



# Town of South Kingstown

## Zoning Board of Review Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 15, 2026 at 7:00 PM  
South Kingstown Town Hall, Town Council Chambers  
180 High Street, Wakefield, RI 02879  
[www.southkingstownri.gov](http://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 7:02:57 PM.

### B. Chairman Introductions and Instructions

Mr. Cagnetta explained the rules and procedures.

**Members Present:** Robert Cagnetta, Chairman; Thomas Daniels, Vice Chairman; Arlene 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\*

On June 25, 2026, the South Kingstown Building Department received a letter of withdrawal from David L. Johnston, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. Regarding the petition **ZBR-26-19: Peter Abbenante**, owner of the property is Denali Corp. located at **0 Willard Drive**.

Mr. Cagnetta called for the first petition.

- I. **Petition ZBR-26-21: Andrew Shea**, 231 Briarwood Drive, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to replace a 982 sq. ft. deck at the rear of the dwelling. The deck will be located 1'2" from the east side property line and 4'2" from the north side property line. The required side yard setback is 4'6", therefore, relief of 3'4" and 4" is requested. Lot size is .21 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 205 (Single Nonconforming Lots) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are Gary & Constance Wyllie for premises located at 42 Browning Street, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 96-1, Lot 47 and is zoned R30.  
[42 Browning Street - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Prior to the hearing, the South Kingstown Building Department was notified that Petition ZBR-26-21 would require a continuance to the August zoning board meeting. The applicant did not mail the required public hearing notices to all abutting property owners within the timeframe prescribed by the zoning ordinance. The ordinance requires that notices be mailed to all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property at least fourteen days prior to the scheduled public hearing. The applicant's notices were mailed only seven days before the hearing. Accordingly, the petition could not be heard at this meeting, and the board's only action was to consider a motion to continue the petition to the August 19, 2026, Zoning Board of Review meeting.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion 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, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. Daniels -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye)**

---

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- II. **Continuation of petition ZBR-26-18: Paul Soucy**, 1033 Vintner Blvd, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) measuring 24' in height. The maximum height for an accessory building is 20'. Therefore, relief of 4' is requested. Lot size is 1.27 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 Paul & Joyce Soucy Trust for premises located at 821 Green Hill Beach Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 90-4, Lot 166 and is zoned R80.  
[821 Green Hill Beach Road — Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

The Board noted that Mr. Soucy had revised the application since the previous zoning board meeting by reducing the proposed structure height from 26 feet to 24 feet, as reflected in the Revised Elevation Plans (A2). Mr. Soucy is now requesting 4 feet of relief for the height of the ADU.

The applicant, Paul Soucy, was present and sworn in.

Mr. Soucy testified that he has been a resident of Green Hill Beach Road for approximately 30 years and is seeking to expand the use of his property to better accommodate his family's current and future needs. He explained that the existing 1,500-square-foot residence adequately served his family when his children were younger; however, as his children have grown and started families of their own, additional living space has become necessary.

Mr. Soucy stated that he is requesting approval to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to provide housing for his growing family while also allowing him the opportunity to age in place. He attested that the proposed ADU would comply with all applicable setback requirements and the maximum allowable square footage for the lot. The proposed design includes a two-car garage located beneath the ADU, which would be used for storage while providing the convenience of covered parking and immediate access to the upstairs living area, particularly as he grows older.

During last June's zoning board meeting, Mr. Soucy's neighbors produced a 12-page report of opposition written by Attorney Vincent Indeglia. Since then, Mr. Soucy has had time to read the document and wishes to clarify some of the concerns that the abutters have.

At this time, Mr. Soucy handed out his "Applicant Exhibit 1" to the board members. The packet includes "Photos of the Main Home as Purchased and Renovations," "Photos of Abutters' Properties", and "A Photo of the Proposed Garage and ADU."

Mr. Soucy stated that he purchased the house from the original owner in 1996. In 1997, they added the attached garage onto the side of the main home. The existing home is currently in a flood zone and a velocity zone which requires breakaway walls. The property is within 125 feet of the CRMC buffer zone, which precludes it from any further expansion. The applicant testified that the existing storage area is located at or near the water table. The concrete floor slab contains visible cracks, and a foreign object is protruding through the floor, contributing to concerns regarding the condition and usability of the space.

