



Town of South Kingstown

Zoning Board of Review Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 18, 2026 at 7:00 PM
South Kingstown Town Hall, Town Council Chambers
180 High Street, Wakefield, RI 02879
www.southkingstownri.gov

Robert Cagnetta, Chair
Thomas Daniels, Vice Chair
William Rosen, Member
Arlene Hicks, Member
Geoff Elia, Member
William MacDonald, Alt. #1
Vacancy, Alt. #2
Vacancy, Alt. #3

A. Call to Order

Mr. Cagnetta called the meeting to order at 7:01:53 PM.

B. Chairman Introductions and Instructions

Mr. Cagnetta explained the rules and procedures.

Members Present: Robert Cagnetta, Chairman; Thomas Daniels, Vice Chairman; Arlen Hicks, Member; Geoff Elia, Member; William MacDonald, Alt. #1.

Members Absent: William Rosen, Member

Staff Present: Amy Goins, Special Legal Counsel; Jamie Gorman, Building and Zoning Official; Ben Barbera, Building and Zoning Associate.

Members voting tonight will be Mr. Cagnetta, Mr. Daniels, Ms. Hicks, Mr. Elia, and Mr. MacDonald.

C. Agenda Items *Order can be subject to change*

Mr. Cagnetta called for the first petition.

- I. Petition of Henry Cabrera, 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway, Wakefield, RI 02879, for an Appeal under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to **Appeal a Notice of Violation issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO)**, dated May 22, 2025, related to premises at 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway. The owner of the property is Henry Cabrera, for premises located at 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 78-3, Lot 7 and is zoned R200.
[3812 Comm O H Perry Hwy - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

This property is known as the Lavendar Waves Farm.

Correspondence requesting an extension to the March 25, 2026, Zoning Board of Review Meeting, written by Stephen J Angell, ESQ and dated February 17, 2026, was received by the Zoning Board.

This is the second application to appeal a notice of violation issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer for this property. The last application was heard during December's Zoning Board Meeting, where it was denied without prejudice because the appellant and legal counsel had not appeared for the hearing.

The notice of violation was issued for planned wedding events on the property. There are no weddings taking place on the property at this time.

Mr. Daniels also mentions that previously there was a denial because the applicant did not send out the letters to the abutters properly.

It appears that the applicant may be trying to resolve this violation through the Town of South Kingstown's Planning Department.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to continue the petition to the March 25, 2026 meeting was made by Mr. Cagnetta and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.

Motion Passed: (4-1 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Cagnetta -Aye, Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Nay, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a continuation was approved regarding the petition of **Henry Cabrera**, 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway, Wakefield, RI 02879, for an Appeal under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to **Appeal a Notice of Violation issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO)**, dated May 22, 2025, related to premises at 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway. The owner of the property is Henry Cabrera, for premises located at 3812 Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry Highway, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 78-3, Lot 7 and is zoned R200.

There was no one who spoke on behalf of the applicant.

There was no one present who spoke either in favor of or opposition to the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Correspondence #1, written by George and Maria Petitt and dated February 2, 2026; Extension Request written by Stephen J Angell, ESQ and dated February 17, 2026.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- II. Continuation of the petition of **Milton Rogers**, 70 Foster Sheldon Road, South Kingstown, RI, 02879, for an **Appeal to the Zoning Board** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to **appeal a decision issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO)**, dated June 25, 2025, related to premises at 28 Columbia Street. The owner of the property is Rogers Home, Inc., for premises located at 28 Columbia Street, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 57-1, Lot 43 and is zoned CN (Commercial Neighborhood)
[28 Columbia Street - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

This petition has been continued for some time now.

The applicant is asking for another continuance through email.

Mr. Gorman reminded the Board members that Mr. Rogers had shown up to December's meeting and asked for a continuation of the petition. The continuation was approved but Mr. Rogers was advised to bring his attorney to the following meeting. Mr. Gorman has not received any communication from the applicant since December's meeting.

Ms. Goins advised the Board that they may deny the petition without prejudice, or the applicant may file for a new petition.

The Board discussed whether a continuation should be approved or not.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to deny the continuation of the application was made by Mr. Daniels and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.

