Park Avenue – Cranston, RI 02910

### MINUTES

#### **CITY HALL – 3<sup>rd</sup> FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER 6:30PM – TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2026**

---

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Commission President Frias called the meeting to order at 6:35 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, and John Colasante.

- Thomas Barbieri and Frank Corrao were not in attendance.

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.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- May 5, 2026

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the May 5, 2026 minutes, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

- May 12, 2026

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the May 12, 2026 minutes, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Colasante and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

#### **EXTENSION REQUEST**

- **“Champlin Heights”**  
Major Land Development with street extension- Preliminary Plan  
Request: One-year extension to June 30, 2027.  
Proposal: Construction of 152 multifamily units with accessory uses  
Zoning District: B-2  
Owner/Applicant: Champlin Heights II, LLC  
AP 20/4, Lot 2128 and AP 12/6, Lot 3108

The Applicant, Mr. Taglianetti, provided an update on the project and reported that the development team has entered discussions with a national residential developer regarding a potential joint venture or sale of the property. He noted the firm's recent success with similar partnerships and stated that the prospective developer specializes in projects of approximately 250 units, closely matching the combined 242-unit scope of Champlin Heights Phases 1 and 2. He expressed confidence that a path forward could be established within six months.

Planning staff recommended approval of the extension.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the one-year extension, made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

- **“Legion Bowl”** **(vote taken)**  
MASTER PLAN - Major Land Development w/o street extension  
Request: Two-year extension to July 13, 2028.  
Proposal: Mixed-Use Residential/Commercial redevelopment with 69 residential units and first floor commercial on Park Avenue.  
Zoning District: C-3 (Neighborhood business)  
661 Park Avenue – AP 3, Lots 289, 291, 1695, 1696

The Applicant, Mr. D’Ambrosio, requested a two-year extension of the approved master plan. He stated that while no transaction has yet been finalized, market conditions have improved and there has been renewed interest from potential purchasers and developers.

Planning staff recommended approval.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the two-year extension, made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

### **SUBDIVISIONS/LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – OLD BUSINESS**

- **“KJ Amour Venue”** **PUBLIC HEARING** **(vote taken)**  
PRELIMINARY PLAN – Development Plan Review with UDR  
Request: Preliminary Plan Approval  
Proposal: Change of use to event venue. Dimensional variance and waivers for landscaping, curbing and sidewalks were previously granted at the May 12, 2026, City Plan Commission meeting.  
Zoning District: C-4 (Highway business)  
1016 Park Avenue – AP 9, Lot 95

Staff explained that the matter had previously been delayed due to a notice-posting error. No additional questions were raised by Commissioners.

Planning staff recommended approval of the preliminary plan.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the preliminary plan, made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed with a (5-0) vote.

- Commissioner David Exter abstained due to not being present at the prior meeting

- **“Vaughn Lane”** **PUBLIC HEARING** **(vote taken)**  
MASTER PLAN - Residential Planned District  
Request: Master Plan Approval  
Proposal: Cluster subdivision into forty-four (44) lots for residential single-family including new street creation and street extension.  
Zoning District: C-4 (Highway business), A-80 & A-20 (Residential with 80,000 & 20,000 sf lots)  
AP 30, Lots 4, 83, 84, 85, & 258  
0 & 538 Main Street, 0 & 99 Vaughn Lane

Representatives of the applicant, including Attorney Thomas Moses and project consultants, responded to issues raised at the prior meeting. The applicant maintained that many technical concerns—including traffic analysis, stormwater design, ledge evaluation, blasting impacts, and construction sequencing—are appropriately addressed during the preliminary plan phase. The applicant stated that required engineering studies and agency reviews would be completed before preliminary plan approval.

The applicant indicated no objection to:

- Maintaining a gated emergency-only connection at Vaughn Lane;
- Considering construction-hour limitations;

- Phasing the project so that development nearest Vaughn Lane occurs during the final phase of construction.

