#### Page 1Minutes for Wednesday February 14, 2024 Cranston Zoning Board of Review

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in Cranston City Hall Council Chambers by Chairperson Christopher E. Buonanno on **Wednesday February 14, 2024 at 6:35 pm.** Also present were Joy Montanaro, Paula McFarland, Carlos Zambrano, and 3<sup>rd</sup> alternate Frank Corrao III

The following matters were heard before the Board:

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

### Ward 6

**DOMAIN REALTY, LLC (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board to construct a new free-standing sign within the required setbacks from the street(s) and within the area required as to not impede corner visibility; and to waive the required Development Review Process for the site at **846 Oaklawn Avenue**, A.P. 15, lot 361; area 15,490 s.f. zoned C3. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variances; Sections 17.20.100(A)- Corner Visibility; 17.72.010- Signs; 17.84, et seq- Development Plan Review. Application filed 7/06/2023. Joseph P. Carnevale, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Perdikakis and seconded by Ms. McFarland, this matter was unanimously voted on to be continued to the March 13, 2024 meeting at the request of the applicant.

#### 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 **846 Oaklawn Avenue**, A.P 15, lot 361. The Building Official has determined that a proposed sign does not meet the required setbacks, height, or area for the C3 zone as required by 17.72.010 (4)- Signs. The sign base constructed without benefit of permit has been determined to encroach into the required corner visibility area and impede vision as indicated in 17.20.100 (A)- Corner visibility Application filed 9/13/2023. Joseph P. Carneval, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr. Perdikakis, this matter was unanimously voted on to be continued to the January 10, 2024 meeting at the request of the applicant.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### Ward 1

**FORT PROPERTIES, LLC (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board to sub-divide a property with two existing non-conforming multi-family structures, separating each on to its own lot, resulting in non-conforming area, frontage, and setbacks at **0 First Avenue,** A.P. 4, lot 222 (A.K.A. Parcel A), area 8,010 s.f., zoned C-5. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 Variances, Sections 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses, 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. Application filed 1/2/2024. David M. Dolbashian, Esq.

On motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr Corrao, this matter was unanimously **Approved** as presented to the Board on February 14, 2024.

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

- 1. The Board accepted the recommendation of the Plan Commission that Due to the findings that the requests for dimensional and use relief are consistent with the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan; and due to the findings that the requests would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area;
- 2. The Current lots contains 2 residential structures and is a pre-existing non-conforming parcel
- 3. The applicant wishes to subdivide the parcel which would make it more conforming
- 4. That not structures are being constructed or moved.

#### Page 2 Minutes for Wednesday February 14, 2024 Cranston Zoning Board of Review

5. The applicant's attorney gave a narrative of the relief and there was no other testimony either for or against the project

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

## <u> Ward 1</u>

**FORT PROPERTIES, LLC (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board to sub-divide a property with two existing non-conforming multi-family structures, separating each on to its own lot, resulting in non-conforming area, frontage, and setbacks at **1581 Elmwood Avenue**, A.P. 4, lot 221 (A.K.A. Parcel B), area 8,737 s.f., zoned C-5. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 Variances, Sections 17.20.030-Schedule of Uses, 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. Application filed 1/2/2024. David M. Dolbashian, Esq

On motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Mr Corrao, this matter was unanimously **Approved** as presented to the Board on February 14, 2024.

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

- 1. The Board accepted the recommendation of the Plan Commission that Due to the findings that the requests for dimensional and use relief are consistent with the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan; and due to the findings that the requests would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area;
- 2. The Current lots contains 2 residential structures and is a pre-existing non-conforming parcel
- 3. The applicant wishes to subdivide the parcel which would make it more conforming
- 4. That not structures are being constructed or moved.
- 5. The applicant's attorney gave a narrative of the relief and there was no other testimony either for or against the project

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

Stanley Pikul Secretary, Zoning Boards

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM

# Page 3 Minutes for Wednesday February 14, 2024 Cranston Zoning Board of Review