Mr. Soucy then addressed concerns regarding the existing garage. He testified that, prior to the construction of the garage, the first floor of the existing dwelling had already been established approximately seven feet above grade. As a

result, the garage ceiling was constructed to a height of approximately seven feet, and the garage floor was excavated as low as possible. Mr. Soucy further testified that, during rain events, stormwater flows down the driveway and into the garage, resulting in drainage issues.

Mr. Soucy then moved on to the design of the proposed structure. The detached garage will be facing the existing home. The street side of the building will be very attractive and have the same design as the main house with gables and pediments. Mr. Soucy is aware that the abutters are not comfortable with a 26-foot-high building, so he has revised the elevation plans to be 24 feet high. Because of the topography of the lot, the proposed building will be placed at an elevation of 10 feet, a full 5 feet below the grade of the street. This means that the building will look to be about 19 feet tall, which is not out of character for the neighborhood.

Board questions ensued.

Mr. Elia asked Mr. Soucy where he resided throughout the year. He also had questions about aging in a place and the difficulties that could result from a second floor living area.

Mr. Soucy is not a full-time resident of South Kingstown, he is a Florida resident. The ADU would be for Mr. Soucy when his kids and their families come to visit.

Mr. Daniels asks how many months he spends in Rhode Island.

Mr. Soucy replies that 5–6 months will be spent in Rhode Island. Mr. Soucy stated that he has already received a permit from DEM for a denitrification system and control of water during construction. He has also worked with CRMC to make sure that the proposed building would be outside the coastal buffer zone.

Mr. Cagnetta asked if Mr. Soucy would be taking down any trees during construction.

Mr. Soucy would like to keep as many trees as possible. He had cut down trees earlier in the year, stating that those had fallen over during windstorms.

Mr. Elia confirmed with the applicant that he is now seeking 4 feet of relief in height, not 6 feet, which was in the original plans.

There were no more board questions for Mr. Soucy.

Mr. Cagnetta asked the audience if anyone would like to speak in favor of the petition.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Cagnetta asked the audience if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the petition.

Michelle Atkinson was present and sworn in.

Ms. Atkinson's property directly abuts Mr. Soucy's property to the north. She had questions about the allowed height for an accessory structure. She also asked about CRMC approval. Ms. Atkinson is concerned that the height of ADU will interfere with her privacy. By allowing this petition to pass, more people on Green Hill Beach Road will want to have ADUs on their property, leading to more traffic, noise, and light pollution.

Natalie Palmer was present and sworn in.

Ms. Palmer shares Ms. Atkinson's concerns about the height of the ADU. She would like the height to be limited to 20 feet. Adding that this proposed building might make the town's ordinance on accessory height allowed be seen as merely a suggestion in the future.

Mr. Cagnetta reminds her that each case which is reviewed by the board is unique and not based on prior approvals. The board faces a challenge with ADU's because the State of Rhode Island is telling all towns to build more ADUs, and it is the board's job to make sure that an ADU is used properly and does not increase the density of the neighborhood.

Attorney, Vincent Indeglia was present and sworn in.

Mr. Indeglia, representing the owners of 804 and 810 Green Hill Beach Road, addressed the board. He questioned whether denying the petition would effectively deprive the applicant of the beneficial use of the property. Mr. Indeglia requested that installation of a denitrification system be made a condition of any approval. He further expressed his opinion that the proposed structures should comply with the town's height limitations, stating that the property should be permitted to accommodate either a garage or an ADU, but not both. Additionally, Mr. Indeglia noted that although Mr. Soucy stated he did not intend to rent the proposed ADU, there are still concerns regarding the potential use of the ADU by future property owners.

Board questions ensued.

Mr. Daniels states the applicant has testified that the existing garage is unusable.

Mr. Indeglia agrees with the applicant's testimony but once again states that the applicant can have a garage or an ADU that is within the ordinance's zoning height of 20 feet.

There were no further questions for Mr. Indeglia.

Mr. Soucy returned to the podium.

Mr. Cagnetta asked about CRMC and DEM permits.

Mr. Soucy testified that he met with the CRMC to obtain a water-edge verification. During that process, CRMC identified prior work completed on the property that had not received the required CRMC approvals. Mr. Soucy stated that he has since worked with CRMC to resolve the outstanding permitting issues related to three previous projects requiring CRMC authorization. He further testified that, should the petition receive zoning approval, he intends to return to CRMC to obtain final approval.

Mr. Soucy also testified that he has received approval from DEM. As a condition of that approval, DEM imposed a deed restriction on the property limiting the proposed ADU to no more than two bedrooms.

