

Minutes for Wednesday September 9, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in the Council Chambers, Cranston City Hall by Chairperson Dean Perdikakis on **Wednesday, September 9, 2026, at 6: pm**. Also, present were Vice-Chairperson Joy Montanaro, Ivy Swinski, Carlos Zambrano, Kenneth Filarski. 1st Alternate Anthony Mastantuono, 2nd Alternate Mario Carlino, and 4th Alternate Justin McCarthy were not in attendance.

*The following matters were **not** heard before the board:*

WARD 1

YOLANDA ROSA (OWN) AND NERY CRUZ (APP) have applied to the Board for permission to convert the basement of a legal, non-conforming three-family dwelling into a fourth unit at **547 Park Avenue**; A.P. 3, lot 1141; area 5,989 sf; zoned B2. Applicants seek relief per 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations; Section 17.20.090 Specific requirements. Application. ZBR-26-35. No Attorney.

This application was withdrawn, without prejudice, by the applicant on September 7, 2026

WARD 1

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. Application ZBR-26-41 filed 08/05/2026. Attorney John J. Garrahy, Esq.

This application was withdrawn, without prejudice, by the applicant on September 9, 2026

WARD 3

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. Application ZBR-26-37 filed 07/29/2026. Attorney Andrew Cormier, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the October 14, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

WARD 3

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. Application ZBR-26-27 filed 06/02/2026. Attorney Andrew Cormier, Esq.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the October 14, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

WARD 3

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. Application ZBR-26-36 filed 06/10/2026. Attorney John J. Garrahy.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the October 14, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

WARD 3

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. Application ZBR-26-43 filed 08/07/2026.

Minutes for Wednesday September 9, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

Attorney John J. Garrahy.

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski the Board voted unanimously to continue this application to the October 14, 2026, docket, at the request of the applicant.

The following matters were heard before the board:

OLD BUSINESS

WARD 4

COLBEA ENTERPRISES, LLC (OWN/APP) have applied to the Board for permission to install a new electronic message center on an existing free-standing sign at **2050 Plainfield Pike** A.P. 36, lot 117; area 72,638 sf; zoned C5. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variances; Sections 17.72.010 - Signs. Application ZBR-26-33. Attorney James A. Hall, Esq.

On a motion made by Ms. Swinski and seconded by Mr. Zambrano, the Board voted unanimously to **approve** this application **with conditions** on September 9, 2026.

Mr. Filarski made a motion to amend the change rate from Ms. Swinki's proposal of 60 seconds down to 30 seconds. The Board voted unanimously to approve this amendment.

Conditions:

- 1.) Change rate of any display shall not be less than 30 seconds.
- 2.) Static graphics only with no animation of any kind
- 3.) Advertisement limited to products sold on-site only.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

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

- 17.72.010.G. Signs Prohibited Under This Section
 - *"All signs not expressly permitted under this section or exempt from regulation hereunder in accordance with the previous section are prohibited in the city."*
- Electronic LED message signs of any type are not permitted in the zoning code in any zone as per Section 17.72.010.G.
 - Other LED billboards have been approved by the Zoning Board of Review through Variances and installed throughout the City of Cranston, but none are found near the subject property.

BOARD FINDINGS

The attorney for the applicant presented the facts to the Board and presented different photos and renderings of the sign package. There was no expert testimony by the applicant

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 variance, the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per 17.92.010-Variances; Sections 17.72.010 - Signs.

NEW BUSINESS

WARD 1

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 17.60.010 Accessory uses. Application. ZBR-26-32 filed 06/18/26.

Minutes for Wednesday September 9, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to **approve** this application with conditions on September 9, 2026.

Condition:

- 1.) Garage to be rebuilt with a minimum of a 2ft side setback and 2ft rear setback.

This Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.60.010 – Accessory Uses

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Accessory Structure Side Setback (Same as Existing Condition)	5 Feet	1.7 Feet	3.3 Feet
Accessory Structure Rear Setback (Same as Existing Condition)	5 Feet	0 feet	5 Feet

The Board found this Application compatible 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.

- The applicant stated that the current garage is in bad condition and that the proposed garage will be reconstructed with no increase in setback relief. Slight increases in the building size will not increase non-conformity on accessory structure setback requirements.
- The board heard testimony from the applicant and there was no other testimony about the project
- The Board questioned the applicant regarding the placement of the garage and the need for a setback.
- The Board found that for maintenance, construction and safety reasons, a condition of approval of a setback was needed.

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 17.92.010- Variance; Section 17.60.010 Accessory uses.

WARD 3

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. Application ZBR-26-38 filed on 07/30/26. Attorney John J. Garrahy, Esq..

On a motion made by Mr. Filarski and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to **continue** this application to the October 14, 2026, meeting date to allow the applicant the ability to secure additional parking for staff.

WARD 2

Minutes for Wednesday September 9, 2026, Cranston Zoning Board of Review

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. Application ZBR-26-42 filed 08/06/2026. No Attorney.

On a motion made by Mr. Zambrano and seconded by Ms. Swinski, the Board voted unanimously to **approve** this application as presented on September 9, 2026.

The Board made their decision based on the following:

Findings of Fact:

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

- 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations

Relief Sought:

B-1 Zone	Required	Proposed	Relief Sought
Minimum Lot Size	8,000 sf for a two-family	7,600 sf	400 sf
Minimum front setback	25 Feet	18’-6” Feet	6’-6” Feet
Minimum rear setback	20 Feet	7’-6” Feet	12’-6” Feet
Minimum corner side yard setback	25 Feet	22’-9” Feet	2’-3” Feet

Testimony by Applicant:

The application is to legalize an existing dwelling as a two-family. The house has been taxed as a two-family property since approximately 1980. This application is not to modify any part of the building or lot, only to allow the building as it exists to become a legal two-family dwelling. Relief is required due to the house being on a 7,600 sq ft lot with restricted setbacks.

The Board found this Application compatible 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. +

The board further found that:

- This property was granted the exact relief that they are asking for today through a ZBR application in 2004. However, a permit to officially convert the building into a two-family was never filed. Due to ZBR variance approvals only last 1 year, this property is required to apply for the same variances again.
- The 2004 approval was based upon the following evidence:
 - The subject property has been used as a two-family since 1980 and taxed as a two-family since December 31, 1983.
 - There are 7 two-family dwellings on the same block upon 5,000 sf lots.
 - No substantial changes to these findings have occurred since 2004.
- Auburn is largely characterized by single-family, two-family, and multifamily dwellings, many of which are located on 5,000-square-foot lots. At 7,600 square feet, the subject lot exceeds the neighborhood’s median lot size.
- This application seeks only to legalize the existing structure and does not propose any changes to current conditions.

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 17.92.010 - Variance; Section 17.20.120 - Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.88.010 Section 17.20.090 Specific Requirements.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 PM

Stanley Pikul
Secretary, Zoning Board