

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in Cranston City Hall Council Chambers by Chairperson Dean Perdikakis on **Wednesday, July 9, 2025, at 6:35 pm**. Also present were Joy Montanaro, Carlos Zambrano, Kenneth J. Filarski, 1<sup>st</sup> alternate Anthony Mastantuono, and 2<sup>nd</sup> alternate Mario Carlino. Ivy Swinski was not present at this meeting.

Old business continued from May 14, and new business previously docketed for June 11 have been continued on this agenda due to an advertising error prohibiting matters from being heard on June 11, 2025.

The following matters were heard before the Board:

## OLD BUSINESS

### Ward 3

#### **APPEAL OF THE DECISION OF THE BUILDING OFFICIAL**

AN APPEAL HAS BEEN TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF CRANSTON MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17, SECTION 17.116.010- APPEAL POWERS FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LOCATED AT **0 Doane Street**, A.P 7, lot 2073. The Building Official has determined that the subject parcel may have been previously merged with A.P. 7, lot 2074 in accordance with 17.88.010 (B); unless the applicant can demonstrate conformance to § 45-24-38 (c). Application filed 2/11/2023. John O. Mancini, Esq.

This appeal was **WITHDRAWN** by the applicant.

### Ward 5

**JANINE M. ATAMIAN, TRUSTEE (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to request permission to leave an existing two-family dwelling on two undersized lots and to separate a third lot for development at **53 Sherwood Street**, A.P. 8, lots 1772, 1783; area 6,3142 sf; zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.090 (A)- Specific Requirements. Application filed on 4/4/2025. Robert D. Murray, Esq.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 0 Sherwood Street before the Board on May 14, 2025, and continued to require additional information to be provided; with public comment remaining open.

Mr. Zambrano and Mr. Filarski were not present for the original testimony on May 14, and did not participate in voting on this matter.

As both 53 Sherwood Street and the proposed 0 Sherwood Street were heard in tandem with each other, and 0 Sherwood Street was **DENIED** by a majority vote, the application was not voted on as it became a moot point to consider.

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

#### **Findings of Fact:**

- The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:
  - 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity
    - Frontage/Width in B-1
      - Required: 60'
      - Proposed: 40'
      - Relief Requested: 20'
    - Lot Size
      - Required (Two-Family): 8,000 SF
      - Proposed: 6,314 SF
      - Relief Requested: 1,656 SF
- The Board accepted a 200' analysis comparable to the test used for determining if substandard lots of record are merged or not merged has shown that the area of the subject lot is smaller than the median lot size of 5,977 sf. Therefore, an official determination would likely show that (Lot 1784) is merged separately from the subject lots of this Application (Lots 1772 & 1783).

- The Applicant is proposing to allow the pre-existing two-family dwelling to remain on a lot and is therefore requesting relief from frontage and lot size requirements for the B-1 Zone.
- The two-family dwelling requires two parking spaces (one per dwelling) under *17.64.010 – Off Street Parking*. This application proposes a shared driveway easement on neighboring lot 8-1784 to meet the off-street parking requirement. The applicant did not submit a parking plan despite being requested to do so
- The Board accepted staffs review of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
  - The property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area. Two-Family Residential is an appropriate use for the required B-1 Zone.
  - The Applicant submitted a neighborhood compatibility analysis as part of the application to compare the subject parcel's size and density with that of other neighborhood parcels.
  - Staff analysis to confirm the above findings in addition to:
    - The average (mean) lot size of all 1116 lots within 400' is ~ 5,907 with an average density of 8.80 units per acre. 81% of all lots within 200' are below the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - The average lot size of all 55 lots within 200' is 6,810 SF, with a density of 8.60 units per acre. 87% of all lots within 200' are below the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - The average (mean) lot size of the 28 two-family residential lots within 400' is ~ 5,295 SF with an average density of 19.4 units per acre. 21% of all two-family residential lots within 400' are above the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - There is a total of 23 undeveloped lots within 400' with the designated Land Use Description of Undeveloped Residential Land (RES LD UND).
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as "Single/Two-Family Residential Less than 10.89 Units Per Acre"
  - The existing density of the property prior to receiving a formal "Merger Determination" from the City Zoning Official is 7.06 units per acre.
  - The proposed density for the subject lots of this Application which would result from the construction of the single-family home on lot (1784) is 13.8 which is above the FLUM's designation.
- The proposed two-family lot is not wide enough to provide driveway access to the new rear parking area without the proposed 154.13' driveway easement over (Lot 1784).