Mr. Soucy also brought up another concern of the neighbors; density. His lot is the largest of six lots surrounding him. He asserts that his property is 2/3 larger, yet his home is the smallest in the neighborhood at 1500 square feet. The coverage of the lot is still well below the allowed amount for the proposed garage/ADU. He adds that it would be impossible to build up on the existing home because DEM would never allow for a five-bedroom septic system.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if other homes in the neighborhood have garages.

Mr. Soucy answers yes, to the right and left of his home are garages and at address 804 or 810 there is a two-car garage with almost the same design that Mr. Soucy would like.

Mr. Soucy adds that if he wanted to, he could demolish the existing home and move the footprint to allow him to have an attached garage 35 feet high with a five-bedroom septic, but that is not what he wants to do.

Board question ensued.

Ms. Hicks asked Mr. Soucy hypothetically if his kids were to move into the main house, would he live in the ADU 12

months of the year?

Mr. Soucy answers yes, he would.

Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Daniels asks if there is anything in the ordinance that says that the main house must be owner occupied.

Mr. Gorman states that was the case for the previous ordinance, but new state laws do not require owner occupancy.

Mr. Elia has no reason to see why an ADU would be required for future plans and the proof of hardship has not been met. The ADU can be built without the garage below it.

Mr. MacDonald agrees with Mr. Elia. The applicant can have the ADU while still being within all the required setbacks and height restrictions. A four-foot height variance would not be detrimental to the neighborhood. If the applicant wants an ADU, they can have it without a garage underneath it.

Mr. Daniels states that the applicant could put an ADU or a garage on the property without being in front of the zoning board. An ADU with a garage underneath does make financial sense. Also, the applicant's testimony stated that the existing garage is used for storage only, not cars because the floor is cracking and wet. Mr. Daniels concluded that four feet does not seem like a lot to ask for.

Ms. Hicks thinks that an ADU with a garage underneath makes sense for someone who is aging in place. She agrees that the four feet variance would not look out of character in the neighborhood.

Mr. Cagnetta was unsure of his decision until he heard Mr. Soucy say that an alternative solution would be to demolish the existing house and build a new house with a garage 35 feet tall. The ADU with garage underneath seems like a subtle change in comparison. He also said that he does not have a problem with the four-foot variance. In conclusion, the proposed plan is thoughtful, and Mr. Soucy is making improvements to the existing property.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion was made by Mr. Cagnetta and duly seconded by Ms. Hicks.**

**Motion passed: (3-2 Vote in favor)**

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

At a meeting held on July 15, 2026, a motion to approve the petition was made regarding **Paul Soucy**, 1033 Vintner Blvd, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) measuring 24' in height. The maximum height for an accessory building is 20', therefore, relief of 4' is requested. Lot size is 1.27 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 Paul & Joyce Soucy Trust for premises located at 821 Green Hill Beach Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 90-4, Lot 166 and is zoned R80.

**The following individual spoke as a representative of the applicant:**

- Paul Soucy, applicant and homeowner.

**There was no one from the audience who wished to speak in favor of the petition.**

**The following individuals spoke in opposition to the petition:**

- Michelle Atkinson, direct abutter to the applicant.
- Natalie Palmer, resides on Green Hill Beach Road.
- Attorney Vincent Indeglia, representing on behalf of 804 and 810 Green Hill Beach Road residents.

**The following materials were entered into the record:**

- First Floor, Foundation, Framing, and Section Plans designed by Blackberry Hill design stamped by Ernesto George Jr. R.P.E. dated May 15, 2026 (A1,S1,S2,S3); Letter of Opposition Packet from Indeglia & Associates and dated June 17, 2026 (12 pages); Site Plan with Building vs Street Elevation digitally uploaded by Jennifer Hannigan on July 6, 2026; Onsite Wastewater Treatment System New Design prepared by Atlas Land Surveying, LLC. signed by Marcus Channell P.L.S. dated April 2026; Revised Elevation Plans, designed by Blackberry Hill Design and dated July 6, 2026; Applicant Exhibit 1: "Photos of Main Home as Purchased and Renovations," "Photos of Abutters Properties" & "Photo of Proposed Garage and ADU." submitted by Paul Soucy to board members at the July 15th meeting (3 pages).
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

**Findings of fact:**

The Board noted that Mr. Soucy had revised the application since the previous Zoning Board meeting by reducing the proposed structure height from 26 feet to 24 feet, as reflected in the Revised Elevation Plans (A2).

