

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE
COUNTY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW**

MINUTES

A meeting of the East Providence Zoning Board of Review was held at 7:00 P.M., on Wednesday, 10 June 2015, in the City Council Chambers, East Providence City Hall.

The following members were present:

Eugene Saveory – Chairman

Michael Beauparlant – Vice-Chairman

John Braga - ABSENT

Pier-Mari Toledo - ABSENT

Antonio H. Cunha

Richard Croke, Sr. – 1st Alternate

Gary Pascoa – 2nd Alternate

Edward Pimentel – Zoning Officer / Clerk

Gregory Dias – Assistant City Solicitor

Chairman Saveory announces that it is the policy of the Zoning Board of Review to caution all petitioners that they have the right to counsel before the Board and failure to do so at this time does not constitute sufficient grounds for a change in circumstances under the

eighteen-month repetitive petition clause. All petitioners are also cautioned that if the petition is approved, all construction must be done in compliance with the submitted plan(s), application and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review. A change of any sought must obtain the requisite approval of the Zoning Board of Review. All work that deviates from the approval will be ordered halted and promptly removed. Comments will be limited to the petition being heard and no comments will be heard that do not pertain to an item scheduled on tonight's docket. He also notes that it is the policy of the Board that no new agenda item will be heard after 10:30 PM.

Chairman Saveory also notes that the Board welcomes any commentary from the public provided it solely pertains to an item on tonight's docket.

A. Swearing in of the Zoning Officer

Chairman Saveory asks Assistant City Solicitor Dias to swear in the Zoning Officer, Mr. Pimentel.

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Chairman Saveory informs the public that Ms. Toledo is absent, and therefore Mr. Croke, 1st Alternate, will be both a participating as well

as voting member on all of tonight's agenda items. Chairman Saveory then announces that Mr. Braga is absent as well, and therefore Mr. Pascoa, will be both a participating and voting member.

III. APPROVAL OF ZONING BOARD MINUTES

No minutes to be approved.

IV. ZONING OFFICER'S REPORT

Chairman Saveory announces that there is no report this month.

V. CORRESPONDENCE / DISCUSSION

Chairman Saveory announces that there are no correspondence or items to be discussed this month.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A. Planning Department Staff Report – Dated 2 June 2015 – Previously Submitted.

B. Fire Department's comments – Dated 28 May 2015 – Previously submitted.

C. Engineering comments – Dated 8 June 2015 – Previously submitted.

D. Complaint list – Dated May 2015 – Previously submitted.

Chairman Saveory announces that the referenced documents are already rendered part of the official record.

VII. CONTINUED BUSINESS

1. VSH Realty, Inc., and Cumberland Farms, Inc., 2812 Pawtucket Avenue, being Map 309, Block 06, Parcel 007.00, in a Commercial 2 District. (Dimensional Variances - Petition No. 6579)

Zoning Officer informs the Board that both Planning and Zoning met with counselors for both the subject petitioner as well as adjacent Coastway Bank property, and it has been determined that a joint DPR application is required, and therefore they have requested a formal continuance.

Motion by Mr. Beauparlant to continue the subject petition to the 15 July 2015 regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of

Review. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke, and Unanimously approved.

2A Stanley Engineering Inc., C/o Ellsworth Stanley and Americo Real Estate Company – 360-362 Taunton Avenue, being Map 306, Block 01, Parcel 016.00, in a Commercial 3 District. (Use Variance - Petition No. 6577)

Attorney Sleprow requests that the subject petition be withdrawn without prejudice.

Motion by Mr. Cunha to withdraw the subject petition without prejudice. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant, and Unanimously approved.

2B. Stanley Engineering Inc., C/o Ellsworth Stanley and Americo Real Estate Company – 360-362 Taunton Avenue, being Map 306, Block 01, Parcel 016.00, in a Commercial 3 District. (Dimensional Variances - Petition No. 6578)

Attorney Sleprow requests that the subject petition be withdrawn without prejudice.

Motion by Mr. Cunha to withdraw the subject petition without prejudice. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant, and Unanimously approved.

3. Petition No. 6584: Fernando E. Pereira, seeks a Special Use Permit, to both retain and expand onto a pre-existing three-unit apartment building – said expansion consisting of decking and roof overhang – referenced improvements being deemed an expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming land use pursuant to Section 19-413 ‘Alteration of Nonconforming Use’, for property located at 10 – 12 Birch Street, being Map 105, Block 03, Parcel 003.00, and located within a split-zoned Residential 6 District and Commercial 3 District.

Fernando Pereira, 10-12 Birch Street, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Zoning Officer explains that the subject petition is for both the retention of a deck addition and to install an enclosure onto said decking. The property is improved with a pre-existing three-unit dwelling, and therefore the subject proposal is deemed an expansion of a pre-existing legal non-conforming land use.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Croke.

Mr. Croke notes for the record that the subject property is one of the gateways into the City, and it has been a continuous eyesore, even till to-date. He then inquires if all improvements have already been introduced? Mr. Pereira responds that only the decking is present.

He has already started introducing the headers for the roof overhang.

Mr. Croke inquires as to the usage of the space underneath the decking? Mr. Pereira responds that it will be used for accessory home storage.