Public Comment:

- **Stephen Sypole**, Attorney for Abutters (Gidley, Sarli & Marusak, Providence, RI)

Mr. Sypole argued that the Commission should require additional information and conditions at the master plan stage rather than deferring all issues to preliminary plan review. His principal comments included: 1. The necessity of a traffic study before permanently identifying Vaughn Lane as a secondary access route. 2. A request that any emergency access gate at Vaughn Lane remain in perpetuity and never be converted into a full vehicular connection. 3. Concerns regarding blasting, ledge removal, and geotechnical impacts on neighboring homes. 4. Requests for mandatory pre-blast surveys and additional safeguards beyond those required by state regulations. 5. Concerns that the minimum blasting bond required by state law may be inadequate to address potential damages. 6. A request for peer review of stormwater management plans. 7. A request for a detailed construction phasing plan and restrictions preventing construction traffic from utilizing Vaughn Lane. Mr. Sypole stated that the requested conditions were reasonable and supported by testimony from the abutters' planning expert.

- **Sonia Meysembourg** (30 Roberts Avenue, Fiskeville)

Ms. Meysembourg thanked the Commission for its work over the past year and reiterated concerns regarding traffic impacts on the Fiskeville village area. She stated that alternative access opportunities exist that would have less impact on neighborhood residents and argued that the currently proposed access road places unnecessary traffic through the center of the village. She requested evaluation of less impactful alternatives and urged thoughtful planning and mitigation.

- **Robert Sansone** (145 Main Street, Cranston)

Mr. Sansone, a downstream property owner, focused on drainage and roadway safety concerns.

- **Drake Patten** (684 Natick Avenue, Cranston)

Ms. Patten spoke in support of stronger environmental protections and emphasized preservation of western Cranston's rural character. She argued that stone walls represent an important part of Cranston's agricultural history and noted that state law provides protections for such resources. She urged the Commission to ensure that development proceeds responsibly.

- **Jessica Salters** (6 Vaughn Lane, Cranston)

Ms. Salters focused on construction impacts and requested enforceable project conditions. She expressed concern that Cranston's existing noise ordinance allows construction activity between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and argued that those hours are inappropriate for a quiet rural neighborhood. Ms. Salters emphasized that residents should not be required to rely on assurances that certain practices are "standard" and stated that enforceable conditions would provide accountability and protection for abutters.

- **Jennifer Sutcliffe** (171 Main Street, Cranston)

Ms. Sutcliffe, whose property abuts the proposed Road A area, reported that she had retained a surveyor to verify property boundaries due to the roadway's proximity to her land. She stated that the survey process remains ongoing and that unresolved boundary questions make it difficult to independently verify roadway dimensions and impacts. She requested that the Commission consider these concerns during future review stages.

- **Mike Klitzner** (1410 Hope Road, Cranston)

Mr. Klitzner expressed concerns regarding traffic increases on Hope Road. He stated that the roadway is already heavily traveled and experiences speeding and school-bus traffic. He estimated that the proposed development would generate substantial additional vehicle trips and requested a traffic study before final approvals are granted.

**Applicant Response**

Attorney Thomas Moses responded that the issues raised by abutters are legitimate but are generally matters reserved for the preliminary plan phase. He stated that traffic analyses, ledge investigations, stormwater studies, and engineering reviews are all required components of subsequent review and should not be duplicated at the master plan stage.

Mr. Moses emphasized that:

- The project is a by-right residential development.
- The Comprehensive Plan supports residential development in this area.
- Property owners retain the right to develop their land in accordance with applicable regulations.

In responses to questions from the Commission, he confirmed that the applicant would not oppose:

- A permanent emergency-access gate at Vaughn Lane;
- Reasonable construction-hour restrictions;
- Phasing that places development nearest Vaughn Lane.

## Commission Discussion

Planning Director Beth Ashman noted that subdivision regulations require two means of access and explained that eliminating an access point entirely could require a waiver. Commissioner Lanphear raised questions about the access points to the development.

Commission President Frias stated his personal preference would be to maintain Western Cranston's rural character, but he is not the property owner, and the property owner has the right to use the property to extent permitted by the law. He indicated that Road A allows access to the development. Therefore, he stated he could not deny the approval under the law, and can only impose conditions. He indicated that Vaughn Lane could be a public safety hazard and that it needed a gate with Knox Box access in perpetuity. He also stated that there needed to be a traffic study at preliminary plan stage because of the unique situation of Vaughn Lane. He also indicated skepticism that there was a viable alternative route to the east. He explained that conditions related to blasting and construction hours will be addressed at the preliminary stage. He expressed skepticism that the city has the expertise to review a stormwater plan of a project of this size. He stated that phasing plan must be required and include looking at the impact on schools and fire service. He stated an impact study was justified because of the size and location of the project. He also stated that the phasing of the project, the last phase should be development nearest Vaughn Lane.