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 property is constrained by its waterfront location on Green Hill Pond and is already developed with an existing dwelling, along with existing OWTS and driveway. A height of 24 feet is required for the applicant to construct a garage with an ADU on top of it.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because Mr. Soucy stated that all previously outstanding matters with the CRMC related to prior work on the property have been addressed and formally closed.
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 other properties on Green Hill Beach Road that have multi-car garages. The proposed ADU will only be 24 feet in height, which is shorter than other residential buildings in the neighborhood. The proposed structure will not be out of character for 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 most properties in the area have a garage. Additionally, although relief was not required in connection with the location of the garage & ADU, the Board notes that the proposed location was driven by the existing site constraints, including the setback from the coastal feature and the existing dwelling and OWTS on the property.

**Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:**

- The decision is a Conditional Zoning Approval and is conditioned upon any, if necessary, CRMC or RIDEM approvals and will have a two-year expiration from the recorded date per Section 908 of the Zoning Ordinance

with the right to extend if necessary.

---

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- III. **Petition ZBR-26-20: The Narragansett Electric Company**, 827 Hausman Road, Allentown, PA 18104, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a 32' x 60' utility building associated with an existing electric substation. The building will be 33' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 40', therefore, relief of 7' is requested. Lot size is 4.82 acres. **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 Narragansett Electric Company for premises located at 360 Great Neck Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 29, Lot 4 and is zoned R80.

[360 Great Neck Road — Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

George Watson, outside counsel for the Narragansett Electric Co. and Ben Golnik, project manager, were both present and sworn in.

Mr. Watson begins by saying that this is an existing facility. It is built on the transmission corridor where there are two 115 KB lines that extend through it.

Mr. Golnik describes the layout of the existing facility. The right side of the substation is raised up, and transmission assets are located there, and the lower yard is the distribution assets. The petition is to expand the yard for additional equipment. The current control room does not have the space to accommodate the new equipment. The new equipment will consist of breakers, transformers and additional IT equipment to improve reliability. With the new improvements, The Narragansett Electric Company will be able to minimize outages and break them down into smaller, easier to handle sections.

Mr. Cagnetta adds that the engineers must have a problem with space because everything is laid out in squares.

Mr. Golnik testified that other options were explored in order for no variance to be needed, but they were not feasible. The proposed plan that the applicants are proposing to the board is the least impactful.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if the building that will store the new equipment could be any smaller?

Mr. Golnik answered that it cannot be any smaller. All the equipment that will be going in is critical. Because this is a commercial substation, certain regulations are required, such as clearance and access around equipment.

Mr. Cagnetta asks who is surrounding this substation.

Mr. Golnik answers that the area is surrounded by Great Swamp Nature Reserve. Abutters include a maintenance shed and a gun range.

Mr. Watson adds that, with the variance, everything will still be on the existing property and won't impact any adjacent uses.

Board questions ensued.

Mr. Daniels asks if the public utilities commission needs to be involved.

Mr. Watson answered, they do not need to be involved because they are not modifying the transmission line.

There were no further board questions.

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

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

There was no more board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion 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, Ms. Hicks -Aye, Mr. MacDonald -Aye, Mr. Cagnetta -Aye)**

At a meeting held on July 15, 2026, there was a motion to approve the petition regarding **The Narragansett Electric Company**, 827 Hausman Road, Allentown, PA 18104, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a 32' x 60' utility building associated with an existing electric substation. The building will be 33' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 40', therefore, relief of 7' is requested. Lot size is 4.82 acres. **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 Narragansett Electric Company for premises located at 360 Great Neck Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 29, Lot 4 and is zoned R80.

**The following individuals appeared as representatives of the applicant:**

- George Watson, outside counsel for The Narragansett Electric Co.
- Ben Golnik, project manager.

**There was no one from the audience who wished to speak in favor of the petition.**

**There was no one from the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the petition.**

**The following materials were entered into the record:**

- Professional Survey Packet prepared by WSP USA INC. and developed by Rhode Island Energy dated May 1, 2026 (5 Pages). Professional Survey Packet includes: 1) Cover Sheet. 2) Construction, Erosion and Sedimentation Controls. 3) Existing Conditions. 4) Proposed Conditions. 5) Details.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

**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 applicants are looking to construct a 32' by 60' supplemental building for critical equipment. The applicants are asking for 7' feet of set back relief.

2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is The Narragansett Electric Company's first time seeking a dimensional variance on this lot.

