FEB 08 2023

CITY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE OR SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Check Each Type Zoning Relie	f Sought:	_ _ 	✓	Variance – Use * Variance – Dimensional* Special Use Permit **
* Attach Appendix A to apply for ** Attach Appendix B to apply for the street of the street is a possible to apply for the street of the stree			es	
Applicant: Waterman and Ives E-mail rducoff@aol.cor Phone 401-861-4358		Address 362 Ives Street Zip Code 02906 401-529-9310		
Home/Office Owner: Waterman and Ives Reserved E-mail rducoff@aol.com Phone 401-861-4358 Home/Office		Mobile (Control of Mobile (Contr	36 e <u>02</u> 0-93	2 Ives Street 2906
E-mail N/A Phone: N/A Home/Office		Address Zip Cod N/A Mobile (6	e N	/A
Does the proposal require revi	gn Review Commi oment District Com Commission	ittee	ck e	ach):
1. Location of Property:	176 Waterman St Street Address			
2. Zoning District(s): Special purpose or overlay	Residential Profes district(s): N/A			
3a. Date owner purchased the		ebruary 26, 20)20	
3b. Month/year of lessee's occ	upancy: N	I/A		

3.	Dimensions of	f each lot:		
	Lot # 326	Frontage 50	depth <u>96</u>	Total area <u>4,915</u> sq. ft.
	Lot # 353	Frontage 50		Total area 4,977 sq. ft.
	Lot #		depth	Total areasq. ft.
4.	Size of each st	tructure located on	the Property:	
	Princinal	Structure:	Total gross square fo	otage 5,750
		ootprint 2,741	Height <u>?</u>	
	Accessory	Structure: Total	gross square footage	1,200
	Footprint 1,200		Height ?	Floors 1
5.	Size of propos	sed structure(s):	Total gross square fo	otage: N/A
	Footprint N/A		Height <u>N/A</u>	Floors N/A
6a.	Existing Lot	coverage: (include a	ull buildings, decks, etc.)	Lot 326: 56% / Lot 353: 24%
6b.	Proposed Lot	coverage: (include	new construction) N/A	
7a.		of Property (each lo ental office/residentia		
7b.	Legal Use of Use 1: Dwellin	Property (each lot/s ng - Two Family / Us	structure) as recorded i e 2: Medical/Dental/Offic	n Dept. of Inspection & Standards:
8.		e of Property (each	lot/structure):	
9,	Number of C	urrent Parking Sp	aces: Lot 326: 0 / L	ot 353: 13 (plus 3 in the garage)
10.			tion or alterations (each	
11.	X Z	tstanding violations Coning Ordinance Al State Building Cod Providence Housing C	de	rty under any of the following:
12		ions of the Zoning	Ordinance from which	n relief is sought and description of each
	section: Section 4	Total maxim	um impervious surface c	overage
	Section 4	Maximum im	pervious surface covera	ge - rear yard
			E	•

13. Explain the changes proposed for the	Property.
See Exhibit A.	
The undersigned acknowledge(s) and agree may enter upon the exterior of the Propert application.	(s) that members of the Zoning Board of Review and its staff by in order to view the Property prior to any hearing on the
are true and accurate, and that providing a	at the statements herein and in any attachments or appendices false statement in this application may be subject to criminal including prosecution under the State and Municipal False atly responsible with their attorneys for any false statements.
Owner(s):	Applicant(s):
Waterman and Ives Realty, LLC	Waterman and Ives Realty, LLC
Type Name By Keller J. Juaff Signature Man Gen	Type Name By: Kolold Signature (JAUAGER)
Type Name	Type Name
Signature	Signature

All requirements listed and described in the Instruction Sheet must be met or this application will not be considered complete.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE(S)

Rhode Island General Laws § 45-24-41(c) requires that the Applicant for a variance demonstrate:

- (1) That 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 is not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant, excepting those physical disabilities addressed in § 45-24-30(16);
- (2) That 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) That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based;
- (4) That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary; and
- (5) (a) For a use variance: That the land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the zoning ordinance;
 - (b) For 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.

Please provide the following information:

•	Specify any and all unique characteristics of the land or structure that cause the hardship?				
	See Exhibit A.				
	(a) Is the hardship caused by an economic disability?	Yes	No <u>X</u>		
	(b) Is the hardship caused by a physical disability?				
	(c) If the response to subsection (b) is "yes," is the phys	sical disabili			
	with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. § 121 Yes No	tor et seg.:			

	primarily in order to obtain greater financial gain. See Exhibit A
6.	State any and all facts that support your position that you are seeking the least relief necessary to lessen or eliminate the hardship (for example, why there are no viable alternatives to your proposed plan). See Exhibit A.
7.	If you are seeking a USE VARIANCE, set forth all facts that demonstrate that the Property cannot have any beneficial use if you are required to use it in a manner allowed in the zoning district. N/A
8.	If you are seeking a DIMENSIONAL VARIANCE, set forth all facts that indicate that if the variance is not granted, the hardship the owner/applicant will suffer is more than a mere

EXHIBIT A

Part I. Clarifications and Additions to Main Application

To Question 3

The applicant plans on merging these two lots. It has applied for an administrative subdivision concurrently with this application for a variance.

