

Jamie Pahigian
137 Dexterdale Rd
Providence, RI 02906

June 3, 2025

To the Providence Zoning Board of Review:

I am writing in regards to the application for a special use permit and dimensional variance for the property at 963 North Main Street. I am the Vice Chair of the city's North Main Street Task Force and the board secretary of the Providence Streets Coalition, though my comments do not necessarily reflect the views of these two groups. I am also a close neighbor to this property, living withing about two hundred feet of it on Dexterdale Rd.

My objection to the proposed permit and variance is that if approved, they would reduce the size of the carwash's parking lot, which is already inadequate for current usage. On weekends and weekdays alike, it's normal to have cars lined up at the Dexterdale entrance blocking traffic on both North Main and on Dexterdale, and frequently parked in queue on the corner and crosswalk. This means cars turning onto Dexterdale going eastbound have to use the westbound lane to enter the street, with limited views of the crosswalk and of potential oncoming traffic in the westbound lane, presenting a hazard for pedestrians and drivers alike. Though it's much less common, at times both lanes of Dexterdale are blocked by cars waiting to enter the carwash parking lot. Increasing the size of the building and reducing the size of the lot will only make this situation worse by pushing more queuing vehicles into the street.

Additionally, this business commonly parks vehicles on the sidewalk - a problem only likely to get worse if the the parking lot area is reduced. While this may sound like a nuisance complaint, it is actually a serious public safety hazard. A 2024 review of crash records on North Main Street by the Providence Streets Coalition (<https://pvdstreets.org/north-main-st-crash-data/>) found that out of 46 pedestrian collisions in the corridor, 2 were the result of pedestrians walking in the roadway due to vehicles on the sidewalk. One of these collisions resulted in a fatality. We should not be making special allowances for modifications to nonconforming properties that might further compromise pedestrian safety. The applicant's request is at odds with the city's planning goals for the corridor and the city's priority safety initiative, and should be rejected.

Attached, please find photographic evidence of the problems I cite in this letter.

Sincerely,

Jamie Pahigian