Mr. Beauparlant inquires if the petitioner is simply seeking to install a roof, or entirely enclosing the decking? Mr. Pereira responds that he is merely proposing a roof overhang.

Mr. Beauparlant wishes to continue the topic broached by Mr. Croke, and well covered within the Planning Department staff report. The property appears to be in a continuous state of disarray and under some form of construction. Minimally, some landscaping enhancements should be introduced. He concurs, and if he decides to approve, he will be expecting some landscaping improvement – perhaps holding off on an approval till said improvement is introduced. Zoning Officer responds that there has to be introduction of some formal landscape plan, otherwise it will be unclear from an enforcement perspective what was expected of the petitioner. Mr. Beauparlant finds that quite agreeable.

Mr. Cunha inquires if the petitioner resides at the subject property? Mr. Pereira responds that he does with his family. He needs the improvement for health reasons. As for the lack of landscaping, it has been a slow but continuously improving process. He purchased

a portion from the state, and it was already in the state of disarray. As the funds become available, he has been slowly improving the property.

Mr. Cunha inquires if the petitioner is operating some form of business from the premises? Mr. Pereira responds in the negative, noting that he has worked for quite some time for Harvard University, and is prepared to do so for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Pascoa inquires if a building permit was obtained for the present decking? Mr. Pereira responds that the petitioner's response requires some clarification. Although a permit was obtained, it was in response to a stop-work order. Also, the petitioner has long been informed that the Zoning Officer could not approve due to the fact that it was an expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming use. Therefore, neither decking nor roofing has been approved.

Chairman Saveory inquires if underneath the decking will ever be enclosed. Mr. Pereira responds that sometime in the future he would like to make it shed-like with a garage-like door to deter theft of his items.

Chairman Saveory notes that the present plans fail to illustrate that improvement. Mr. Pereira responds that that is a future improvement.

Chairman Saveory inquires about the associated stairs. Mr. Pereira

responds that they are already present. The deck was immediately built, because the original deck was struck by a vehicle and needed immediate replacement.

Chairman Saveory notes that he is in full agreement with Mr. Beauparlant regarding the need for submission of a landscaping plan.

Chairman Saveory then notes that he concurs with Mr. Croke regarding the subject property being one of the entrances to the City. At one time there were several boats stored on the premises, rendering the appearance of a boat yard. Mr. Pereira notes that all but one boat has been removed.

Chairman Saveory notes that the exterior has been deplorable for quite some time. He needs to see some improvement. Mr. Pereira responds that he has expended considerable funds to-date on the property and is prepared to landscape, however he first need the deck covering because his health must come first. Chairman Saveory notes that he has no concerns regarding the deck proposal, however there has to be associated improvement with the property. Mr. Pereira notes that funds are an issue, and he will follow-through as they become available.

Board discusses the best manner of approving the subject proposal such that the landscaping is realized. Zoning officer offers several alternatives, noting that if the Board desires specific landscaping, a

plan must be submitted for enforcement purposes. Zoning Officer also inquires about the decking and underneath enclosure discussed tonight. Does the Board want updated plans reflecting that specific improvement? The Board notes that they want specific plans illustrating both components – landscaping and deck enclosure. They explain to the petitioner what they seek and that the matter must therefore be continued to their regularly scheduled meeting in July. Mr. Cunha further explores the issue of converting the underneath portion of the deck to a storage area, especially how the area will be secured. The petitioner clarifies, noting that garage doors will be installed. He then responds that he fully understands what it is the Board requires for the next hearing.

Motion by Mr. Croke to continue the subject petition to the 8 July 2015, zoning hearing. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Cunha, and Unanimously approved.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Petition No. 6585: Vasilios Zafiriades, seeks Dimensional Relief, to permit subdivision of an existing parcel into two (2) lots [Master Plan approval having already been obtained], without complying with the following dimensional criteria, for property located at 17 Crescent View Avenue, being Map 513, Block 21, Parcel 002.00, and located within a Residential 4 District.**

Proposed Parcel A

A. Dimensional Variance, to permit the referenced subdivision, resulting in proposed designated Parcel 'A' failing to comply with the minimum lot-depth requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Two and fifty-six one-hundredths (2.56) foot dimensional variance, resulting in designated Parcel 'A' being furnished approximately ninety-seven and forty-four one-hundredths (97.44) feet of total lot-depth.

B. Dimensional Variance, to permit the referenced subdivision, resulting in proposed designated Parcel 'A' being designed such that it will result in excessive off-street parking within the requisite front-yard setback pursuant to Section 19-281(b) – One (1) automobile dimensional variance, resulting in the proposed driveway accommodating a total of two (2) vehicles within the respective front-yard, fronting Crescent View Avenue.

Proposed Parcel B

A. Dimensional Variance, to permit the referenced subdivision, resulting in proposed designated Parcel 'B' failing to comply with the minimum lot-depth requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Sixteen one-hundredths (0.16) foot dimensional variance, resulting in designated Parcel 'B' being furnished approximately ninety-nine and eighty-four one-hundredths (99.84) feet of total lot-depth.