Motion passed: (4-1 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Nay)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion to deny a continuation without prejudice was approved regarding the petition of **Milton Rogers**, 70 Foster Sheldon Road, South Kingstown, RI, 02879, for an **Appeal to the Zoning Board** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to **appeal a decision issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO)**, dated June 25, 2025, related to premises at 28 Columbia Street. The owner of the property is Rogers Home, Inc., for premises located at 28 Columbia Street, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 57-1, Lot 43 and is zoned CN (Commercial Neighborhood).

The continuation of this application was denied without prejudice, because the appellant and legal counsel had not appeared for the hearing. This application has also been continued many times previously.

No individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant.

There was no one present who spoke either in favor of or opposition to the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- The fourth Request for Continuance, sent via email delivery, signed by Samuel Budway, ESQ. on behalf of the applicant, Milton Rogers, dated November 19, 2025; Third Request for Continuance, sent via email delivery, signed by Samuel Budway, ESQ. on behalf of the applicant, Milton Rogers, dated October 13, 2025; Request for Continuance, sent via email delivery, signed by Samuel Budway, ESQ. On behalf of the applicant, Milton Rogers, dated August 22, 2025.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- III. Continuation of the petition of **Tyson Ford**, 95 Inkberry Trail, Narragansett, RI 02882, for a **Use Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to establish a 10' x 20' storage shed on a vacant parcel. A storage shed is only permitted on a property which contains a principal use; therefore, relief is requested. Lot size is .13 acre. **A Use Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 300 (Schedule of Use Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owner of the property is Tyson Ford for premises located at 0 Tomahawk Trail South, South Kingstown Assessor's Map 34-2, Lot 114 and is zoned R20.
[0 Tomahawk Trail South - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

For the record, this matter is a continuation of the November 19, 2025, Zoning Board of Review meeting; All testimony presented during that hearing remains part of the official record for this hearing.

Tyson Ford, the applicant and property owner, was present and sworn in.

Discussions began involving new documents that the applicant had submitted since the November Zoning Board meeting. An updated property survey shows the exact location of an 8' by 10' shed with 9.9' front setbacks. Other documents show pictures of accessory sheds in the neighborhood that are located at the front of property and close to property lines.

Mr. Cagnetta asks how the applicant determined the placement of the shed.

Mr. Ford says that the Department of Environmental Management (DEM) recommended the location because most of this lot is considered wetlands. DEM's report concluded that there is no place for a house on the property, but there is a location that is suitable for the shed.

Mr. Cagnetta explains how the property has limited use and even with a shed on the property there will be no plumbing, no electricity, and no staying overnight.

Mr. Ford understands and says he only wants to use the shed to store kids' things and recreational equipment.

Mr. Daniels asks if the pictures of the sheds shown have a primary dwelling on the property, which they do.

The board had no further questions for Mr. Ford.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if anyone from the public would like to speak either in favor of or opposed to it.

Jane Bessette was present and sworn in.

Ms. Bessette raised questions related to the zoning considerations and alteration to the general character of the area. She feels that the applicant would not need a shed because he is already utilizing the property, and he has access to all the amendments provided to Indian Lake property owners.

Mr. Cagnetta asked Ms. Bessette how she would feel if Mr. Ford laid his belongings all over the lot or under a tarp instead of in a shed.

Ms. Bessette was unable to answer, but did applaud Mr. Ford for cleaning up the lot.

Mr. Cagnetta stated that the proposed location of the shed was determined by DEM. This is also the driest place on the property.

Mr. Gorman added that initially the petition was submitted as a 200 square ft. shed, now it's been revised to an 80 square ft. shed. He noted that the latest survey shows a position 5.5 feet from the front property line where the front yard setback requirements are 9.9. If this is accurate, then the applicant would have to submit a new site plan for Mr. Gorman's review.

Ms. Goins expressed that this application is advertised as a "Use Variance *Not* Requiring A Dimensional Variance."

Mr. Daniels questioned how Ms. Bessette felt if the applicant stored his belongings on the property without a shed. Ms. Bessette stated she was not qualified to answer the question on behalf of the fire district. Ms. Bessette said she would be comfortable with a non-permanent structure on the lot.