Commissioner Coupe stated that perhaps any conditions related to Vaughn Lane not be imposed until after the traffic study. Director Ashman indicated that the Cranston Fire Department has stated that Vaughn Lane in its current condition was sufficient for emergency vehicles.

Commission President Frias stated that a premise of the proposal was that Vaughn Lane would not be improved and widened, and used as a secondary access point. Therefore, he did not want a situation to arise where the traffic study would be used to justify widening Vaughn Lane and require the knocking down of buildings near Vaughn Lane. He stated the condition should be amended to indicate Vaughn Lane shall not be improved to public street standards.

Commissioner Lanphear indicated that a condition should be included that a storm water plan may be required to be peer reviewed following consultation with the Department of Public Works.

:

- .

There was a discussion regarding waivers for the width of Road A and curbing. Commissioner Coupe requested that the condition be modified to indicate that the Commission waive the length requirement for cul-de-sac and a dead-end street.

## Action – Master Plan Approval

The Commission voted to approve the master plan with staff-recommended findings and conditions, as amended, and requested waivers

## Additional Conditions Included:

1. Vaughn Lane shall not be improved to public street standards.
2. A gate with Knox Box access shall be maintained between Vaughn Lane and the subdivision in perpetuity.
3. If necessary, relief from dead-end street and cul-de-sac length requirements shall be granted.
4. A traffic study shall be completed and peer reviewed during preliminary plan review.
5. A phasing plan shall be submitted during preliminary plan review, with the portion of the development nearest Vaughn Lane constructed during the final phase.
6. An impact study shall be completed.
7. A stormwater peer review may be required following consultation with the Department of Public

Works.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the master plan with staff-recommended findings, with waivers, and conditions, as amended, made by Commissioner President Frias. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Coupe and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

Commission President Frias noted that approval of the master plan does not conclude the review process.

### **ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

- **Ordinance # 4-23-03”** **PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL** **(vote taken)**
- **“Ordinance # 4-23-03”**

The ordinance sponsor, Councilman Andujar appeared remotely and described the proposals as common-sense measures intended to increase housing opportunities and strengthen the City's tax base. He stated that many homes already exist on lots of similar dimensions and noted that comparable approaches have been adopted in other municipalities.

Assistant Planning Director Jonas Bruggemann presented the staff analysis and summarized both ordinances. He explained that the amendments only affect B-1 and B-2 residential zoning districts and would:

#### **Ordinance 03 – Substandard Lots Ordinance**

- Permit certain historically platted lots to be subdivided by right when minimum standards are met.
- Allow development on certain substandard lots of record that are currently merged under existing zoning regulations.
- Require a minimum of 3,000 square feet of suitable developable land and minimum frontage standards.
- Exclude wetlands, flood hazard areas, easements, and other constrained land from developable area calculations.

#### **Ordinance 04 – Two-Family Ordinance**

- Clarify that two-family structures could be permitted on qualifying substandard lots of record.
- Expand housing opportunities within established neighborhoods containing similar historic development patterns.

Mr. Bruggemann stated that staff found both ordinances generally consistent with several Comprehensive Plan objectives related to housing diversity, neighborhood-scale development, infrastructure efficiency, and reducing development pressure on open space in western Cranston. Staff also noted that additional stormwater management measures should be considered concurrently with any future increase in residential density. Staff recommended positive recommendations on both ordinances.

During questioning, Commission President Steven Frias noted that allowing two-family homes on 4,000-square-foot lots would result in residential densities significantly exceeding those identified in the Future Land Use Map. He also noted that the median lot size of many neighborhoods in the B-1 zone are greater than 4,000 square feet.

#### **Public Comment**

- **Annette Bourne** (51 Community Drive, Cranston)

Ms. Bourne spoke in support of both ordinances. She spoke about her childhood growing up on a small lot and explained how these lots can be highly desirable for families. She also explained the financial benefits of this type of development for municipalities.