Attorney Martin P. Sleprow, with law offices at 1481 Wampanoag Trail, East Providence, RI, informs the Board that he is legal counsel for the subject petitioner.

Attorney Sleprow informs the Board that the subject petitioner is quite ill, and was therefore unable to appear tonight. However, given the simplistic nature of the proposed subdivision, he believes that he can describe it quite readily. The subject property fronts on both Crescent View Avenue and Willett Avenue. There is a single-family residence at 17 Crescent View Avenue, otherwise designated Parcel 'B', and a new single-family residence on designated Parcel 'B'. Both parcels fully comply with all requisite dimensional criteria, inclusive of all setbacks. However, the referenced parcels were platted many, many years prior to the adoption of the regulations, and as reflected by all other surrounding parcels, lot depth is insufficient. The deviation however is a mere three-feet between the two parcels, and is the least relief he has ever personally pursued. He would also note that the Planning Department has noted how minimal the variance is, and therefore the appropriateness of pursuing the requested relief. Finally, there is a minor variance associated with off-street parking in the front-yard, and the purpose is to avert removal of a very old tree, that not only provides character but value to both property and neighborhood in general.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Cunha notes for the record that the relief sought is quite minimal and appropriate, and if for the purpose of preserving the referenced tree, he has no objection.

Mr. Pascoa notes that he does not have any questions and/or objections.

Mr. Croke concurs that the relief does result from the unique characteristics of the subject property, having been platted many, many years ago. It also appears to be in-line with neighboring properties, thereby not negatively impacting the neighborhood.

Mr. Beauparlant notes that he concurs with Mr. Croke's comments. The relief sought is appropriate, and therefore has no objections.

Chairman Saveory notes that he is in full agreement with fellow Board members.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Cunha, based on all the evidence and testimony

presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variances will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Mr. Cunha hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variances, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional

variances are not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Mr. Cunha moves that the dimensional variances be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

1. Compliance with all conditions of approval pursuant to Preliminary Plan – Minor Subdivision Approval.

2. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

3. Compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Attorney Slepko, on behalf of his client, if he accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Attorney Slepko, responds on behalf of his client, that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Cunha - Aye The relief sought is very minor and in character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Pascoa - Aye Concurs with Mr. Cunha's comments.

Mr. Croke - Aye The hardship results from the unique characteristics of

The subject land that well pre-dates zoning.

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye Unique characteristics result from its pre-existing nature and unique configuration and will have no detrimental neighborhood impact.

Chairman Saveory - Aye Fully concurs with Mr. Croke's and Mr. Beauparlant's comments.

Dimensional variances unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

2. Petition No. 6586: Thomas Haynes, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to construct a front porch, without complying with the minimum front-yard setback pursuant to Section 19-145 – Seven (7) foot variance, resulting in the stated improvement being situated within approximately thirteen (13) feet of the northerly (front) property boundary, for property located at 5 Sea View Avenue, being Map 415, Block 07, Parcel 011.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

Thomas Haynes, 5 Sea View Avenue, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Cunha inquires if the proposed farmer's porch will replace the existing stairs? Mr. Haynes responds that he has brought a photograph that will enlighten his desire somewhat more descriptively.

Motion by Mr. Cunha to accept the submitted photograph, designated Exhibit 'A', and render it a full exhibit. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke, and Unanimously approved.

Mr. Haynes explains that he will be extending the existing stairs and introducing a roof overhang, but not extending beyond the present windows – maintain the existing sunlight. The porch will extend a mere six-feet, or few feet beyond the present stairs, and be approximately eighteen feet in width.

Mr. Pascoa notes that he does not have any objection.

Mr. Croke inquires if any of the beautiful landscaping will have to be eliminated? Mr. Haynes responds that sadly enough some of the vegetation will need to be removed. Mr. Croke notes that although this is regretful, he does not have any objection.

Mr. Beauparlant likewise notes that the proposal is quite acceptable.

Chairman Saveory inquires as to the length of ownership? Mr. Haynes responds that it has been approximately ten-years.

Chairman Saveory notes that it will greatly enhance both the property as well as surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Haynes notes that he has spoken with his immediate neighbors and they are all supportive.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Cunha, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Mr. Cunha hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variance, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Mr. Cunha moves that the dimensional variance be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

1. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

2. Compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it

may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Mr. Haynes if he accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Mr. Haynes responds that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Cunha - Aye The least relief necessary to cure a documented hardship.

Mr. Pascoa - Aye

Mr. Croke - Aye Concurs with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye Unique characteristics result from the pre-existing placement of the dwelling, averting any improvement.

Also, it will enhance, and not detract, thereby contributing to the neighborhood in a positive manner.

Chairman Saveory - Aye The relief sought is quite minor and will improve the overall image of the neighborhood.