The board had no further questions for Ms. Bessette.

Mr. Gorman reminded the Board that as of December 1, 2025, a building permit is required for any shed over 64 square ft.

Mr. Ford stepped up to the podium again.

Mr. Ford explains the two sets of surveys that were submitted to the record were from before and after a meeting with DEM. Mr. Ford recalls DEM saying that the location of the shed should be as close to the front property line as possible. Mr. Ford confirms that the survey showing 9.9' front set back and an 80 square ft. shed is the correct survey to base the final motion on.

The board had no further questions for Mr. Ford.

The board discussed their main concern: an accessory unit on a lot without a primary dwelling is prohibited.

Ms. Goins raised the possibility that, should this petition be approved, it may create a circumstance in the future whereby a dwelling could potentially be considered on the lot.

All board members agreed that they personally would like to see a shed on a property rather than a pop-up tent or tarps.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

For the record, the following motion was made regarding the updated plot plan of a 9.9' front set back and the size of the shed is 8'x10'.

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Mr. Cagnetta and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in favor)

(Mr. Cagnetta -Aye, Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, there was a motion to approve the petition of **Tyson Ford**, 95 Inkberry Trail, Narragansett, RI 02882, for a **Use Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to establish a 8' x 10' storage shed on a vacant parcel. A storage shed is only permitted on a property which contains a principal use; therefore, relief is requested. Lot size is .13 acre. **A Use Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 300 (Schedule of Use Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owner of the property is Tyson Ford for premises located at 0 Tomahawk Trail South, South Kingstown Assessor's Map 34-2, Lot 114 and is zoned R20.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because as identified by DEM this property is mostly wetland or buffer. Hardship is due to the unique characteristics of this land, in which the applicant cannot build on it. The applicant is looking to get beneficial use of the property by storing items that they will use for recreational activities in a shed.

2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is the applicant's first petition for this property and there were no other issues related to the Board.

3. The Board finds 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, because there are already many sheds in the area. This will be the only property in the area with a shed and no dwelling on the property, based on the unusual characteristics of the lot.

4. The Board finds that the subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the

provisions of the zoning ordinance. Nonconforming use of neighboring land or structures in the same district and permitted use of land or structures in an adjacent district shall not be considered in granting a use variance. The applicant did reduce the size of the shed that he originally asked for. If there was no shed on this property, then the applicant wouldn't have beneficial use of the land as it appears that constructing a dwelling would not be feasible due to site constraints.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- DEM approval for the location of the 8'x10' shed with the 9.9' front set back.
- Two (2) year expiration for additional approvals from other agencies.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- Tyson Ford, the applicant
- Mr. Ford's surveyor was present but did not participate in discussions.

There was one individual present who spoke in opposition to the petition.

- Jane Bessette, speaking for the neighborhood at Tomahawk Trail South.

There was no one who spoke in favor of the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Boundary & Topographic Survey created by Sardelli Survey LLC & Environmental Services, signed and stamped by Jamie L Sardelli PLS dated March, 6 2025; Site Plan uploaded by Tyson Ford on October 23, 2025; 12x16 Lean to Storage Shed Plan created by Shedplans.org uploaded by Tyson Ford on October 30, 2025 (15 pages); 10x20 Lean to Storage Shed Plans created by Shedplans.org uploaded by Tyson Ford dated September 24, 2005; Correspondence 01 prepared by Arthur H Parmentier and Mary Filippo dated November 12, 2025 (52 pages); Correspondence 02 prepared by Beverly Waldman Rich and Harlan Rich dated November 12, 2025; Correspondence 05 prepared by Raymond Papanian and dated January 11, 2026; DEM December 19, 2025, Meeting uploaded digitally by Tyson Ford on January 12, 2026; Shed Site (2 documents) uploaded digitally by Tyson Ford on January 12, 2026; Updated Site Plan - Proposed 8'x10' Shed created by Sardelli Survey LLC, signed and stamped by Jamie L. Sardelli PSL dated December 11, 2025; Pictures of Neighboring Sheds on front of property (2 photos), uploaded digitally by Tyson Ford on January 12, 2026; Before and After Pictures of Drain on the property (3 photos), uploaded digitally by Tyson Ford on January 12, 2026; Correspondence 5 written by Raymond Papanian, President of Indian Lake Shores Fire District Council, dated January 11, 2026.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- IV. Petition of **Joni LeDonne**, 341 Sweet Allen Farm Road, South Kingstown, RI,02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to legalize a previously constructed deck attached to the dwelling. The deck is located 27.4' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 30', therefore, relief of 2.6' is requested. Lot size is .23 acres. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are James & Joni LeDonne for premises located at 341 Sweet Allen Farm Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 48-4, Lot 98 and is zoned R20.
[341 Sweet Allen Farm Road - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

