

A meeting of the Cranston Zoning Board of Review was called to order in Cranston City Hall 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Council Chambers by Chairperson Matthew Gendron on **Wednesday February 14, 2018 at 6:30 pm.** Also present were Thomas Barbeiri, Christopher E. Buonanno, Joy Montanaro, 3<sup>rd</sup> alternate Donald J. Roach, Jr. Assistant Solicitor Stephen Marsella Esq. was Counsel to the Board. The Board heard the following applications:

### OLD BUSINESS

#### **WARD 5**

**275 ATWOOD LLC(OWN) AND 275 ATWOOD LLC C/O MOSES AFONSO RYAN LTD (APP)** Have filed an application to allow additional wall and a freestanding signage to be installed on the property currently under development at **275 Atwood Avenue** A/P 12 lot 2700, 92,603 s.f. area zoned C4. Applicant seeks relief per Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, Section 17.72.010 (P) Table 17.72.010 (5) Signs. Application filed 11/21/17. Moses Afonso Ryan, Ltd.

**This matter was continued to the March 14, 2018 meeting.**

### PLATTING BOARD

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

**CROSSROAD CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION** Has filed an appeal of the Building Official pursuant to Section 17.116.010, and Section 17.116.040 (B) for inactions not taken to correct alleged violations on businesses at **1075 Scituate Avenue** A/P 36 lot 43, 199,790 s.f. zoned A80.

**This matter was continued to the March 14, 2018 meeting.**

### NEW BUSINESS

#### **WARD 3**

**CHEBBO REALTY (OWN) AND BMC PETROLEUM (APP)** have filed an application to allow new signage to be installed exceeding the allowable square footage at **905 Cranston Street** A/P 7 lot 2943 zoned C5. Applicant seeks relief per Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, Section 17.72.010 (C) (4) Table 17.72.010 (6) Signs. Application filed 12/21/17. James Callaghan, Esq.

This application was Approved with conditions on a motion made by C. Buonanno , seconded by P. McFarland, and so voted 4-1 in favor. M.Gendron voted Nay against this application.

### CONDITIONS:

1. **Menu sign to be removed**
2. **State inspection sign to be no larger than minimum required by State D.O.T regulations**

**Decision:** The Board made the following findings of fact based upon the evidence presented:

1. The existing pylon sign is 22' high, with a sign that rotates. That sign is being replaced with a new pylon sign that conforms to the 15' height maximum of the Sign Ordinance.
2. The proposed new pylon sign is 56.3 sq. ft. per side, where 50 sq. ft. is allowed. (The sign illustration submitted states 41.17 sq. ft. total for the pylon, but does not take into consideration that a rectangle has to be drawn around the irregular shape of the Sunoco sign and arrow, to determine square footage, as spelled out in the ordinance.)
3. The gas station is located on the corner of Webster Avenue and Cranston Street, which allows for signage on both street frontages.
4. There are two canopies proposed on the site that will contain signage.
5. The sign ordinance allows 40 sq. ft. total for canopy signage.
6. Total canopy signage that faces Webster Avenue equals 56.54 sq. ft.
7. Total canopy signage that faces Cranston Street also equals 56.54 sq. ft. (19.7 + 7.17 sq. ft. "Sunoco", and 22.5 + 7.17 sq. ft. "Diesel").
8. The "BMC Auto Repair" wall signage that faces Cranston Street equals 40.7 sq. ft., where 30 sq. ft. is allowed per the Sign Ordinance.
9. The total wall and canopy signage that faces Cranston Street equals 97.24 sq. ft.
10. Total area of both canopies, wall and pylon signage on the lot equals 210.08 sq. ft., which is less than the 300 sq. ft. total allowed by the Sign Ordinance.

In this case, the Board further finds that the application involves a hardship that is due to the unique characteristics of the property, and 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, is the least relief necessary. In granting a use variance the subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the zoning ordinance, and in granting a dimensional variance, that the hardship suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variance is not granted amounts to more than a mere inconvenience, and that the Applicant met the requirements of the Zoning Code, Section 17.92.010.