Dimensional variance unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

3. Petition No. 6587: Matthew Dawson, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to permit installation of a second off-street parking stall within the requisite front-yard setback pursuant to Section 19-281(b) – One (1) automobile dimensional variance, resulting in the proposed driveway accommodating a total of two (2) vehicles within the respective front-yard, fronting Channing Avenue, for property located at 40 Channing Avenue, being Map 414, Block 09, Parcel 004.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

Matthew Dawson, 40 Channing Avenue, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Mr. Channing explains that they are beautifying the entire property, and they are now completing the final components, namely exterior landscaping. Given the narrowness of the property and even more-so the driveway, an extension on parking is desperately needed. Although, it is somewhat possible to accommodate two-vehicles, it is a very tight-fit. And, after the winter we just had, in which vehicles had to remain off the street, and there was little space remaining to accommodate a second vehicle, it became quite clear that the driveway had to be enlarged. It is a very minor variance, requiring a minimal few feet enlargement. The driveway needs to be rehabbed,

so this is the perfect time to pursue the relief. Concern about excessive coverage need not be, considering that as part of the landscape enhancement program they just started, upwards of fifty (50) new plantings will be introduced throughout the property.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Cunha notes for the record that he fully concurs with the petitioner. He conducted a personal site inspection and likewise concluded that given the narrowness of the lot, specifically the driveway, and manner in which the property is presently improved, extending the driveway is a very minor deviation that will in no way negatively impact the neighborhood. It is simply the most appropriate location to place a second vehicle.

Mr. Pascoa notes that he does not have any questions.

Mr. Croke notes that this will in fact be the narrowest driveway, even after the improvement, given the presence of much wider driveways throughout the subject neighborhood.

Mr. Beauparlant compliments the petitioner on the vast landscaping improvements, and likewise concurs that it is a reasonable proposal.

Chairman Saveory actually refers to present conditions as an alleyway, and not a driveway, and therefore fully understands the

petitioner's dilemma. He then notes that at first he thought a second driveway was being introduced until he was informed that the work on the opposite side is part of the extensive proposed landscaping program.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Cunha, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Mr. Cunha hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variance, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Mr. Cunha moves that the dimensional variance be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

1. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

2. Compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Mr. Dawson if he accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means

that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Mr. Dawson responds that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Cunha - Aye The least relief necessary to cure a documented hardship.

Mr. Pascoa - Aye Concurs with Mr. Cunha's comments

Mr. Croke - Aye Concurs with Mr. Cunha's comments.

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye Personally believes that the vast proposed landscaping

improvements will contribute in a positive manner to the neighborhood, thereby furthering the intent of both the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

It is clearly the least relief necessary, and if denied will result in hardship amounting to more than a mere inconvenience.

Chairman Saveory - Aye The driveway will absolutely conform to the overall

appearance of the neighborhood, especially considering the vast majority of the driveways are much wider.

Dimensional variance unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

4. Petition No. 6588: Crump Family Irrevocable Trust, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to construct an accessory detached garage that will exceed the maximum height limit, for property located at 6 Bridgham Court, being Map 604, Block 01, Parcel 052.00, and located within a Residential 2 District.

Attorney Michael Marino, with law offices at 50 Exchange Terrace, Providence, RI, informs the Board that he represent the subject petitioner.

Attorney Marino informs the Board that they are before them for the sole purpose of constructing an accessory structure that will exceed the 20-foot overall maximum height limit. The subject petition consists of five (5) family members. They recently merged the windmill into the subject property. Today's objective is to realize construction of a garage. The property presently has no garage. The petitioner's own three (3) vehicles, and an assortment of other items, such as several bicycles, that are presently exposed to the elements. The City's comments note that the structure will approach 24.6-feet in overall height, or less than a 20% deviation. They believe this to be consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Given the size of the parcel and typical presence of a garage in

conjunction with a single-family residence, it is their opinion that introduction of the subject garage to be consistent and appropriate. The placement of the garage is what is most important to the subject proposal. There is simply no means of constructing an attached garage. There is a 20-foot water easement that prohibits the garage from being situated in close proximity to the residence. There is also no other logical placement, less addition driveway surface be introduced, impacting the overall aesthetics. Regardless, full dimensional setback compliance associated with a principal structure will be adhered to. Based on architectural significance of the subject area, and more importantly subject property, the garage has adhered to certain features that reflect the historical significance. In so doing, overall height cannot be fully complied with. Their objective is to maintain the historical compatibility between residence and accessory garage, and it is their opinion that there will compatibility in both massing and overall height. It should also be noted that an accessory structure may approach the height of the principal structure if attached and complies with the principal setbacks. The easement precludes such ability. There also appears to be concern about the usage of the accessory structure. He can attest to the fact that it will be purely for storage purposes, given limited storage in the residence. Also, the proposed garage is not two, but one and one-half stories overall. The first-floor will store automobiles and other items, as well as have a work-out room. The second-floor will be used for further storage and as a guest-room. The immediate neighbors have not expressed any objections, even after reviewing

the plans. Also, the garage will have a lower-stature overall than many of the surrounding residences.

Zoning Officer notes for the record that some of the information just corrected on the record regarding statement attained from the Planning Department's staff report was taken directly from the petitioner's application – including number of stories associated with the garage and overall living area associated with the primary residence. Attorney Marino responds that he now understands how the information was obtained and wants to issue some corrections.

Zoning Officer then notes that there were engineering comments issued after the fact, and would therefore recommend that should the Board see fit to approve, that compliance with said comments be made conditions of said approval. Attorney Marino states that he has no objection.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Beauparlant.