To Question 4

The principal structure (currently on Lot 326) is a three-story structure which contains dental office(s) and six residential dwelling units.

The accessory structure (currently on Lot 353) is a three-bay garage.

To Question 6(a)

After merger, lot coverage would be 40%.

To Question 7(b)

The Zoning Certificate reflects Legal Use 1 as "Dwelling – Two Family." However, this property has been used as a multi-family for decades.

To Question 8

There is no new use per se. Lot 326 has been used as a combination dental office and multi-family for decades. This variance and the related merger with Lot 353 are together intended to make this customary use lawful and officially recognized.

To Question 13

The applicant intends to merge Lot 326 and Lot 353. This merger has been initiated concurrently with this application. The purpose of the merger is to ensure adequate lot size for the current and longtime use of the property (i.e., a dental office and six residential dwelling units). However, curing this non-conformity will create two other non-conformities with respect to impervious surface coverage. This application seeks relief from these non-conformities with respect with impervious surface coverage, as will be further set forth in Appendix A.

Part II. Clarifications and Additions to Appendix A (Dimensional Variance)

To Question 1

The applicant seeks relief from (a) maximum impervious surface coverage – rear yard and (b) total maximum impervious surface coverage, both as set forth in Section 4 of the Zoning Ordinance. Following the merger, as described in the Application, rear yard impervious surface coverage will be approximately 85% (opposed to 50% permitted) and total impervious surface coverage will be 65% (opposed to 65% permitted).

To Question 2

This variance and the related lot merger have their origin in an attempt to correct the city record with respect to the longtime use of Lot 326. The three-story structure on Lot 326 has been utilized as mixed commercial/multi-family for decades. City records are inconsistent concerning its use as a one or two family, but, in any event, the reality of its use as a multi-family has never been properly recognized, despite such multi-family use being customary, consistent with the comprehensive plan, in accord with prevailing use in the neighborhood, and recommended from the perspective of rational development. To cure this non-conformity, the applicant is merging Lot 326 and Lot 353. However, Lot 353 is a longtime parking lot and thus almost entirely covered with impervious surface. This unique characteristic of Lot 353 has the effect of badly skewing the impervious surface coverage proportion for the lot that will result from the merger. However, even as it is, Lot 353 is non-conforming with regard to impervious surface coverage and its use for principal parking. This variance, and the merger, if granted, would actually eliminate those two non-conformities (as well as Lot 326's current density non-conformity). Moreover, it would eliminate Lot 326's current non-conformity with regard to parking spaces.

To Question 4

As explained above, the applicant is presently applying for a merger of Lot 326 and Lot 353. The merger will cure certain non-conformities, but will result in non-conformities with respect to total maximum impervious surface coverage and maximum impervious surface coverage for the rear yard.

To Question 5

The applicant is not motivated primarily by greater economic gain, but is seeking to regularize existing use, which will have the advantageous effect of curing a couple of other non-conformities. The multi-family use of Lot 326 is customary and longtime: to the best of the applicant's knowledge and research, there have been *at least* four residential dwelling units in the building since the 1970s. The merger concurrently sought by the applicant will resolve the density issue. However, because Lot 353 is a parking lot, the newly created lot will unavoidably have impervious surface coverage issues. Nevertheless, Lot 353 is already non-conforming in this regard; after the merger, and with this variance, the degree of non-conformity will be reduced. Additionally, the merger (which cannot occur without variance) will eliminate a principal use parking lot. The use of the resulting lot will be customary, consistent with the comprehensive plan, in accord with prevailing use in the neighborhood, and recommended from the perspective of rational development. It will also remedy another existing non-conformity: namely, Lot 326's total lack of parking.

To Question 6

There is no feasible alternative to relief. The footprint of the house and the garage cannot be reduced; the parking lot is a longtime, necessary, and rational use. The parking lot reduces street parking congestion and, after the merger, will eliminate the existing parking space non-conformity with respect to the current Lot 326.

To Question 8

Without relief hereunder, the merger of Lot 326 and Lot 353 cannot occur. If the merger does not occur, then the applicant's use of Lot 326 would remain irregular. This irregularity would substantially reduce the marketability of the property and thus hinder investment in the neighborhood, with redounds to the advantage of the city. Alternatively, if the merger occurred but required the actual reduction of impervious surface coverage, the applicant would be required to reduce the paved area, which would be onerous, time-consuming, disagreeable from a planning perspective, and contrary to the highest, best and most economically rational use of the premises.





