James and Joni LeDonna, the applicants and homeowners, were present and sworn in.

Mr. Cagnetta began by asking the applicants what they had done to their deck.

Ms. LeDonne explains that they recently renovated their existing deck, due to rotting wood. Once all work was complete, the deck ended up being a little over 2 feet larger than what is allowed.

While reviewing the site plan, Mr. LeDonne states that the reason for the larger size is because of the steps along the perimeter of the deck. The steps were originally wood but were changed to "Trex".

Mr. Daniels asks how the applicants were made aware they were over the size limit. To which Mr. LeDonne responded, they found out after getting a professional survey.

There were no further board questions for the applicant.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the above petition.

There was no one present who wished to speak.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Mr. Elia and duly seconded by Ms. Hicks.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Elia -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion was passed to approve the petition of **Joni LeDonne**, 341 Sweet Allen Farm Road, South Kingstown, RI, 02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to legalize a previously constructed deck attached to the dwelling. The deck is located 27.4' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 30', therefore, relief of 2.6' is requested. Lot size is .23 acres. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are James & Joni LeDonne for premises located at 341 Sweet Allen Farm Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 48-4, Lot 98 and is zoned R20.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because the applicant is simply asking for approval of an already existing deck with 2.6 ft. of relief.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is the applicant's first petition for the deck variance, and the board has no other issues related to this property.
3. The Board finds 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, because the deck is already built and fits the general character of the surrounding area.
4. The Board finds 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, meaning that relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted, because the deck is already built and the applicant is only asking for a relief of 2.6 feet.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- James and Joni LeDonna, the applicants

There were no individuals who spoke either in favor of or against the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Proposed Open Patio Site Plan, created by Shevalin Grant and dated October 24, 2024; A second Proposed Open Patio Site Plan, created by Shevalin Grant and dated October 10, 2024; Signed Letter from Kirk D. Andrews PLS of East Greenwich Surveyors, LLC dated November 4, 2025; Survey & Location Map prepared and stamped by Kirk D. Andrews PLS of East Greenwich Surveyors, LLC dated November 3, 2025. Correspondence #1 written by Loren Hedman, abutter, and dated January 6, 2026. Correspondence #2 written by Charles & Lori Marshall and received on January 12, 2026; Correspondence #3 written by Darin S. Pierce and received on January 15, 2026; Correspondence #4 written by Tim Ison and received on January 20, 2026; Correspondence # 6 written by Stephen and Jill Rodgers and received on 2/18/2026.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- V. Petition of Kevin Cahill, 125 Charles Lane, Hebron, CT 06248, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a two-story garage attached to the single-family dwelling. The garage will be located 23.1' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 35', therefore, relief of 11.9' is requested. Lot size is .52 acres. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief).** Owners of the property are Kevin & Pamela Cahill for premises located at 151 North Weeden Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 86-3, Lot 168 and is zoned R20.
[151 North Weeden Road - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Kevin Cahill, the applicant, was present and sworn in.

Mr. Cahill stated that he has been a resident of the Town for six years. He is proposing to construct a two-car garage with space above intended for an office. Mr. Cahill further noted that maintaining natural light within the existing dwelling is important to him. He indicated that the first floor contains numerous windows with desirable views that he would prefer not to have obstructed a structure. Accordingly, the applicant is proposing to locate the garage further back on the lot in order to avoid blocking natural light to the existing structure.