Mr. Beauparlant notes for the record that he was a sitting member during the previous submission, when he sought setback relief for the addition onto the primary residence. He concurred at that time with the documented hardship, namely that there was insufficient on-site storage. However, he now has great difficulty, both because of the previously granted addition, and the fact that the proposed

garage is simply too massive. Albeit acceptable if attached to the residence, in the manner so proposed, it is simply too large – reason for limiting an accessory detach structure to 20-feet. Also, the second-floor layout simply lends itself to another residential dwelling.

This too raises serious concerns. Whatever they approve runs in perpetuity with the land, and therefore a future property owner could easily convert to a residential dwelling. Although open to some degree of relief, there must be some revisions. Also, he has not observed any other detached structures of such magnitude in the neighborhood. Attorney Marino responds that the prior variance was quite insignificant – mere 18-inches. The property owners have gone to great length to improve the property, and made a real statement in the neighborhood. Also, other than their inability to attach to the primary residence, they would be in order to construct as presented. The imposed City restrictions (easement), placement of the residence and desire to maintain architectural compatibility, is what results in the presence of documented hardship. He would also object to the inference that they would use the second-floor for anything other than what is permitted.

Mr. Cunha notes that he too has serious concern about the second-floor. In regard to the argument about the presence of the easement, the property owners must have had clear knowledge of said easement when purchasing the property. The overall appearance and pitch of the roof, has the appearance of a second residential dwelling. The Board must consider future impact of their

actions, and allowing such a massive structure with the intended second-floor layout, may very well lead to issues subsequent to this ownership. He is more than willing to support a three (3) or four-car garage, but has concern about the second-floor. Attorney Marino responds that the Board appears to be going outside of its discretion.

Chairman Saveory responds that the applicant is before the Board because of some departure from the regulations, thereby giving them the authority to question the introduction of the accessory structure. Attorney Marino responds that in regard to overall height he would agree, however the actual usage is not in question, and there is no intent to use it in a non-permissible manner. Chairman Saveory reiterates that the applicant is seeking some form of relief, and in this case it is overall height of the garage. Attorney Marino concedes that point. Mr. Cunha reiterates that he has an objection regarding the excessive height, not necessarily what takes place inside the structure.

Mr. Pascoa notes for the record that he does not have any questions and/or comments at this time.

Mr. Croke inquires as to length of ownership? Attorney Marino responds that it has been approximately five-years.

Mr. Croke inquires if the petitioner has already received prior variances? Attorney Marino responds that his client has received a single prior variance.

Mr. Croke notes that he has to assume pursuant to the Ordinance, that any hardship that may have been associated with the subject property has been cured by the issuance of said variance and that he now has full and reasonable usage of the property. He too is concerned about the excessive height. Clearly, the client must have been well aware of the property restrictions, such as the presence of the easement. All other property owners have introduced reasonably sized garages.

Chairman Saveory notes that the principal residence was originally the accessory garage serving the adjacent residence, and the then property owner somehow subdivided and realized an additional residence. Because it was originally a garage, it was constructed on slab. The lack of a proper basement is what results in insufficient storage. However, this too should have been common knowledge, or should have been realized prior to purchase, rather than now using as a basis for hardship. He then inquires as to the size of the addition, that the applicant labels a shed. As he recalls, it was quite a sizeable addition that was used to increase overall living area. He reiterates the Board's concerns about the excessive height and massing, as well as overall intended usage. This does not appear to be merely a three-car garage. He personally believes that this will have a detrimental impact on the immediate neighbors – it is neither the least relief necessary or comports with the neighborhood. Attorney Marino responds by noting that the directly immediate

neighbors have indicated that they have no objection.

Attorney Marino inquires if the Board is adamant about not granting any height relief, or is it the overall mass and height – in other words, considerate of some degree of relief if reduced in overall size?

The Board members respond by acknowledging that some minor degree of relief will be considered, and may very well be deemed reasonable. However, the present degree of relief is simply too much.

They do note that presently it has the appearance of being two 92) dwellings on a singular parcel. The appearance must change too render it an accessory garage.

Attorney Marino inquires if there is any opportunity to receive a conditional approval, reducing the height to some minor degree tonight. There is simply no ability to reduce to just in excess of the 20-feet. Mr. Beauparlant responds in the negative for all of the prior iterated reasons.

Attorney Marino asks the Board for a formal continuance to consider the Board's comments and concerns.

Motion by Mr. Beauparlant to continue the subject petition to 8 July 2015. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Cunha, and Unanimously approved.

5. Petition No. 6589: Kathy P. Davenport, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to construct an addition onto a single-family dwelling, without complying with the requisite minimum side-yard setback requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Six (6) foot dimensional variance, said addition to be situated approximately fourteen (14) feet from the southerly (side) property boundary, for property located at 6 Drowne Parkway, being Map 504, Block 15, Parcel 004.00, and located within a Residential 2 District.

Joseph Cabral, 100 Mayflower Drive, Seekonk, MA, preparer of the subject plans, informs the Board that the petitioner was unable to attend due to the fact that she had to care for her special needs child. He has been personally asked to present the petition on her behalf. Mr. Cabral is properly sworn in.

