

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order via a Zoom conference meeting by Chairperson Christopher E. Buonanno on **Wednesday April 14, 2021 at 6:30 pm.** Also present were Joy Montanaro, Paula McFarland, Carlos Zambrano, and 1st alternate Craig Norcliffe..

Zoom Meeting

The following applications will be heard via Zoom conference call as indicated below.

Wednesday April 14, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.
The items listed may be subject to final action.

City Of Cranston is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting
Meeting ID: 831 7057 6893
Passcode: 567519

Call In: 888 788 0099 (US Toll-free)

NEW BUSINESS

FORCE REALTY LLC. (OWN) and ALANI’S BISTRO INC. (APP) have filed an application to install signage in excess of that which is allowed at **74 Rolfe Square**, A.P. 5, lot 1835 area 2,992 s.f.; zoned C3.

TKG CRANSTON DEVELOPMENT LLC (OWN) and SECURITY VAULT WORKS, INC. (APP) have filed an application to construct a new drive-up ATM kiosk at **1776 Plainfield Pike**, A.P. 37, lot 3; area 14.37 ac.zoned C4.

NEW BUSINESS

FORCE REALTY LLC. (OWN) and ALANI’S BISTRO INC. (APP) have filed an application to install signage in excess of that which is allowed at **74 Rolfe Square**, A.P. 5, lot 1835 area 2,992 s.f., zoned C3. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.72.010 (6) - Signs. Application filed 03/09/21.

On a motion made by Mr. Norcliffe and seconded by Ms. McFarland, the variance was **Approved** as presented to allow two wall signs to exceed the allowable size permitted in a C3.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The applicant proposes to add two (2) new wall signs that are 35 sqft. and 48 sqft respectively and so both signs require relief.
2. The signs only require relief for areas, and are compliant with regard to sign height as well as the total sign allowance on the property inclusive of all other signs.
3. This variance proposal is for the Alani’s portion of the building only. Because this portion of the building is on its own lot, the other portions of the building (previous laboratory center) are NOT subject to City review as part of the immediate variance application.
4. The proposed signs are being requested in conjunction with a change of operation at this property. The new business is a restaurant and the signage is being proposed to allow customers to identify the new restaurant.
5. The applicant has stated that they believe the signs are an important component of their business plan to ensure the signs are visible to pedestrians and drivers.
6. The applicant has stated they worked with a sign design company to ensure the signs are well-designed and will enhance the aesthetic of the building.

7. The Plan Commission reviewed the proposal, including the submitted pictures of signs from nearby businesses, and found that the proposed signs are not out of character with the surrounding neighborhood..
8. The applicant testified about his business and the signage and there was not testimony either for or against the project by the public³

In this case, 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, that the hardship does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain, will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the comprehensive plan, and is the least relief necessary. In granting a variance the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per Section 17.92.010 from Section 17.72.010 (6) - Signs.

TKG CRANSTON DEVELOPMENT LLC (OWN) and SECURITY VAULT WORKS, INC. (APP) have filed an application to construct a new drive-up ATM kiosk at **1776 Plainfield Pike**, A.P. 37, lot 3; area 14.37 ac. zoned C4. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.020 Special Use Permit; Sections 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses. Application filed 3/09/2021. John Revens, Esq.

On a motion made by Ms. McFarland and seconded by Ms. Montanaro, the Special Use Permit was **Approved** as presented to allow an ATM kiosk to be installed in the parking lot.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The applicant proposes to establish a stand-alone ATM Kiosk within a commercial parking lot (Walmart) in a C-4 zone. There is no bank building on the property in which this ATM would be connected with. The ATM will have an associated canopy, lighting fixture, and bollards. Such a use is only allowed via a Special Use Permit.
2. As a result of the proposed project, a total of 13 parking spaces will be removed. Per the previous approvals for the Walmart plaza, the removal of 13 parking spaces will not bring the other uses in to non-conformity with regard to parking requirements.
3. The application has been reviewed by technical staff (planning, traffic, and building) and there are no concerns with the proposal in terms of its impact on interior traffic circulation, or the removal of parking spaces.
4. While the proposal does not explicitly trigger the drive-thru use provisions, this proposal meets all of the required standards, including the minimum separation distance between an ATM "audio device" and the nearest residential property (minimum of 100 feet).
5. The application does not require any dimensional variances or relief and meets all applicable standards.
6. The Future Land Use Map designation for this property is Commercial/Highway Services which supports the general use of a commercial operations such as this. The Comprehensive Plan does not have any specific policies or information regarding ATM Kiosks or drive-thru operations. However, the overall content of the Plan, particularly within the Land Use and Economic Development Elements, encourages the City to support efficient use of properties while minimizing negative impacts to the neighborhood. The Plan Commission found that this proposal is consistent with the general content of the Comprehensive Plan.
7. Experts for the applicant testified about the project and there was no testimony either for or against the project by the public.

In this case, applying the facts above to the standard for a Special Use Permit the Board further finds that the use will substantially conform to the scale and context of the surrounding area, shall be compatible with its surroundings; shall not be injurious, obnoxious or offensive to the neighborhood; shall not hinder the future development of the city; shall promote the general welfare of the city; and

shall be in conformance with the purposes and intent of the comprehensive plan. In Granting the Special Use Permit the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code and relief per Section 17.92.010 from Section 17.92.020 Special Use Permit.

Stanley Pikul
Secretary, Zoning & Platting Boards

The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 PM