Mr. Cahill further stated that there are two additional reasons for proposing to move the garage further back on the lot. First, he indicated that doing so would improve the overall visual aesthetics of the property. Second, he explained that the lot contains a unique slope and is susceptible to flooding. By locating the garage further back on the property, where

the ground is more level, the risk of flooding would be reduced.

The applicant has received positive feedback from abutters regarding this application.

Mr. Cagnetta asked about the driveway, which would be extended back to the garage.

Mr. Elia agrees with the beautiful natural light and approves of the design plans. Mr. Elia also points out that the upstairs of the garage will be used for storage, not to be rented out.

Mr. Daniels asked what the house was going to be used for.

Mr. Cahill says it is his summer home, and he uses it up to five months a year.

The board had no further questions for Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak either in favor of or opposition to the above petition.

There was no one present.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Mr. Elia and duly seconded by Mr. Daniels.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion was passed to approve the petition of Kevin Cahill, 125 Charles Lane, Hebron, CT 06248, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a two-story garage attached to the single-family dwelling. The garage will be located 23.1' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 35', therefore, relief of 11.9' is requested. Lot size is .52 acres. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are Kevin & Pamela Cahill for premises located at 151 North Weeden Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 86-3, Lot 168 and is zoned R20.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because the applicant is looking to construct a two-story garage for personal use only.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is the applicant's first petition and there are no other issues in relation to the board and this petition.
3. The Board finds 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, because the design of the proposed two-story garage fits in with the surrounding area.
4. The Board finds 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, meaning that relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted, because the two-story garage is for personal use only and a relief of 11.9' is requested.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- Kevin Cahill, the applicant

There were no individuals who spoke either in favor of or against the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Site Plan Survey created by Jackson Surveying, Inc. Signed by Charee M. Jackson., PLS dated October 20, 2025; Elevation and Floor Plan (4 pages), uploaded digitally by Kevin Cahill on December 23, 2025.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- VI. Petition of **Kate Ray**, 27 Eldred Court, Wakefield, RI 02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a two-story addition to the single-family dwelling. The addition will be located 2.7' from the west side property line. The required side yard setback is 8.2', therefore, relief of 5.5' is requested. Lot size is .19 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 205 (Single Nonconforming Recorded Lots) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief).** Owners of the property are Rajan Ray & Kate Fox for premises located at 27 Eldred Court, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 56-3 Lot 34 and is zoned R10.
[27 Eldred Court - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Kate Ray and Rajan Ray, the applicants, were present and sworn in.

Ms. Ray begins by saying they intend to remove the existing garage and replace it with an attached garage. They are asking for a variance because the original shed footprint will be enlarged. They are looking to add a first floor bedroom to the house to accommodate older relatives visiting. Additionally, they will be enlarging the kitchen space. The new garage will be moved further away from the property line. The second floor will be loft space, not finished or habitable space.

The board had no further questions for the applicants.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak either in favor of or opposition to the above petition.

There was no one present.

Ms. Hicks asked if 2.7 feet to the property line is enough room to build the structure. Also, do any abutters have concerns about construction possible being on or close to the property line?

Mr. Cagnetta responds that, in his experience, 3 feet is the ideal amount of space.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Ms. Hicks and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion was passed to approve the petition of **Kate Ray**, 27 Eldred Court, Wakefield, RI 02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a two-story addition to the single-family dwelling. The addition will be located 2.7' from the west side property line. The required side yard setback is 8.2'. Therefore, relief of 5.5' is requested. Lot size is .19 acres. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 205 (Single Nonconforming Recorded Lots) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are Rajan Ray & Kate Fox for premises located at 27 Eldred Court, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 56-3 Lot 34 and is zoned R10.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because they will need to move closer to the property line to be able to put in the two-car garage.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because they will be replacing the existing garage and replacing it with a new structure.
3. The Board finds 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, because a two-car garage is perfect to go along with the house, and it will fit into the neighborhood well.
4. The Board finds 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, meaning that relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted, because currently the applicant has an existing detached garage, and they would like to replace it with a larger garage that will be attached to the house.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- Kate and Rajan Ray, the applicants.