Mr. Cabral informs the Board that the petitioner was advised to seek legal counsel, but decided instead to have himself present the proposal. He proceeds to describe the general characteristics of the property. The subject dwelling is already dimensionally non-conforming, being situated approximately fourteen (14) feet off of the southerly side property boundary. Her desire is to continue that line and enlarge the living area towards the rear. The addition is approximately 422 square feet in area as represented on the Class I Survey plan prepared by Waterman Engineering. There will also be a 187 square foot addition on the second-floor. There will be full compliance with both the maximum building and impervious lot

coverage. The request is simply to maintain a long-standing pre-existing deviation, and extend it by a small amount. The present kitchen is much too small and dated. The objective is to enlarge, add a laundry room and larger family room. Also, there is a future expectation that the property must be rendered handicap accessible, thus converting a small lavette to full bathroom at a size that will accommodate a wheelchair. Finally, the second-floor will likewise be modernized to permit sufficient closet space and master bathroom. The entire rear-yard is well vegetated and therefore not visible. There will be no resulting negative impact. Also, if you refer to the radius map, it is quite apparent that off the surrounding residences fail to comply with the requisite side-yard setbacks.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Beauparlant.

Mr. Beauparlant inquires about other proposed improvements and whether they encroach into any setbacks? Mr. Cabral explains that they all align with other existing conditions, and do not encroach, other than the pre-existing side-yard.

Mr. Beauparlant inquires if the petitioner spoke with her neighbors? Mr. Cabral describes the neighbors that were spoken to and that he was informed that they did not offer any objections.

Mr. Beauparlant compliments the submission package, and indicates that he has no objection.

Mr. Cunha inquires about the purpose for the improvement to the far rear? Mr. Cabral explains that that is an exterior patio area. In fact, due to the petitioner's present non-committal to size, he actually over-enlarged the eventual patio for purposes of reflecting impervious lot coverage compliance. He does not personally believe that she will ever introduce anything so large.

Mr. Pascoa notes that he does not have any objections.

Mr. Croke inquires if a full basement will be provided, and if so, solely for storage use. Mr. Cabral responds in the affirmative, noting that it will also provide a secondary means of egress.

Mr. Croke notes that the property is well maintained and it is quite apparent that the addition will not be visible, thereby implying no neighborly concerns. Mr. Cabral notes that the addition abuts the neighbor's garage, thereby providing additional screening. Mr. Croke notes that he concurs with that observation.

Chairman Saveory notes that he too has no objection. It does not appear that the additional will be visible from any vantage point.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who

would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Beauparlant, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Mr. Beauparlant hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variance, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variance is not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Mr. Beauparlant moves that the dimensional variance be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

1. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

2. Compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Mr. Cabral if he accepts, on behalf of his client, the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Mr. Cabral responds on behalf of his client that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye The relief sought is quite minor. The addition will

Not adversely impact the neighborhood because

It is not visible, being located to the rear of the

Subject residence. Furthermore, it is in-line with

A pre-existing dimensional deviation.

Mr. Cunha - Aye Hardship is not the result of any prior action.

Mr. Pascoa - Aye

Mr. Croke - Aye Will have no impact – well screened.

Chairman Saveory - Aye Based on a pre-existing deviation.

**Dimensional variance unanimously granted, subject to the
aforementioned condition(s).**

6. Petition No. 6590: Dipina Investment Group, LLC and Michael LeValley, seeks a Use Variance, to permit conversion of a car wash to a commercial / industrial business engaged in the sale and leasing of mobile storage containers – said containers being stored to the exterior of the facility, otherwise defined as ‘Open Storage’, which is a prohibited activity within the Commercial 5 District, pursuant to Section 19-98 ‘Schedule of Use Regulations’ and Section 19-175 ‘Open Storage’, for property located at 30 Highland Avenue, being Map 607, Block 20, Parcel 001.00, and located within a Commercial 5 District.

Attorney Michael Kehoe, with law offices at 128 Union Street, New Bedford, MA, informs the Board that he represents the subject petitioner. Both the petitioner, Mr. Michael LaValley, and current property owner, Mr. Shay DiPina, are present tonight.

Attorney Kehoe is presently improved with a car wash. The prior, original use, actually engaged in somewhat a similar activity as to the proposed use. The current proposal is a combination of sales and leasing of mobile storage container units. The submitted plans illustrate the manner in which the property will be used. The existing facility, although presently used as a car wash, is clearly not being properly used nor configured for such a purpose. The present proposal would be a far better reuse of the subject premises – portion used for office space, and the other for the display and storage of containers. There is not enough room inside the facility to store all of the containers, therefore a portion of the exterior will be similarly used for storage. The storage area will be properly screened. The area in question is already fenced in. Additional fencing surrounding the storage area will be introduced. They are also quite open to any other reasonable screening that the Board sees fit to impose. Although some containers are sole, the majority are for lease. They have the on-site vehicles necessary to bring the container(s) to the project site and return them when the project is complete. There is little traffic generated, considering the majority of leases is conducted by either phone or internet – few by on-site visitation. Presently, there is some 150 trips per day, and given the proximity to

the intersection, it causes conflict. The business intends on hiring between seven (7) and fourteen (14) jobs, at an average wage of 28 dollars-per-hour. The property is unusually configured, thereby limiting appropriate usage. Difficult to envision either office or restaurant use, given the configuration and location at the intersection. Although some container will be maintained on-site – upwards of six (6) or seven (7) – need for open storage is absolutely necessary. The property owner has already selected an alternative site that is more conducive to his business model. They believe that they are consistent with the surrounding character, for example the immediate auto dealerships with their exterior inventory. Also, the freight-line business with the storage of heavy trucks. The property owner reached out to all immediate businesses, and has not received any objection.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Pascoa.