## Ward 5

**JANINE M. ATAMIAN, TRUSTEE (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on lot with reduced frontage at **0 Sherwood Street**, A.P. 8, lot 1784; area 6,000 sf; zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.090 (A)- Specific Requirements. Application filed on 4/4/2025. Robert D. Murray, Esq.

This application was presented and heard in conjunction with 53 Sherwood Street before the Board on May 14, 2025, and continued to require more information to be provided; with public comment remaining open.

Mr. Zambrano and Mr. Filarski were not present for the original testimony on May 14, and did not participate in voting on this matter.

A motion was made by Mr. Carlino to approve the application with conditions and seconded by Mr. Mastantuano. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn by Mr. Carlino.

A new motion was made by Mr. Carlino to re-open the hearing to allow new testimony, which did not receive the 2nd required on the motion.

On a motion made by Ms. Montanaro to **DENY** the variance and seconded by Mr. Carlino, the Board voted 3-1 to disapprove the requested variance. Mr. Mastantuano voted nay on the denial.

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

- **Findings of Fact:** The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:
  - 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity
    - Frontage/Width in B-1
      - Required: 60'
      - Proposed: 40'
      - Relief Requested: 20'
    - Lot Size
      - Required (Two-Family): 8,000 SF
      - Proposed: 6,314 SF
      - Relief Requested: 1,656 SF
- The Board accepted a 200' analysis comparable to the test used for determining if substandard lots of record are merged or not merged has shown that the area of the subject lot is smaller than the median lot size of 5,977 sf. Therefore, an official determination would likely show that (Lot 1784) is merged separately from the subject lots of this Application (Lots 1772 & 1783).
- The Applicant is proposing to allow the pre-existing two-family dwelling to remain on a lot and is therefore requesting relief from frontage and lot size requirements for the B-1 Zone.
- The two-family dwelling requires two parking spaces (one per dwelling) under *17.64.010 – Off Street Parking*. This application proposes a shared driveway easement on neighboring lot 8-1784 to meet the off-street parking requirement. The applicant did not submit a parking plan despite being requested to do so
- The Board accepted staffs review of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
  - The property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area. Two-Family Residential is an appropriate use for the required B-1 Zone.
  - The Applicant submitted a neighborhood compatibility analysis as part of the application to compare the subject parcel's size and density with that of other neighborhood parcels.
  - Staff analysis to confirm the above findings in addition to:
    - The average (mean) lot size of all 1116 lots within 400' is ~ 5,907 with an average density of 8.80 units per acre. 81% of all lots within 200' are below the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - The average lot size of all 55 lots within 200' is 6,810 SF, with a density of 8.60 units per acre. 87% of all lots within 200' are below the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - The average (mean) lot size of the 28 two-family residential lots within 400' is ~ 5,295 SF with an average density of 19.4 units per acre. 21% of all two-family residential lots within 400' are above the proposed lot size of this Application.
    - There is a total of 23 undeveloped lots within 400' with the designated Land Use Description of Undeveloped Residential Land (RES LD UND).
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as "Single/Two-Family Residential Less than 10.89 Units Per Acre"
  - The existing density of the property prior to receiving a formal "Merger Determination" from the City Zoning Official is 7.06 units per acre.
  - The proposed density for the subject lots of this Application which would result from the construction of the single-family home on lot (1784) is 13.8 which is above the FLUM's designation.
- The proposed two-family lot is not wide enough to provide driveway access to the new rear parking area without the proposed 154.13' driveway easement over (Lot 1784).
- The Board found the plans submitted to be insufficient despite requesting more detail
- There was substantial opposition to the project and the testimony is incorporated herein

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Ward 5**

**ANNA L. STORTI (OWN) and DENALI CORPORATION(APP)** has applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on undersized lot previously merged by zoning at **0 Tacoma Street**, A.P. 12, Lot 756; area 4,800sf; zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010-Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations, 17.88.010(B)(2)- Lot Mergers. Application filed on 5/6/2025. No Attorney.

Attorney David Johnston represented the applicant at the hearing.