There was no one present who spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the petition.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Proposed Conditions Plan created by South County Survey Co., signed by James T. Caldarone PLS., dated January 12, 2026; Foundation, Framing, Exterior Elevation, Section, and Roof Plans (S1, S2, A1, A2, A3, A4, and A5), from Blackberry Hill Design, stamped by Ernesto George Jr. on December 18, 2025; Several Load Calculations (10 Pages), created by Ernest George from Coastal Engineering dated November 24, 2025.

- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- VII. Petition of **Robert Rinaldi**, 26 Quarry Road, Medfield, MA 02052, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct 1. A detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); 2. A detached barn; and 3. An addition to the existing dwelling. The lot area is 14,133sf, whereas 20,000sf is required to establish an ADU. Relief of 5,867sf is requested. The ADU will consist of 884sf in floor area. The maximum floor area permitted is 803sf, therefore, relief of 81sf is requested. The proposed building height of the ADU is 21.6'. The maximum accessory building height is 15, therefore, relief of 6.6' is requested. The barn will be located 3' from the side yard. The required side yard accessory structure setback is 6', therefore, 3' of relief is requested. The proposed building height of the barn is 18', therefore, 3' of relief is requested. The dwelling addition will be 2.26' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 10', therefore, relief of 7.74' is requested. Lot size is .3 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief).** Owner of the property is Robert Rinaldi, for premises located at 382 Woodruff Avenue, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 57-4, Lot 123 and zoned R10.
[382 Woodruff Avenue - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Mr. Cagnetta starts by mentioning that this is a unique property.

Robert Rinaldi, Iori Giuttari, and Attorney Chris O'Connor were present and sworn in.

Mr. O'Connor began by saying that this property is being reverted to a residential property. It had been a hair salon for a long time. This property is considered a "pass-through lot", meaning it has frontage on two main roads. Currently, the lot is paved from front to back. Most, if not all, of the pavement will be removed for the new development. The existing building is on the property line, the petition will move the dwelling away from the property line.

Ms. Giuttari then spoke. She says that the house was purchased in 2025. Mr. Rinaldi and Ms. Giuttari would like to live there. They have since pulled a building permit to restore the existing structure from business to residence. Currently, there is no accessory structure on the property. The applicants are looking to build a structure to store their vehicles. The barn will have a lean to covering for a car and another car can go inside the barn. The barn will be post and beamed on a slab and include a loft for extra storage.

The last item on this petition is the construction of an ADU. The applicants are asking for three-dimensional reliefs. The lot is roughly 14,000 square ft. the ordinance requires 20,000 square ft in order to build an ADU on the lot.

Mr. Cagnetta asks the applicants why they want to build an ADU on an already undersized lot.

Mr. O'Connor says that the state has a presence to build an ADU where one can be accommodated. He believes that, under its own merits, this ADU will fit into the neighborhood and meet all the other requirements necessary to build an ADU on the lot.

Mr. Rinaldi added that there is a lot of dead space in the back of the property, which would be an ideal place for an ADU. An ADU would also help with affordable housing in the town.

The applicants add that there has been care taken in planning and designing the ADU so that it fits in with the character of the neighborhood. The occupants of the ADU would also have their own private access.

Mr. Daniels also questions why the ADU needs to be 2 bedrooms and 2 baths. He feels like the petition is asking for too much relief. Why can't the applicant build an ADU with one bedroom and one bathroom? Mr. Rinaldi confirmed that the plan for the ADU is to rent it out.

Ms. Hicks adds that the ADU will almost be the same square footage as the main dwelling.

At this point in the hearing, the applicants stepped away from the microphone to talk amongst themselves.

Mr. Gorman mentions that a two-bedroom ADU is limited to 1200 square feet or 60% of the primary dwelling, whichever is less.

Mr. O'Connor stepped to the podium again. He requested, with the Board's approval, that the ADU being proposed be removed from the petition without prejudice.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if the applicants would like a continuation of the proposed ADU.

Mr. O'Connor replies that, with all the logistics involved, he is unsure how much time they would need before coming back in front of the Board. Mr. O'Connor wishes to remove the ADU from the petition and perhaps file for a new petition when the time is right.

The ADU has been removed without prejudice from the petition with the Board's approval.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak either in favor of or opposition to the above petition.