Mr. Pascoa inquires about hours of operation? Attorney Kehoe refers the question to the perspective property owner / business owner.

Michael LeValley, South Dartmouth, MA, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Mr. LeValley informs the Board that the hours of operation are 8 to 4, Monday thru Friday, and Saturday by appt. They are closed on Sunday. Sometimes they do start at 7:30 AM.

Mr. Croke inquires as to the number of containers to be stored on-site? Mr. LeValley responds that there will be between 20 to 25-containers, stacked two-high - under twenty-feet in overall height. The objective is not to use as a storage yard, but primarily to attract customers. They do have two (2) other yards where the majority are stored. Primarily for exposure.

Mr. Croke notes that at twenty-feet high, they will be visible above the fence-line. Mr. LeValley states that trucks are similarly that height. Also, the containers are always well maintained and painted – not unsightly. He has to ensure that they are equally presentable at the customer’s site. Attorney Kehoe adds that within reason, they are amiable to whatever additional screening the Board sees fit to impose. The primary objective is to have some on hand for customers. Also, the containers are empty containers – everything is personally dropped off and picked-up.

Mr. Croke notes that it was previously testified that a prior occupant had stored items outside, however those items were of a rather smaller nature, such as wheel-barrows and similar items. Nothing on the magnitude of a storage container. Attorney Kehoe concurs with Mr. Croke’s assertion about the non-storage of containers, however he was simply noting for the record that a prior business had engaged in exterior ‘open storage’. Mr. Croke then notes that the items that were stored outside, were taken in every night – not left

outside on a permanent basis. He would also note that there has been an area renaissance over the last few years – with the recently approved plaza diagonally across from the subject property along with other similar land uses. He does not believe that this is the most appropriate location for such a business.

Mr. Beauparlant inquires as to the daily delivery schedule? Mr. LeValley responds that it is approximately four (4) to five (5) a day. Actually, it is quite typical that they are already pre-rented, and are therefore taken from one-site directly to another site. It used to be that such a business would be by computer or such other means. However, the much larger companies control those forms of advertising, and therefore he must more-so rely on passer-by traffic.

Mr. Beauparlant notes for the record that he concurs with Mr. Croke's general observation about the character of the neighborhood and how this particular use is better suited for an industrial area. He personally believes that this will detract from what has been being realized within the neighborhood. Also, he believes that the property owner is already enjoying beneficial use, and therefore no grounds for the relief sought. Mr. LeValley responds that industrial areas are typically contaminated. Also, his objective is to be located in a high-visible area to advertise his product – industrial areas are typically well-hidden. He already owns such properties, where the vast majority of storage is principal land use. His objective is to be retail in nature and an attractive entity that contributes to a

commercial neighborhood. Once again, he is willing to add landscaping and beautify the property if that is what the Board so desires.

Mr. Cunha notes that he does not understand why storage of so many on-site containers if the petitioner already owns several other yards. If the intent is for customer attraction – advertising the product – and retail / rental of said product, he could easily accommodate several inside the facility. The petitioner is agreeing to vast screening of the exterior containers, basically resulting in limited visibility of said items, and therefore questions the retail argument. He also questions location to market. The distance between locating in East Providence and New Bedford is no that drastically different – perhaps an hour or two to anywhere in the regional area. The clear intent is to establish another storage yard. Mr. LeValley responds that the market has changed. In order to remain competitive, he must have visibility and a decent supply of containers on-site. Even if the distance between the two (2) sites is a mere hour or two, it still adds cost. He understands his market and business, and being directly within the region one wishes to serve is imperative.

Mr. Cunha notes that he too does not believe that this is the most appropriate site for the business in question. In fact, he does not believe that the present car wash is the most appropriate business. Mr. LeValley once again notes that the property was previously used in a similar manner, and in fact has evidence of large pieces of

equipment stored on the premises when ‘Sunbelt’ occupied the premises.

Discussion ensues about what type of equipment, had, or had not, been stored on premises.

Zoning Officer informs the Board regardless of the nature of the open storage, any pre-existing ‘grand-fathered’ rights were extinguished when the business vacated the site and it was then occupied by an altogether different ‘permissible’ land use, namely the car wash. Furthermore, adding to what Mr. Croke has already indicated regarding the recent renaissance of the area, he would not be surprised if sometime in the future some overlay district were adopted – similar to what is being presently prepared for Taunton Avenue – for the general area. Such a district would support the types of uses now being developed, and prohibit other less appropriate land uses. He then referenced the types of uses that have long been supported, such as the Coastal Medical Building and Extended Stay Hotel, in addition to the more recent improvements on Highland Avenue.

