

Berry, Joshua

From: Pezzullo, Jason
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 1:40 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: FW: Cranston Resident Voicing Support for COSTCO / Cranston Crossing Development

From: Chris Sabitoni [mailto:csabitoni@neliuna.org]
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 11:06 AM
To: mike@coastal-re.com
Subject: Cranston Resident Voicing Support for COSTCO / Cranston Crossing Development

As a Cranston resident and member of LIUNA Local 271 my family and I would like to register our support for the COSTCO / Cranston Crossing Development. COSTCO is a great company who will create good-paying jobs, increase the tax revenue to the City and create union construction jobs. There are over 88,000 residents of Cranston. The Council is responsible to the residents to be fiscally responsible in improving the long-term economy of the city and not cater to a small group of residents who have opposed anything proposed on Mulligan's. They even opposed Mulligan's. In these challenging times, the Council needs to promote job creation and tax revenue. I support the COSTCO / Cranston Crossing Development.

Thank you,
Christopher Sabitoni

LiUNA!
Christopher A. Sabitoni
International Representative
Laborers' International Union of North America
New England Regional Office
226 South Main Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
Phone: (401) 751-8010
Fax: (401) 861-3340

Berry, Joshua

From: Megan Kasperek <megkas9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 5, 2020 3:19 PM
To: Berry, Joshua
Subject: Cranston Neighbors for Smart Development

Good afternoon Mr. Berry,

My name is Megan Kasperek and I live at 132 Hilltop Drive. I attended the Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday December 1st and wanted to share my continued opposition to the proposed "Cranston Crossing" project.

It was no surprise to me that over 100 families from the surrounding communities attended this meeting and made it perfectly clear that this project would negatively impact our quality of life. The developer had many "experts" testify during the meeting and it amazed me how not one "expert" mentioned the detrimental effects this project will have on our neighborhoods. How is that possible? That just shows that this developer is hiding the truth from us.

Because the truth is, this project will hurt us. My neighbor, friend, and engineer Ben Caito, presented evidence that the proposed project will certainly negatively impact our neighborhood. He clearly showed that no amount of landscaping or buffering will hide the sight of a monstrous building from our first and second floor windows. Yet the developer claims we will not see any evidence of the Costco from our neighborhood. An example of the developer hiding the truth.

The developer also claims that our neighborhood will not be impacted by the noise coming from this proposed development. As a resident of this community for over 6 years I can tell you that is absurd. We can hear the intercom from the prison on a regular basis so it is absolutely guaranteed that we will hear the trucks, cars, people, etc. from this proposed development. Once again, the developer is hiding the truth from us.

Another claim made by the "experts" was that traffic will not be impacted by this project. That stretch of Route 2 is always filled with traffic with people trying to get to 295, 95, 37 and Garden City. Do you know how long I spend waiting at those traffic lights? Yet the "experts" claim that this proposed development will only add 6 seconds to that wait. They obviously have not spent any time traveling along this route. Again, hiding the truth from us.

The developer also tried to bolster his plan by "gifting" land to the City. This is not a gift at all. That land is not a gift and is just a business maneuver trying to win over the City Council and Planning Commission. Hiding the truth again.

A real estate "expert" also claimed that our property values will not decrease due to this proposed development. Our neighborhood is a gem with its bucolic setting and privacy from main parts of Cranston. People are always amazed at how peaceful and quiet our neighborhood is. However, if this proposed development is approved then our neighborhood becomes a noisy, commercialized, cut-through neighborhood for outsiders wanting to get a bargain at Costco. Would you really destroy the lives and homes of hundreds of your residents just to earn some tax money from Costco? Surely the livelihood of hundreds of your residents is more important than money.

It was also interesting to note the lack of support this project has. Over 100 families attended the 5-hour long meeting and spoke out against the proposed development. However, the only 2 people who spoke in favor of this development were people who would financially gain from it: the owner of Mulligan's Island and a Union representative. Not one resident spoke in favor of this development! That has to speak volumes to the City Council!

In closing, the "Cranston Crossing" proposed development is not right for this part of Cranston for many reasons stated above. Costco can find another part of Cranston to build, but not in my backyard. I think you can agree that you would not want to live with a huge commercial property in your backyard. I hope you are able to see past the monetary gain from this development and consider the hundreds of families that will be negatively impacted by a development of this scope and size.

Please forward this email to the other members of the Planning Commission.

Megan Kasperek
132 Hilltop Drive

Berry, Joshua

From: Brian Malachowski <brianmalachowski234@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 3:52 PM
To: Aniece@aniecegermain.com; brady4cranston@gmail.com; chrisaplauskas@gmail.com; citizensofcranston@aol.com; dukefarina@cs.com; ferriforcranston@gmail.com; Berry, Joshua; johndoneganforcranston@gmail.com; Pezzullo, Jason; khopkins7878@gmail.com; lammis.vargas@gmail.com; mike@favilaw.com; nicoleforcranston@gmail.com; reillyforcranston@gmail.com; sstycos26@gmail.com
Subject: Cranston Crossing - MDP conflicts and concerns

Hello,

Please forward this note to the full Planning Commission.

During last night's Planning Commission call Josh Berry expressed his concern about how long it will take for a planning recommendation regarding the Cranston Crossing proposal to be drafted. His comments were that the effort required is immense due to the significant complexity and scope of the proposal and that three days may not be sufficient time. I do sympathize with Josh. He is clearly being asked to do something very complicated in a short amount of time and I am appreciative of the job he is doing, his time and efforts.

However, I can't help but find it ironic that our planning department has seemingly endorsed the idea that this proposal is a simple amendment to an MDP and not a Major Land Development Project. I'm not sure how to rationalize the planning department telling us that this plan only amends the existing MDP but also telling us that this development project is so large, complex and detailed that a recommendation cannot easily be drafted. Those two statements seem to be directly at odds with each other.

We're all aware that the developer wants this to be considered an amendment to the existing MDP so that they can provide as little information as possible to get the land re-zoned and so that they can avoid having to answer tough questions. But if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quakes like a duck then it's..... a Major Land Development Project (or should we say it's an obvious need for future litigation?).

I also appreciate that last night was a long meeting and it was reasonable to adjourn and move the vote to next week. But I have significant concerns that the applicant will be submitting revised materials, updates, changes, etc... to the plan before next Tuesday in an attempt to influence the commission without there being appropriate public comment on those revisions. They even tried this last night after the public comments concluded. Mr. Bolton suggested the applicant would be willing to define parcel 3 as only future retail. Is that now officially part of the submission that the commission will be voting on or not? I don't see that stated in any of the Cranston Crossing documents publicly available from the planning departments website.

I have little doubt that they will continue to attempt to put lipstick on this pig by tweaking their plans over the next week. Any of those tweaks or revisions should not be accepted by our planning commission unless there is also an opportunity for appropriate public comment. The city has made more than enough concessions to this applicant already.

Thank you

Brian Malachowski