- **Charlotte Toolan** (37 Harmon Avenue).

Ms. Toolan spoke about how the veteran who originally bought her 10,000 sq ft collection of lots after the war. She explained that she thought she was investing in two developable lots when she bought

the land. She was told by the children of the veteran that the right to develop the second lot was taken away by a zoning change in the 1960s. She said her 10,000 sq ft “mega lot” was bigger than 3 of the neighbors perfectly nice homes on 3200 sq. ft. The neighbors keep up their homes, and no one should judge them as “substandard.” She urged support for the ordinances.

- **Monica Teixeira de Souza** (1921 Broad Street, Cranston)

Ms. Teixeira de Souza spoke in support of both ordinances. She described her experience of owning a two-family home in Edgewood, where her family resides with her mother-in-law in separate dwelling units. She stated that similar housing opportunities helped make homeownership attainable for her family and argued that such housing types provide affordable options without requiring public subsidy.

She stated that many neighborhoods in eastern Cranston already contain small lots, two-family homes, and multifamily structures that contribute positively to neighborhood character. She further argued that many properties became legally nonconforming only after zoning changes adopted decades ago and that the proposed ordinances would better align zoning regulations with existing neighborhood development patterns. Ms. Teixeira de Souza expressed concern about housing affordability for younger generations and stated that smaller homes and two-family housing could help future residents remain in Cranston.

- **Robert Murray** (75 Debbie Drive, Cranston)

Mr. Murray spoke in opposition to both ordinances. He stated that while zoning flexibility can be beneficial, the proposals represented a transformational shift in long-standing land use policy and should not be adopted without more comprehensive analysis. He indicated that the ordinances would convert Cranston into Providence. He indicated that ordinances should not be adopted to make it easier for the staff. Mr. Murray also argued that:

- The amendments would primarily benefit developers and real estate speculators.
- Existing review processes provide important public oversight and neighborhood input.
- The proposals could result in increased density, parking shortages, and overdevelopment.
- The ordinances conflict with established planning principles and existing neighborhood protections.
- The City should address housing needs through targeted planning initiatives rather than broad zoning changes.

He argued that the ordinances would create unintended consequences throughout established neighborhoods.

**Karen Rosenberg** (46 Bow Street, Cranston)

Ms. Rosenberg supported the ordinances. She indicated that the city needed more housing units, and the city has not done much. She stated it would bring in more revenue.

- **Kristina Brown** (217 Armington Street, Cranston)

Ms. Brown spoke in support of both amendments. She noted that she resides on a nonconforming lot in Ward 1 and stated that the proposed changes would legalize and reflect the existing built environment found throughout many eastern Cranston neighborhoods.

She argued that the ordinances would:

- Restore development rights to property owners.
- Preserve existing neighborhood character.
- Allow a broader range of housing types and price points.
- Support smart-growth principles.
- Help accommodate housing needs while reducing pressure to develop open space elsewhere in the city.

Ms. Brown encouraged the Commission to issue positive recommendations.

- **Naoko Shibusawa** (90 Sefton Drive, Cranston)

Ms. Shibusawa stated that she was initially skeptical of the proposals but ultimately concluded that the amendments would help address housing affordability challenges. She expressed concern about whether future generations, including her own children, would be able to remain in Cranston due to rising housing costs. She characterized the ordinances as restorative measures that would return certain property rights to homeowners rather than radically changing neighborhoods. She also objected to descriptions of smaller homes and denser housing as “tenements,” noting that many long-standing Cranston neighborhoods successfully contain those housing types. Ms. Shibusawa urged the Commission to support the ordinances as a means of creating more attainable housing opportunities.

## Commission Discussion

Commissioner Lanphear noted that while the term "substandard lot of record" may sound unfavorable, it is a legal zoning term that does not reflect the quality of a property or neighborhood. She expressed concern that the proposed ordinances would be a sea change, and is being considered hastily. It would apply broadly without sufficient case-by-case review and could create unintended consequences. She noted the unintended consequences of the solar farm ordinance. She noted that there can be more housing on Elmwood Avenue. She stated that the ordinances do not require that the new housing be affordable. She indicated that proposed ordinances exceed density in the Future Land Use Map. She also stated that small-lot development may lack adequate parking.