**On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr. Filarski, the Board unanimously voted to Approve the variance as presented on July 9, 2025.**

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

#### **Findings of Fact:**

- The Applicant has requested specific relief in their application, namely:
  - 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity
    - Minimum lot area in B-1
      - Required: 6,000sq. ft.
      - Proposed: 4,800sq. ft.
      - Relief Requested: 1,200sq. ft.
  - 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers
    - Section (B)(2) – “In the event that there are multiple contiguous substandard lots of record with more than one way the lots could be merged, upon request of a zoning certificate, the zoning official shall determine which lots are merged. The determination shall be based upon factors including but not limited to the existing improvements on site, natural conditions, and/or the sum of the area and frontage of the substandard lots (those lots whose sum is closest to the minimum required in the underlying zoning district would be combined before lots with larger sums, all other conditions being equal).”
      - The proposed relief from this provision would enable Lot 756 and Lot 758, which are both substandard lots under common ownership, to be unmerged.
- The Board accepted Staff’s determination that upon the unmerging of the two lots, Lot 758 and its existing house will not require any variances. Lot 758 is in the C-2 zone and the structure on the lot complies with all dimensional requirements.
- The Board accepted Staff’s review of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area.
  - The property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area. Single-Family Residential is an appropriate use for the A-6 Zone.
  - Staff has conducted a neighborhood analysis to compare the subject parcel’s size and density with that of other neighboring parcels. Staff find that:
    - The median lot size of all 34 lots within 200’ is +/- 4,810 sq. ft. Fifty percent (50%) of lots within 200’ are at or below the lot size proposed by the Applicant.
    - The residential density within 200’ of Lot 756 is 6.71 units per acre. With an additional single-family home, the density would rise to 6.93 units per acre, which is still within the FLUM designation of “Single-Family Residential 7.26 to 3.64 Units Per Acre.”
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates Lot 756 as “Single-Family Residential 7.26 to 3.64 Units Per Acre”
  - The existing density of the property prior to receiving a formal “Merger Determination” from the City Zoning Official is 7.06 units per acre.
  - The proposed density that will result from the new single-family home proposed on the subject lot of this Application (pursuant to a merger determination by the City

Zoning Official) is 7.24 units per acre which is in compliance with the designated FLUM density of this property.

In this case, the Board voted to accept the staff finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per Section. 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations, 17.88.010(B)(2)- Lot Mergers

### Ward 1

**NANCY PATRICIA BARNETT and KERRISSA JANE HEFFERNAN (TRUSTEES/APP)** have filed an application for permission to demolish an existing garage structure and to construct a new garage with workshop and pergola within the required setbacks at **116 Shaw Avenue**, A.P.2, lot 2890; area 8,040sf; zoned A6. Applicants seek relief by 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.60.010 Accessory Structure Setbacks. Application filed on 5/12/2025. No Attorney.

This application was WITHDRAWN by the applicant.

### Ward 5

**ROBERT M. MORETTI (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board for permission to raze an existing single-family dwelling to allow the construction of a new two-family dwelling at **40 Ashley Street**, A.P. 11, lots 2235, 2236, 2237, and 2238; total area 16,800 sf, zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief by 17.92.010- Variance; Section 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses. Application filed on 5/20/2025. Robert D. Murray, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Mastantuano and seconded by Mr. Zambrano, the Board unanimously voted to **Approve** the variance as presented on July 9, 2025.

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

#### **Findings of Fact:**

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

The Applicant is requesting relief from *17.20.030- Schedule of Uses* which does not permit two-family dwellings in the Residential A-6 Zone.

The Board accepted Staff's review of this Application in consideration of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- A 400' analysis of the subject property demonstrates that there are 110 lots zoned A-6 in the surrounding area. Sixty-nine (69) contain single-family homes, three of which have an Accessory Dwelling Unit. Fifteen (15) contain two-family homes. The median lot size within 400' is 6,000sq. ft. for all lots. For two-family homes, it is 6,000sq. ft. For single-family homes, it is 6,500sq. ft. Given that the subject property is 16,800sq. ft., it is 280% of the median two-family lot in the surrounding area.
- N.B. The analysis performed by staff includes lots within 400' of the outermost edge of lots 2235, 2236, 2237, and 2238. The analysis provided by the Applicant includes lots 2233 and 2234. The two-family dwelling requires two parking spaces (one per dwelling) under *17.64.010 – Off Street Parking*. This application proposes two (2) two-car garages on the property to satisfy the off- street parking requirement.