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 allowed land use of the property is classified as Utility MDL 95, indicating a non-residential utility building on the parcel. The property is currently utilized as an electric substation and is largely obscured from view by the surrounding forested 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 applicants emphasized that the proposal requires only seven feet of dimensional relief and stated that the requested relief is necessary to accommodate new equipment intended to improve the reliability of utility service and help prevent future outages.

**Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:**

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

---

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- IV. **Petition ZBR-26-22: Jalyn Campanini**, 287 Woodruff Avenue, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a detached garage with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) located on the 2nd story. The proposed building will measure 25'6" in height. The maximum accessory building height is 15, therefore, 10'6" of relief is requested. The lot area is 14,905 sq. ft., whereas 20,000 sq. ft. is required to establish an ADU. Relief of 5,095 sq. ft. is requested. **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 Jalyn Campanini for premises located at 30 Branch Street, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 49-4, Lot 32 and is zoned R10. [30 Branch Street — Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

Jayln Campanini was present and sworn in.

Ms. Campanini purchased her grandparent's property, and she would like to add a detached garage with an ADU located on the second floor. Currently, her cousin resides in the main house as Ms. Campanini travels back and forth from North Carolina. She would like to rent out the main house while she lives in the ADU. Ms. Campanini is asking for 10.6 feet of relief in height. The lot area is 14,905 square feet whereas 20,000 square feet is required to build an ADU. There is a pre-existing shed on the property that will be demolished to make room for the proposed structure. There is currently no garage on the property and parking has become an issue.

Mr. Cagnetta noted that Ms. Campanini's proposed structure would be located in proximity to the adjacent property. He inquired whether the applicant had any knowledge regarding the adjacent residence or any potential impacts the proposed structure might have on it.

Ms. Campanini believes that it will be torn down, but she is not certain.

Mr. Cagnetta asks who will stay in the ADU.

Ms. Campanini says that she will live there when she is staying in Rhode Island. She works remotely and would like a quiet space all to her own.

Mr. Gorman states that if the ADU were attached to the main dwelling, then the applicant would not need the height variance, but it would still need relief for the lot area.

Mr. Cagnetta points out that the density is unique in this area. Homes are close together because they were built before zoning laws existed.

Board questions ensued.

The board's questions were mostly about information that the applicant had already stated, they just wanted more clarification.

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

Elizabeth Kirby was present and sworn in.

Ms. Kirby, who resides across the street from the subject property, testified that parking on Branch Street is a significant concern. She stated that the existing residence contains three bedrooms and expressed concern that the addition of an ADU would increase the number of occupants beyond what the property could reasonably accommodate for off-street parking.

Ms. Kirby further testified that the applicant and individuals renting the property have, at times, used the adjacent driveway for parking. She stated that the property is frequently occupied by multiple renters, resulting in vehicles being moved throughout the day, with additional vehicles often parked on the street due to limited onsite parking availability.

There were no board questions for Ms. Kirby.

Steven Gee was present and sworn in.

Mr. Gee clarifies that the reason for the garage is to have more parking and keep cars off the street. Cars that park in the driveway have to be stacked bumper to bumper not side to side.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if there is anywhere else to put parking on the lot.

Mr. Gee answers: no, when the site survey was done, the proposed plans were the best design they could come up with. The proposed garage will be 30 feet deep, which is enough for a car and also storage space.

Mr. Elia asks if there are any issues with DEM pertaining to the septic system.

Mr. Gee states no, because it is on the town's sewer and water.

Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Daniels is concerned about how much relief the applicant is asking for. He thinks that an ADU should not be allowed on a lot of this size (15,000 square feet) when the ordinance minimum lot size is 20,000 square feet. He concludes that the lot is too small, and the applicant is asking for too much.

Mr. Cagnetta visited the area and was shocked at the density of the neighborhood. He appreciates that the applicant wants to put in an ADU and a garage to decrease parking congestion. Mr. Cagnetta agrees with Mr. Daniels that the applicant is asking for a lot, but at the same time, because of the unique set-up of the neighborhood, an ADU with a garage under it can be justified. Ms. Kirby testified that parking was an issue and the garage would relieve some of that.

Mr. Daniels interjected that if parking is an issue, why doesn't the applicant just add a longer driveway instead of the garage and ADU.

Mr. Elia retorts that a driveway will not solve the applicants' storage issues.