Commissioner Coupe stated that he agreed with the intent behind the proposals. He also noted that the Planning Commission approves many housing proposals. However, he believed the lot sizes allowed under the ordinances are too small in most situations. He noted lack of parking space in small lots.

Commission President Frias noted that two-family homes on 4,000 square foot lots would be double the density of the Future Land Use Map. Also, he noted that 11 of the 13 neighborhoods in a B-1 zone, and 1 of the 4 neighborhoods in B-2 zone have median lot sizes above 4,000 square feet. Therefore, under these ordinances, lots could be developed on lots which are smaller than a majority of residential lots in the surrounding neighborhoods. He stated that the possibility that these ordinances will reduce work for the Planning Department staff or reduce costs for developers should only be an ancillary benefit and not be a motivating factor for changing zoning policy. He also explained that that a proper evaluation of the fiscal impact must consider the costs as well, in particular the cost of education. He calculated that building on smaller lots will not have a net positive fiscal impact on the city. He also stated building more housing in B-1 and B-2 is unlikely to reduce the demand for more housing in Western Cranston because the demand for housing in Western Cranston is driven by those who seek homes on large lots. He indicated that stormwater issues should be addressed before allowing people to build by right on smaller lots. He noted that the Commission have approved hundreds of housings of units, and could approve more housing on Elmwood Ave. He also explained some of these small lots were platted before the invention of the Model-T, and at a time when many walked to work. He noted that zoning for small lots was changed in the 1960s because of parking issues. He also noted that in the past few months, the Planning Staff and the Plan Commission have recommended against, and the Zoning Board has voted against applications seeking variances to build on lots which were about 3,200 square feet.

**Motion:** Motion by Commission President Steven Frias to issue a negative recommendation on Ordinance 03 (Substandard Lots Ordinance) based upon findings that the ordinance is inconsistent with:

- Goal LU-6: Protect and stabilize existing neighborhoods.
- Policy LU-18: Preserve the existing density of established neighborhoods.
- Future Land Use Map density.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner David Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

**Motion:** Motion by Commission President Steven Frias to issue a negative recommendation on Ordinance 04 (Two-Family Ordinance) based upon findings that the ordinance is inconsistent with:

- Goal LU-6: Protect and stabilize existing neighborhoods.
- Policy LU-18: Preserve the existing density of established neighborhoods.
- Future Land Use Map density.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner David Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

## **SUBDIVISIONS/LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – NEW BUSINESS**

- **“Elena Village”** **PUBLIC HEARING** **(vote taken)**  
PRELIMINARY PLAN – Minor Subdivision with UDR  
Request: Preliminary Plan Approval and Variance Approval

Proposal: The Proposal is to subdivide the one (1) existing lot into two (2) lots and requires a dimensional variance to reconfigure a total of 20,098 sq. ft., for the existing dwelling to remain on 8,097 sq. ft. "Parcel 1" and the new dwelling to contain 12,001 sq. ft. "Parcel 2".  
Zoning District: A-12 – Single Family Residential (12,000 sq. ft.)  
44 Village Avenue – AP 12/3, Lot 2499

Attorney Robert Murray, 21 Garden City Drive, Cranston, appeared on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Murray stated that the subdivision was designed to minimize changes to the established streetscape and neighborhood character by maintaining frontage patterns consistent with surrounding development. He noted that the proposed new lot would contain 100 feet of frontage, consistent with A-12 zoning requirements.

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Murray indicated that he generally agreed with staff's density calculations and acknowledged that the proposal would slightly exceed Future Land Use Map density assumptions, though he characterized the increase as modest and within a reasonable range.

The applicants also stated that they had discussed the proposal with neighboring property owners after required notices were distributed.

Brianna Valcourt presented the staff report. Staff explained that the application sought approval of a subdivision that would yield one additional single-family lot while requiring dimensional relief for the existing residence. Staff presented an analysis of neighborhood density and lot configurations within a 200-foot radius and concluded that the proposal would effectively fill an existing gap in the streetscape without significantly altering neighborhood character. Staff further noted that the lot requiring relief would be comparable in size to neighboring lots located within the adjacent A-8 zoning district.