Howard Browning was present and sworn in.

Mr. Browning's mother's home is adjacent to the petitioned property. He is concerned because there were survey posts located on his mother's property. Mr. Browning would like to have the lot resurveyed and, if it comes back that the original survey is correct, he would like to know what are his legal options?

There were no further board questions for Mr. Browning.

Ms. Goins made the board aware that even though there might be a dispute over property lines. The board can not withhold approval or pause an application; only the superior court can determine property lines.

Robert Dwyer was present and sworn in.

Mr. Dwyer shares the same concern with Mr. Browning. It may be possible that Ms. Browning has no idea that this development is going on next door. Mr. Browning believes that this development is exploitative in nature. If this petition were to pass, it would invite many more applications like this for other properties. Mr. Dwyer is concerned with over development and an increase in the density of neighborhoods. Mr. Dwyer says he is not terribly concerned about the proposed barn and the addition to the house.

There were no further board questions for Mr. Dwyer.

At this time, the applicants returned to the podium for their rebuttal.

Mr. O'Connor references the abutter's letters that went out to everyone within a 200-foot radius of the lot. Ms. Giuttari mentions that she did talk to Mr. Browning's sister about fixing up the lot and the sister said that any renovation to the property would be good for the neighborhood. Mr. Rinaldi concludes that they did not buy this property specifically to build an ADU.

There were no further board questions for the applicants.

Mr. Browning went to the podium again to clarify that he is his mother's power of attorney and that the neighboring lot is in the family's name.

There was no one else from the audience who wished to speak.

The board talked amongst themselves, most agreeing that they have little issue with the proposed addition and barn.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The petitioned ADU has been withdrawn without prejudice from the petition by the applicants with the Board's approval. The following motion does not include the proposed ADU.

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Mr. Cagnetta and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Elia -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion was passed regarding the petition of **Robert Rinaldi**, 26 Quarry Road, Medfield, MA 02052, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct: 1. A detached barn; and 2. An addition to the existing dwelling. The barn will be located 3' from the side yard. The required side yard accessory structure setback is 6', therefore, 3' of relief is requested. The proposed building height of the barn is 18', therefore, 3' of relief is requested. The dwelling addition will be 2.26' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 10', therefore, relief of 7.74' is requested. Lot size is .3 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owner of the property is Robert Rinaldi, for the premises located at 382 Woodruff Avenue, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 57-4, Lot 123 and zoned R10.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because this is unique a site, the property is narrow so the fact that the applicant is seeking relief in the back does make sense in order to add on to the existing structure which is not in conformance with the setbacks. The applicants are looking to locate the barn off the center of the main property, and because this is a unique lot, they request 3 ft from the side yard. The applicants are looking to make the barn narrow with loft space on the second level. Therefore, 3 ft of height relief is understandable due to the unique size of the lot.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because there were no other conflicts pertaining to this petition with Board members.
3. The Board finds 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, because there are a lot of unique outbuildings in this neighborhood. There are detached garages on property lines and the main house being on the property line is not unusual for this neighborhood.
4. The Board finds 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, meaning that relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted, because it is a smaller house on a small property,

so having an outbuilding for cars and storage is a reasonable request.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- Robert (Bob) Rinaldi, the applicant.
- Lori Giuttari, co-owner.
- Chris O'Connor, ESQ, the attorney representing on behalf of the applicant.

There were no individuals who spoke in favor of the petition:

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the petition:

- Howard Browning, a family member, owns the property adjacent to the subject premises.
- Robert Dwyer

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Barn Concept Photo uploaded digitally by Matthew Landry on January 14, 2026; Narrative and Waivers uploaded digitally by Matthew Landry on January 14, 2026; Land Survey checked by Matthew J. Cotta PLS. From American Engineering, Inc. dated December 24, 2026; ADU Floor Plan uploaded digitally by Matthew Landry on January 14, 2026; ADU Front Elevation Photo uploaded digitally by Matthew Landry on January 14, 2026; Picture of finished main dwelling (Exhibit #1) received from Robert Rinaldi during the hearing on February 18, 2026.
 - 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.
-

Mr. Cagnetta called for the last petition.