Mr. MacDonald stated that he understands the applicant's need for additional storage space and the proposed ADU. However, he expressed reservations regarding the extent of the dimensional relief requested and indicated that the magnitude of the requested variance gave him pause in considering how he would vote on the motion.

Ms. Campanini, the applicant, returned to the podium.

Ms. Campanini reiterated her concerns regarding the existing parking conditions on the property. She testified that the proposed garage would provide a safe location for her vehicle and reduce the need for on-street parking. Ms. Campanini further stated that the proposed ADU is an essential component of the project, as it would provide accommodations for her during the months she resides in Rhode Island.

Ms. Hicks states that when she went out to look at the property she was concerned about lot coverage. It seemed like the applicant was proposing something too big for the backyard. She adds that she does not have a problem with the requested height variance. The house to the left of the subject's property has a chain-link fence and looks abandoned.

Mr. Gee jumped to the podium to say that he believes that the old house to the left will most likely be demolished at some point.

Mr. Gee asked Jamie Gorman, Building Official, if the applicant were to just build an ADU, would they still be within the allowed setbacks.

Mr. Gorman answers that the proposed garage is six feet off the side property line, which complies with the town ordinance.

Mr. Cagnetta adds that the ADU still would not be allowed because the applicant's lot is less than the required 20,000 square feet.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion was made by Ms. Hicks and duly seconded by Mr. Elia.**

**Motion passed: (3-2 Vote in favor)**

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

At a meeting held on July 15, 2026, there was a motion to approve the petition regarding Jalyn Campanini, 287 Woodruff Avenue, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to construct a detached garage with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) located on the 2nd story. The proposed building will measure 25'6" in height. The maximum accessory building height is 15, therefore, 10'6" of relief is requested. The lot area is 14,905 sq. ft., whereas 20,000 sq. ft. is required to establish an ADU. Relief of 5,095 sq. ft. is requested. **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 Jalyn Campanini for premises located at 30 Branch Street, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 49-4, Lot 32 and is zoned R10.

**The following individual spoke as a representative of the applicant:**

- Jalyn Campanini, applicant and homeowner.

**The following individual spoke in favor of the petition:**

- Steven Gee, project contractor.

**The following individual spoke in opposition to the petition:**

- Elizabeth Kirby, a direct abutter to the applicant.

**The following materials were entered into the record:**

- Site Plan — Proposed Conditions with Stormwater Drainage Design and Details, stamped by Jeffery K. Balch P.L.S. dated October 11, 2024 (2 pages); "Campanini ADU" — Floor Plans, Elevations, Cross-Section, Foundation Plan, and Framing Plans. Created by Ocean State Drafting and dated May 25, 2026 (A1, A2, A3, S1, and S2).
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

**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 house that exist is already on a smaller lot. The applicant is looking to build an ADU for her to live in with parking garage space below to relieve some stress of parking on Branch Street.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because of the small size of the lot, the applicant is looking for additional housing and parking.
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 and size of the ADU is not out of character compared to other structures in 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 without an ADU, the applicant cannot live on the property that she owns, since the main house is currently being rented to one or more people.

**Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:**

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

---

Mr. Cagnetta called for the next petition.

- V. **Petition ZBR-26-23: GSC Construction Co.**, 601 Sand Trail Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to demolish a 320 sq. ft. garage and construct a new 650 sq. ft. attached garage in the same location. The garage will be located 20'8" from the front property line, 10'5" from the side property line, and 29' from the rear property line. The required front/rear and side yard setbacks are 33' and 14', respectively. Relief of 12'4", 3'7", and 4' is requested. Lot size is .43 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 205 (Single Nonconforming Lots) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief)**. Owners of the property are David & Deborah Bannon for premises located at 36 Edwards Avenue, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 35-4, Lot 13

and zoned R20.

36 Edwards Avenue - Application

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

David and Deborah Bannon, the applicants, and Michael Kinne, project architectural designer, were present and sworn in.

Ms. Bannon begins by explaining that the existing single-car garage on the property is too small for their vehicles. The Bannon's would like to demolish the existing 320 sq. ft. garage and construct a new 650 sq. ft. two-car garage with added storage.

Mr. Kinne then described the design of the proposed garage while referencing the design plans. Mr. Kinne pointed out that the proposed garage was designed to keep the existing view of the water intact for anyone who is walking down the adjacent road. The proposed width of the new garage will be 25.4 feet while the existing garage is 16.3 feet wide.

Mr. Cagnetta asked the applicants if they had spoken with neighbors about the project.

Ms. Bannon proudly points out that her neighbor is present in the audience tonight.