Mr. LeValley responds that he understands the City’s desires, however given the type of structure that presently occupies the site, it would most likely require razing to realize redevelopment. Mr. Cunha notes that that happens every day. If someone desires the property, razing existing facilities is of no concern to them. Zoning Officer

provides the recent approved medical building on the Trail, which resulted in razing several on-site structures. Mr. LeValley responds that there has been little interest shown in the subject property – he being the sole interested party. Mr. Cunha concludes by noting that storage of containers is not attractive, and will detract from the character of the neighborhood and the intentions of the City.

Chairman Saveory inquires if any vehicles will be stored on premises? Mr. LeValley refers to the submitted site plan, which illustrates vehicle storage, including transport vehicles. Two (2) will be on-site, and they could be stored behind the fencing. However, the large trailers would not be stored on the subject premises.

Chairman Saveory notes for the record that he is somewhat familiar with the general area in which the petitioner has his other operations, and they are industrial in character. He is in agreement that the subject operation is simply not conducive to the future goals of the general neighborhood. The City of East Providence is finally benefiting from the redevelopment of the Town of Seekonk, which is slowly running out of real estate. The City has also helped this along, by either extinguishing inappropriate land uses, such as the former trailer park and junk yard on Warren Avenue, or forbidding inappropriate uses such as a mini-storage facility on Warren Avenue. He then explains how he is familiar with the subject facility, given his own past business experience and dealing with the operation that once occupied said premises. He also expressed his personal belief

that one day soon the property will be much more valuable. Mr. LeValley responds by noting that there is more and more vacant retail space, including along Route 6. Therefore, the City may not want to solely rely on any one individual land use. Zoning Officer notes for the record that the recent renaissance is actually more aligned with restaurants, hotels, etc. and not necessarily retail in nature.

Zoning Officer asks the petitioner if perhaps it would make more sense to use the subject property for purely retail and leasing (office) purposes, and have the storage located elsewhere in proximate distance of the subject property. Mr. LeValley once again notes that he needs the traffic volumes, and this is the perfect spot to serve both needs.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition.

Shay DiPina, North Providence, RI, subject property owner, requests permission to speak on behalf of the subject petition. Mr. DiPina is properly sworn in.

Mr. DiPina informs the Board that he is somewhat disturbed by tonight's commentary from the Board, including the Zoning Officer's statements regarding the non-permissibility of his car wash and eventual elimination of said land use. Zoning Officer responds that that is not correct. There has been discussion of possibly

establishing an overlay district that will render certain previously permissible land uses non-conforming, however even if that happens said land uses are grand-fathered and can remain in perpetuity. No one can shut down a business simply because they no longer believe it is appropriate for an area, when said business was legally established.

Mr. DiPina then notes that it has been a real hardship over the last several months, given the presence of the median and difficulty in ingressing and egressing the subject property. The vast majority of his clientele are older women, and they communicate to him how difficult it is to enter and exit the property. He pays considerable taxes and does not believe he is getting community support. The present proposal will generate considerable taxes and higher paying wages.

Mr. DiPina then commences discussion on the permissibility of digital signs and how the City has not applied the regulatory standards fairly. Zoning Officer proceeds to explain the whole history of digital signs and why there is presently a moratorium imposed until such time when the regulations will be amended to most likely outright permit them with certain limitations. He does agree that Mr. DiPina got caught in the middle of this dilemma, however this should eventually be resolved.

Mr. DiPina then comments on the prior usage of the property for

exterior storage. Zoning Officer explains how that right is no longer afforded the property, because it was legally abandoned.

Board members explain to Mr. DiPina that although they understand his desire to sell the property and has an interested party, which does not necessarily mean that the use is appropriate for the site.

Chairman Saveory then inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Pascoa, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

- 1. The use is compatible with neighboring land use.**
- 2. The use does not create a nuisance in the neighborhood.**
- 3. That the use will not hinder the future development of the City.**
- 4. That the use conforms to all applicable sections to the use requested.**

Mr. Pascoa hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. The applicant would be deprived of any beneficial use of this property if he is required to conform to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Pascoa moves that the use variance be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

- 1. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.**
- 2. Compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.**

Chairman Saveory asks Attorney Kehoe, if he accepts, on behalf of his client, the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Attorney Kehoe responds on behalf of his client that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Pascoa - Aye

Mr. Croke - Nay

Mr. Pascoa - Nay The business is not compatible with the general neighborhood and may potentially hinder the future development. Furthermore, the property owner already has full and beneficial use of the property.

Mr. Cunha - Nay A business has to be appropriate for an area to Receive a use variance, and open storage is simply Inappropriate in the subject location.

Chairman Saveory - Nay Open storage is not conducive to the subject area, but More-so appropriate for an industrial area.

Motion to approve is denied in a four (4) vote against to a one (1) vote in favor.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Saveory announces that the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Review is scheduled for Wednesday, 8 July 2015, at 7:00 PM, in the City of East Providence Council Chambers, City Hall, East Providence, RI.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Cunha. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant and Unanimously voted to adjourn. Meeting is adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Edward Pimentel, AICP

Zoning Officer / Clerk

Secretary