Based upon its findings, staff recommended:

1. Approval of the required dimensional relief.
2. Approval of the subdivision subject to standard conditions regarding pavement restoration and payment of applicable impact fees.

Public Comment:

- **Mary Parillo** (260 Elena Street, Cranston)

Ms. Parillo spoke in opposition to the application and expressed significant concerns regarding drainage, stormwater management, environmental impacts, and neighborhood conditions. Ms. Parillo explained that her property and surrounding area were formerly part of an apple orchard and that neighbors had informed her that portions of her property historically functioned as a pond. She stated that large areas of her backyard remain saturated throughout much of the year and that significant standing water is routinely present. She described frequent wildlife activity on and around her property, including deer, turkeys, foxes, raccoons, rabbits, waterfowl, coyotes, and other species. She expressed concern that additional development could reduce habitat and feeding areas utilized by local wildlife. Ms. Parillo concluded by emphasizing that her primary concern was ensuring that existing flooding and drainage issues would not be exacerbated by future development.

**Applicant Response**

In response to the public comment, Mr. Murray and Mr. Colino addressed the concerns raised by Ms. Parillo. Regarding drainage, the applicant acknowledged the existence of a drainage pipe on the property and stated that:

- The pipe currently discharges onto the undeveloped portion of the lot.
- The applicant intends to redirect the drainage into a properly designed dry well system.
- The applicant would not object to making that improvement a condition of approval.

The applicant further stated that:

- Any future construction would be required to comply with City stormwater regulations.
- The Department of Public Works would review stormwater management plans through the building permit process.
- The goal would be to ensure that post-development runoff does not negatively impact

neighboring properties.

Regarding ledge concerns, Mr. Carlino explained that he has previously constructed homes in the immediate area and has not encountered ledge that required blasting. He indicated that while large rocks are common throughout the neighborhood, excavation has generally been accomplished without blasting. The applicant also stated that there were no plans to disturb existing stone walls and expressed a willingness to accept a condition protecting those features.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commission President Steven Frias acknowledged the flooding concerns raised by Ms. Parillo and explained that the Commission's authority is limited to ensuring that new development does not worsen existing drainage conditions. He noted that while the Commission could not require the applicant to solve pre-existing flooding problems on neighboring properties, it could require compliance with all applicable stormwater regulations.

Commission President Frias stated that he was confident the Department of Public Works would thoroughly review any future stormwater management plans and ensure compliance with City requirements.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the requested dimensional relief allowing the existing dwelling to remain on approximately 8,097 square feet where 12,000 square feet is required, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

**MOTION:** Motion to approve the subdivision consistent with staff's recommendation and subject to the following conditions made by Commissioner Lanphear:

1. Pavement restoration as required by the city.
2. Payment of all applicable impact fees.
3. Existing stone walls shall not be moved, disturbed, or removed by the applicant.
4. The existing drainage pipe shall be redirected into a dry well system.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Colasante and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

### **ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW – PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

**LA NONA CONSTRUCTION, LLC (OWN/APP)** applied to the Board for permission to leave an existing single-family dwelling on an undersized lot at **235 Beckwith Street** and construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced frontage previously merged by zoning at **0 Beckwith Street**, AP 6 Lot 329 and 332; area 5000sf, 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.

Jamie Ray, Planning Department staff, presented the application. Staff's analysis found that the application is consistent with both lot size and density patterns in the surrounding area. The application is also consistent with the comprehensive plan and future land use map.

During Commission questioning, concerns were raised regarding the size and placement of the existing dwelling on the remaining lot and whether additional zoning relief may be required for setbacks, frontage, or lot coverage. Staff and the Solicitor indicated that those issues would be addressed during the Zoning Board review process.

#### Public Comment

- **Elizabeth Guest** (36 Mauran Street)

Ms. Guest spoke in opposition to the application.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioners discussed the lack of applicant representation at the meeting and concerns regarding the completeness of the application. Questions were raised regarding potential zoning deficiencies associated with the remaining lot and whether sufficient information had been provided to evaluate the request.

Commissioner Kathleen Lanphear expressed concern that the Commission lacked adequate information regarding lot coverage, frontage, and other zoning considerations due to the applicant's absence.