- In zones where two-family dwellings are permitted, they require a minimum lot size of 8,000sq. ft. The subject property provides more than twice this requirement.
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as “Single Family Residential

7.26 To 3.64 Unit Per Acre.” Presently, within a 400’ radius of the subject property, there is a density of 7.12 units per acre. If this variance was approved, the density of the area would rise negligibly to 7.19 units per acre, which remains within the bounds outlined by the Future Land Use Map.

o With two dwelling units on the subject property, the residential density would be 5.19 units per acre, which is also consistent with the density delineated by the Future Land Use Map.

#### Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

- The Board finds that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to residential (re)development support the approval of this Application:
  - o Goal H-2: Permit a variety of residential development types to achieve multiple community objectives.
  - o Goal H-4: Promote housing opportunities for a wide range of household types and income levels.
  - o Policy H-3: Enact flexible development standards that attain desired community objectives, but also provide a wide range of building types, uses, subdivisions, and site plans.
  - o Policy H-4: Provide housing resources to support the range of jobs that reflects the City’s economic base and encourage the development of housing at levels that are consistent with household purchasing power.
  - o Policy H-5: Maintain the stability of established neighborhoods in connection with continued economic development and revitalization.
  - o Policy H-6: Maintain a varied housing stock, with units of different age, size, and type that are affordable to a wide range of incomes.
  - o Policy H-11: Reduce the burden of zoning and building regulations to enable two- and three-family unit dwellings to be easily modified, maintained and improved within the existing neighborhoods.

**In this case, the Board voted to accept the staffs finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per Section 17.92.010 Variance; Sections 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses.**

### Ward 3

**VALENTINO & KELLY CAITO (OWN/APP)** have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot previously merged with A.P. 7, lot 2074 with reduced area and frontage at **0 Doane Street**, A.P. 7, lot 2073; area 3200 sf; zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity, Application filed on 5/22/2025. John O. Mancini, Esq.

**On a motion made by Ms. Montanaro and seconded by Mr. Mastantuano, the Board unanimously voted to **Continue** the application to the August 13, 2025 meeting.**

### Ward 3

**DENNIS P CALDERONE and RYAN T CALDERONE (OWN/APP)** have filed an application to request permission to leave an existing two-family dwelling on an undersized lot and to separate a second lot for development at **76 Packard Street**, A.P. 6, lot 2794; area 3,3120 sf; zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.090 (A)- Specific Requirements. Application filed on 5/22/2025. Zachary Bourdony, Esq.

**On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Mr. Mastantuano, the Board unanimously voted to **Approve** the variance as presented on July 9, 2025.**

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

**Findings of Fact:**

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers, Section (B)(2) – “In the event that there are multiple contiguous substandard lots of record with more than one way the lots could be merged, upon request of a zoning certificate, the zoning official shall determine which lots are merged. The determination shall be based upon factors including but not limited to the existing improvements on site, natural conditions, and/or the sum of the area and frontage of the substandard lots (those lots whose sum is closest to the minimum required in the underlying zoning district would be combined before lots with larger sums, all other conditions being equal).”
  - The applicant seeks relief from the above provision to enable Lot 2794 and Lot 2795, which are both substandard lots under common ownership, to be unmerged.

The Board accepted staffs\_review of this Application in consideration of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- A 400’ analysis of the subject property demonstrates that there are 120 lots zoned A-6 in the surrounding area. One hundred and thirteen (113) contain single-family homes. Seven (7) contain two-family homes. The median lot size within 400’ is 4,000sq. ft. for all lots.
- The new one-family dwelling requires one parking spaces (one per dwelling) under *17.64.010 – Off Street Parking*. This application proposes three (3) parking spaces on the property to satisfy the off-street parking requirement.
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as “Single Family Residential 7.26 To 3.64 Unit Per Acre.” Presently, within a 400’ radius of the subject property, there is a density of 9.63 units per acre. If this variance was approved, the density of the area would rise negligibly to 9.70 units per acre.

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

- The Board finds that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to residential (re)development support the approval of this Application:
  - Goal H-2: Permit a variety of residential development types to achieve multiple community objectives.
  - Goal H-4: Promote housing opportunities for a wide range of household types and income levels.
  - Policy H-3: Enact flexible development standards that attain desired community objectives, but also provide a wide range of building types, uses, subdivisions, and site plans.
  - Policy H-4: Provide housing resources to support the range of jobs that reflects the City’s economic base and encourage the development of housing at levels that are consistent with household purchasing power.
  - Policy H-5: Maintain the stability of established neighborhoods in connection with continued economic development and revitalization.
  - Policy H-6: Maintain a varied housing stock, with units of different age, size, and type that are affordable to a wide range of incomes.
  - Policy H-11: Reduce the burden of zoning and building regulations to enable two- and three-family unit dwellings to be easily modified, maintained and improved within the existing neighborhoods.