- VIII. Petition of **Michael Nedwidek**, 151 Weathervane Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a 22'6" x 13'8" deck attached to the single-family dwelling. The deck will be located 19.4' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 30', therefore, relief of 10.6' is requested. Lot size is .26 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are Michael & Cynthia Nedwidek for premises located at 151 Weathervane Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 48-4 Lot 56 and is zoned R20.
[151 Weathervane Road - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Michael and Cynthia Nedwidek, the applicants, were present and sworn in.

Mr. Nedwidek explains that they are currently working on replacing a deck at their home. The deck is approximately two-thirds complete. Mr. Nedwidek received a "Stop Work Order" on September 5, 2025. There has been no work done on the deck since. The applicants are seeking relief, in particular, where the stairs come down from the back of the deck. The stairs were designed for two particular reasons. One is for ease of use as they age and the other is because they

have young grandchildren who visit regularly. The original stairs on the deck were considered dangerous by the applicants due to how steep and narrow they were. The Nedwidek's have lived at the property for over 36 years.

There were no further Board questions for the applicants.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak either in favor of or opposition to the above petition.

Deborah Tranter was present and sworn in.

Deborah is a neighbor to Nedwidek's property. Her concern is with the amount of noise that may come with the new deck. She says she has heard loud noises in the past, although it is unclear if it came from Nedwidek's property. Ms. Tranter has no issue with the current deck being built.

Mathilda Hills was also present and sworn in.

Ms. Hills shares the same concern with loud noises coming from around the neighborhood.

The board had no further questions for the two individuals from the audience.

Mr. and Mrs. Nedwidek approached the podium again.

Mr. Nedwidek made clear that the new deck is adding about 80 square ft. compared to the original deck. He goes on to say that the original deck was sort of an afterthought when they had the home built in 1987. The deck was built as quickly as possible and with limited funds to spare. The original deck had served its purpose and had started to deteriorate. In conclusion, the applicants pledge to be good neighbors and keep the noise level down.

The board had no further questions.

Whereas the following motion was made:

The Motion is as Follows:

The following motion to approve the petition was made by Mr. Elia and duly seconded by Ms. Hicks.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Mr. Elia -Aye, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye)

At a meeting held on February 18, 2026, a motion was passed regarding the petition of Michael Nedwidek, 151 Weathervane Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, for a **Dimensional Variance** under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a 22'6" x 13'8" deck attached to the single-family dwelling. The deck will be located 19.4' from the rear property line. The required rear yard setback is 30', therefore, relief of 10.6' is requested. Lot size is .26 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 401 (Schedule of Dimensional Regulations) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are Michael & Cynthia Nedwidek for premises located at 151 Weathervane Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 48-4 Lot 56 and is zoned R20.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds 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), because the applicant is simply asking to construct a deck attached to their single family home.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is the applicant's first time in front of the Zoning Board.

3. The Board finds 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, because the deck is almost complete and the design does fit into the surrounding neighborhood.

4. The Board finds 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, meaning that relief sought is minimal to a reasonable enjoyment of the permitted use to which the property is proposed to be devoted, because the deck is constructed in a way that is suitable for people as they age and for grandchildren.

Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:

- Michael and Cynthia Nedwidek, the applicants.

There were two individuals present who spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the petition:

- Deborah Tranter, an abutter to the property.
- Mathilda Hills, an abutter to the property.

The following materials were entered into the record:

- Land Survey created by South County Survey Co., signed by James T. Caldarone, PLS. Dated January 15, 2026.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notice and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

D. Other Items

- I. Attendance for March 25, 2026, Zoning Board of Review

All of tonight's Zoning Board Members will be attending the March 25, 2026, meeting.

- II. Approval of the November 19, 2025 & December 17, 2025, Zoning Board of Review Minutes

There was a motion to approve the Zoning Board of Review meeting minutes from November 19, 2025, and December 17, 2026.

The Motion is as Follows:

A motion to approve both meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hicks.

Motion passed unanimously: (5-0 Vote in Favor)

(Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. Elia -Aye)

Both Meeting Minutes will be published to the public.

- III. Adjournment

Mr. Cagnetta made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

All members were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:02:44 PM