**MOTION:** Motion to issue a negative recommendation to the zoning board of review, made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

**B&E REALTY, LLC (OWN) AND DREAM BIG, INC. (APP)** have applied to the Board for permission to operate a gymnastics and dance studio in an existing building at **41 Western Industrial Drive**, AP 36 Lots 9 & 95; area 2.76 ac, zoned M2. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses; Section 17.64.010 Off-Street Parking Requirements.

Attorney Amy Goins, representing the applicant, appeared with Dream Big owner Shannon Cornicelli, project consultants, and supporters of the application. Ms. Goins provided a brief history of the business.

Planning staff summarized the application and reviewed the zoning relief requested.

Staff recommended a positive recommendation.

#### Public Comment

- **Allan Fung** (1581 Phenix Avenue, Cranston)

Former Mayor Allan Fung spoke in support of the application.

Mr. Fung stated that he has followed Dream Big Gymnastics since its original location on Wellington Avenue and has observed the organization's growth over many years. Mr. Fung stated that the proposed relocation aligns with Comprehensive Plan objectives and would allow the business to continue expanding while remaining in Cranston. He urged the Commission to support the application.

- **Barbara Ann Fenton-Fung** (1581 Phenix Avenue, Cranston)

Former Representative Fenton-Fung also spoke in support of the application.

She discussed the challenges of establishing and growing a small business in Rhode Island and noted that Dream Big has successfully operated in Cranston for nearly two decades. She encouraged the Commission to support the relocation and expansion of the facility.

#### **Commission Discussion**

Commission President Steven Frias noted that he is generally reluctant to support use variances but stated that the proposal represented a less intensive use than the existing industrial occupancy and appeared to improve parking conditions.

**MOTION:** Motion to issue a positive recommendation to the zoning board of review consistent with staff's recommendation made by Commissioner Lanphear. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Exter and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

**ALEXANDER ARANGO (APP) AND MICHAEL SOLOMAN (OWN)** have applied to the Board for permission to construct a single-family dwelling on an undersized lot with reduced setbacks at **555 Park Avenue**; A.P. 3, lot 1577; area 2745sf; zoned B2. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 - Variance; Sections 17.20.120 - Schedule of intensity regulations; 17.20.090 - Specific requirements.

Attorney Robert Murray appeared on behalf of the applicants.

Mr. Murray explained that he had recently become involved in the matter but described the parcel as an unusual and highly constrained lot that had remained vacant following a prior fire.

He argued that:

- The proposed single-family dwelling represented a reasonable use of the property.
- The site is exceptionally small, making zoning relief necessary.

- Denial of all development opportunities could raise concerns regarding reasonable use of the property.

Mr. Murray requested support for the application and endorsed the staff recommendation.

Jamie Ray presented the staff analysis. Staff recommended a positive recommendation.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioners expressed concerns regarding the property's location immediately adjacent to major transportation corridors and in close proximity to a gasoline station.

President Frias questioned whether future homeowners might encounter financing limitations due to the site's proximity to fuel storage tanks. Mr. Murray acknowledged that certain federal mortgage programs may restrict financing opportunities in such circumstances but noted that the issue was outside the Commission's review authority. Commissioner Lisa Mancini questioned site access and driveway placement along Elmwood Avenue.

Additional discussion focused on traffic safety, visibility, and the challenges associated with developing such a constrained parcel.

Commission President Frias stated that he was personally uncomfortable with constructing a new residence within close proximity of a gasoline station and indicated that he would not support the application.

**MOTION:** Motion to issue a positive recommendation consistent with staff's recommendation to the zoning board of review made by Commissioner Mancini. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Coupe and the motion resulted in a (3-3) tie. Commissioners Mancini, Coupe, and Colasante voted in favor. Commissioners Lanphear, Exter, and Commission President Frias were opposed in the vote. Due to the motion failing on a tie vote, the Commission issued no recommendation to the zoning board of review.

### **CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Planning Director Beth Ashman reminded the Commission that the public workshop for the Mixed Use Centers and Corridors Project would be held on June 18, 2026 and encouraged participation. She noted that additional departmental updates had been posted to the Planning Department website.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Coupe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mancini and the motion passed unanimously with a (6-0) vote.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:01 p.m.