**In this case, the Board voted to accept the staffs finding of fact and applying the facts above to the standard for a variance, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that**

is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, and the applicant would suffer more than a mere inconvenience if the variance were denied. The relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per Section 17.92.010 Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity; 17.20.090 (A)- Specific Requirements.

### Ward 3

**DENNIS P CALDERONE and RYAN T CALDERONE (OWN/APP)** have applied to the Board for permission to construct a new single-family dwelling on an undersized lot with a reduced area and frontage at **0 Packard Street**, A.P. 6, lot 2795; area 3320 sf; zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.090 (A)- Specific Requirements. Application filed on 5/22/2025. Zachary Bourdony, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr. Filarski, the Board unanimously voted to **Approve** the variance as presented on July 9, 2025.

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

### **Findings of Fact:**

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

- 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations
- 17.88.010 – Substandard lots of record and lot mergers, Section (B)(2) – “In the event that there are multiple contiguous substandard lots of record with more than one way the lots could be merged, upon request of a zoning certificate, the zoning official shall determine which lots are merged. The determination shall be based upon factors including but not limited to the existing improvements on site, natural conditions, and/or the sum of the area and frontage of the substandard lots (those lots whose sum is closest to the minimum required in the underlying zoning district would be combined before lots with larger sums, all other conditions being equal).”
  - The applicant seeks relief from the above provision to enable Lot 2794 and Lot 2795, which are both substandard lots under common ownership, to be unmerged.

The Board accepts Staff’s review of this Application in consideration of the compatibility with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and the request does not impose undue nuisances and is not out of character beyond any uses on this site or within the surrounding area. The subject property and the surrounding area are primarily residential in nature and the request does not propose or encourage incompatible uses that would be disruptive to the surrounding area.

- A 400’ analysis of the subject property demonstrates that there are 120 lots zoned A-6 in the surrounding area. One hundred and thirteen (113) contain single-family homes. Seven (7) contain two-family homes. The median lot size within 400’ is 4,000sq. ft. for all lots.
- The new one-family dwelling requires one parking spaces (one per dwelling) under *17.64.010 – Off Street Parking*. This application proposes three (3) parking spaces on the property to satisfy the off-street parking requirement.
- The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates the subject property as “Single Family Residential 7.26 To 3.64 Unit Per Acre.” Presently, within a 400’ radius of the subject property, there is a density of 9.63 units per acre. If this variance was approved, the density of the area would rise negligibly to 9.70 units per acre.

### Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

- The Board finds that the following goals, policies, and action items outlined in the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to residential (re)development support the approval of this Application:
  - Goal H-2: Permit a variety of residential development types to achieve multiple community objectives.
  - Goal H-4: Promote housing opportunities for a wide range of household types and income levels.

- Policy H-3: Enact flexible development standards that attain desired community objectives, but also provide a wide range of building types, uses, subdivisions, and site plans.
- Policy H-4: Provide housing resources to support the range of jobs that reflects the City's economic base and encourage the development of housing at levels that are consistent with household purchasing power.
- Policy H-5: Maintain the stability of established neighborhoods in connection with continued economic development and revitalization.
- Policy H-6: Maintain a varied housing stock, with units of different age, size, and type that are affordable to a wide range of incomes.
- Policy H-11: Reduce the burden of zoning and building regulations to enable two- and three-family unit dwellings to be easily modified, maintained and improved within the existing neighborhoods.

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

### Ward 3

APPEAL OF THE DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER  
AN APPEAL HAS BEEN TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF CRANSTON MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17, SECTION 17.116.010- APPEAL POWERS FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LOCATED AT **174 & 0 Gansett Avenue**, A.P 6, lots 2420 & 2421. The Administrative Officer has determined that the subject parcels were previously merged in accordance with 17.88.010 (B) and improperly sub-divided. Application filed 6/3/2025. Zachary Bourdony, Esq

**On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Mr. Mastantuano, the Board unanimously voted to Continue the application to the August 13, 2025 meeting.**

**Stanley Pikul**  
**Secretary, Zoning Boards**

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM**

---