Ms. Hicks asks about the age of the house and the existing garage.

Ms. Bannon states that the garage never had siding put on to it because they had always planned to eventually tear it down.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if the proposed garage could be built on the opposite side of the house.

The applicants say that it can not be moved to the other side because that is the waterfront and there is currently a patio located there.

There were no further board questions.

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

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Board discussion ensued.

Ms. Hicks asks if any CRMC approvals are required for the project since it is so close to the water.

Mr. Gorman answers that CRMC approval is needed if any work is done within 200 feet of coastal features. The proposed garage looks to be just beyond CRMC's 200-foot jurisdiction.

Ms. Goins, special legal counsel, added that if CRMC jurisdiction does apply to this project, then the applicants may have to come back in front of the zoning board. But for right now, the board can grant the application with the issue of CRMC not being fully resolved.

Mr. Cagnetta remarks that, according to the dimensions of the plot, the proposed garage will be 206.2 ft from coastal features.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion 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 July 15, 2026, there was a motion to approve the petition regarding **GSC Construction Co.**, 601 Sand Trail Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to demolish a 320 sq. ft. garage and construct a new 650 sq. ft. attached garage in the same location. The garage will be located 20'8" from the front property line, 10'5" from the side property line, and 29' from the rear property line. The required front/rear and side yard setbacks are 33' and 14', respectively. Relief of 12'4", 3'7", and 4' is requested. Lot size is .43 acre. **A Dimensional Variance is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 205 (Single Nonconforming Lots) and Section 907 (Standards of Relief).** Owners of the property are David & Deborah Bannon for premises located at 36 Edwards Avenue, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 35-4, Lot 13 and zoned R20.

**The following individuals spoke as representatives of the applicant:**

- David and Deborah Bannon, applicants and homeowners.
- Michael Kinne, architectural designer.

**There was no one from the audience who wished to speak in favor of the petition.**

**There was no one from the audience who spoke in opposition to the petition.**

**The following materials were entered into the record:**

- Proposed Site Plan, created by East Greenwich Surveyors, LLC. stamped by Kirk D. Andrews, P.L.S. and dated April 30, 2026; "Bannon Residence Garage Renovation" Packet Contains: General Notes, Plot Plan, Foundation & Floor Plans, Ceiling & Roof Plans, Proposed Elevations, Sections, Schedules, and Details, Perspectives. designed by M. Kinne Designs L.L.C. and dated August 26, 2025 (A100.1, A100.2, A101, A102, A201, A301, and A401).
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

**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 demolish the existing 320 sq. ft. garage and construct a new 650 sq. ft. garage in the same location.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because this is the first time the applicant has been 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 of the unique neighborhood that the lot is located in.
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 applicants are looking for more parking space and storage.

**Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:**

- There are no conditions upon this approval.
- The town's legal counsel advised the applicant to consult with CRMC regarding the proposed project, noting that properties located within 200 feet of coastal features require CRMC review and approval. The subject property was stated to be approximately 206 feet from the coastal features.

---

Mr. Cagnetta called for the last petition.

- VI. **Petition ZBR-26-24: William McCallig**, 3147 Tower Hill Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to legally establish a 129 sq. ft. addition previously constructed to the dwelling. The addition is located 21' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 40', therefore, relief of 19' is requested. Lot size is 2.05 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 William, Megan, & Laura McCallig for premises located at 3147 Tower Hill Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 18-3, Lot 28 and is zoned R80. [3147 Tower Hill Road - Application](#)

All the material was recognized and entered into the record.

William McCallig, the applicant, was present and sworn in.

Mr. McCallig testified that the house was constructed by his grandfather in 1962. He explained that the property contains an existing bulkhead where he observed cracking in the foundation, which allowed water to enter the home. Mr. McCallig stated that he and a friend attempted to repair the damaged area themselves without first obtaining the required permit; however, their efforts were unsuccessful. He further testified that the existing dwelling is located approximately 31 feet from the property line and that the existing bulkhead extends approximately 7 feet from the house.

Mr. Cagnetta mentions that the property is uniquely shaped.

Mr. McCallig agreed, stating that the subject property consists of approximately two acres and is long in depth. He further testified that two abutting property owners submitted letters indicating that they do not object to the requested 19 feet of dimensional relief.

Board questions ensued.

Mr. Daniels asks about the prior addition to the main dwelling.

Mr. McCallig replies that the addition was done years ago. He explains that at one time there was a large pine tree behind the house that fell. When the tree fell, it cracked the home's foundation. Mr. McCallig tried to remedy the problem by bringing in "fill dirt" to elevate the grade around the bulkhead. Unfortunately, the lip of the bulkhead was too low and water started to seep in through the cracks and into the bulkhead.

Mr. McCallig testified that, at the time he attempted the repair, he was under the stress of being a new father and was unaware that a building permit was required for work involving the bulkhead and foundation. He further testified that, after a complaint was filed with the Town regarding the unpermitted work, he immediately ceased all activities and took the necessary steps to address the violation through the proper permitting process.

Mr. Cagnetta asks about the size of the existing addition.

Mr. McCallig answers that the previous structure was 6 ft wide, 7 feet deep and 7 ft. towards the property line. The new proposed structure will be 10 ft from the property line and 12 ft wide. The increased dimensions will provide additional storage space and improve access between the kitchen, basement, and rear yard.

Mr. Cagnetta asks if there is another place Mr. McCallig could put the addition so that less of a variance is needed.

Mr. McCallig answers that at the front south-east side of the house there exists a fieldstone concrete porch. The septic tank and electrical service would also cause issues on the side of the house.

There were no further board questions.

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

There was no one in the audience to respond.

Mr. Cagnetta concluded the board's discussion by stating that he had visited the subject property and, in his opinion, the proposed expansion would not have a significant impact on any of the adjacent property owners. He further noted that there is ample existing vegetation providing screening between the properties.

There was no further board discussion.

Whereas the following motion was made.

**The motion is as follows:**

**The following motion was made by Mr. Daniels and duly seconded by Mr. MacDonald.**

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

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

At a meeting held on July 15, 2026, there was a motion to approve the petition regarding **William McCallig**, 3147 Tower Hill Road, Wakefield, RI 02879, requests a Dimensional Variance under the Zoning Ordinance as follows: The applicant is seeking to legally establish a 129 sq. ft. addition previously constructed to the dwelling. The addition is located 21' from the side property line. The required side yard setback is 40', therefore, relief of 19' is requested. Lot size is 2.05 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 William, Megan, & Laura McCallig for premises located at 3147 Tower Hill Road, South Kingstown, Assessor's Map 18-3, Lot 28 and is zoned R80.

**The following individual spoke as a representative of the applicant:**

- William McCallig, the applicant and homeowner.

**There was no one in the audience who wished to speak in favor of the petition.**

**There was no one in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the petition.**

**The following materials were entered into the record:**

- The "Existing Conditions Survey Site Plan" was designed by Atlas Land Surveying, LLC. stamped by Marcus Channell P.L.S. dated May 2026; Abutters Letter of Support #1, signed by Helen Maguire and dated July 1, 2026; Abutters Letter of Support #2, signed by Steven Cournoyer and dated July 8, 2026.
- 200' Abutter's List and Radius Map; Legal Notices; and Notarized Affidavit of Mailing.

### **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 house on the property is already set within the setbacks due to its age and water damage has become an ongoing issue.
2. The Board finds that the hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant, because the applicant testified that the work was originally undertaken without a permit to address maintenance issues resulting from water damage. Upon receiving a Notice of Violation for the unpermitted work, the applicant immediately ceased all construction activities and subsequently sought the appropriate permits to properly address the maintenance issues in accordance with applicable regulations.
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 this is considered a minor variance and two of the direct abutters have signed letters stating that they do not oppose this petition.
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 applicant is proposing a small addition to protect the integrity of the main dwelling from water damage.

### **Approval is conditional subject to the following conditions:**

- There are no conditions upon this approval.

---

### **D. Other Items**

#### **I. Attendance for the August 19, 2026, Zoning Board of Review Meeting**

All of tonight's Zoning Board Members will be attending the August 19, 2026, meeting.

Mr. Rosen, member, has put in his resignation after being on the Zoning Board of Review for the past seven years.

Amy Goins, Special Legal Counsel, will not be in attendance during the August 19th Zoning Board of Review meeting. Attorney Michael Ursillo, Town Solicitor, will be attending in her place.

#### **II. Approval of the June 17, 2026, Zoning Board of Review Minutes**

There was a motion to approve the Zoning Board of Review Meeting Minutes from June 17, 2026.

#### **The motion is as follows:**

**A motion to approve the June 17, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hicks and seconded by Mr. Elia.**

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

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

The June 17, 2026, 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 9:39:06 PM