

**CITY OF NEW ROCHELLE  
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT  
BOARD OF APPEALS ON ZONING AGENDA**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** pursuant to Chapter 331, Article XI, Section 74, of the Zoning Chapter of the New Rochelle Code, that a Regular Meeting will be held by the Board of Appeals on Zoning, in Meeting Room, B-1, City Hall, 90 Beaufort Place, New Rochelle, New York on **Wednesday evening, November 7, 2012 at 7:00pm** for the adjourned cases and new cases regarding the following applications:

ADJOURNED CASES

**CASE #36-2012 JOHANNA GIACOBBE**, for permission to modify the existing use of the facility from a nursery school to a day care; whereas it is proposed to change from one non-conforming use to another non-conforming use (convert from nursery school to daycare center); whereas proposed day care center requires a special permit in an R1-WF-10 Zoned District, at the premises **555 Davenport Avenue, Block 160, Lot 205 [area variance/special permit]**  
**WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

CASE #38-2012 COLLEEN O'SULLIVAN, for permission for a one-story addition (study) in rear of one-family house. Second story addition (master bedroom & bath) in rear over family room. Minor interior alteration; whereas proposed FAR calculation of .47 is greater than the .35 allowed in an R1-7.5 Zoned District, at the premises **55 Woodlawn Avenue, Block 1120, Lot 29 [area variance]**

**CASE #44-2012 294 UNION AVENUE REALTY LLC**, for permission to change use from iron work shop to contractor's business (proposed) and storefront fabricator (existing to be legalized); whereas the proposed use as a contractor's business with indoor truck parking is a change of the existing non-conforming use to another non-conforming use which may be permitted upon approval by the Board of Appeals on Zoning, based upon a finding that the proposed use is more consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood and having less adverse impact. In permitting such use, the Board may impose such conditions and safeguards as it may deem necessary or appropriate; whereas the legalization of the use as storefront fabrication is a change of the existing non-conforming use to another non-conforming use which may be permitted upon approval from the Board of Appeals on Zoning, based upon a finding that the proposed use is more consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood and having less adverse impact; whereas the hours of operation are proposed to be 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. from Monday to Saturday which change condition #1 of previously approved BAZ resolution #27-1984, dated 4/24/84, which limits the hours of operation between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday excluding Sundays and holidays in an RMF-0.5 Zoned District, at the premises **294 Union Avenue, Block 1287, Lot 13 [change of non-conforming]**

**ADJOURNED**

**CASE #45-2012 YOLANDA REILLY**, for permission to add a one story addition at rear and new powder room on first floor \*(Legalize Existing)\*; whereas the proposed side yard setback of 2.7' is less than the 6' required for the rear addition; whereas the proposed building coverage of 31% is greater than the 30% allowed; whereas the proposed impervious surface coverage of 71% is greater than the 60% allowed; whereas the proposed 0 clearance side yard setback is less than the 6' required for the concrete patio in an RMF-0.4 Zoned District, at the premises **18 Woodbury Street, Block 507, Lot 73 [area variance]**

NEW CASES

**CASE #41-2012 JEFFREY HALAAS**, for permission to finish an existing basement \*(Legalize Existing)\*; whereas the proposed FAR of 0.394 exceeds the permitted FAR of 0.35 required in an R1-10A Zoned District, at the premises **126 Plymouth Drive, Block 3311, Lot 44 [area variance]**

**ADJOURNED BY APPLICANT**

**CASE #42-2012 MICHAEL DONNADIO**, for permission to construct an addition to existing building and construction of a new canopy for existing car wash facility; whereas the proposed rear yard setbacks of 26' at building addition and 0' at canopy is less than the minimum required 30' rear yard setback where the property is adjacent to a residence district; whereas proposed 0' landscaped buffer to a residence district along the rear property line is less than the 15' minimum required; whereas the proposed 0' screening buffer to rear property line is less than the 10' minimum required; whereas the washing facilities must be enclosed within a building that meets all yard setback requirements of the district in which it is located. The enlarged building in which the washing facilities are enclosed do not meet the minimum setback requirements in an C-1M Zoned District, at the premises **100 Main Street, Block 55, Lot 40 [area variance]**

**ADJOURNED BY APPLICANT**

**CASE #43-2012 ABRAHAM M. DIAZ**, for permission to finish basement for storage \*(Legalize Existing)\*; whereas the proposed FAR calculation of .83 is greater than the .40 allowed in an RMF-0.4 Zoned District, at the premises **53 Walnut Street, Block 1227, Lot 16 [area variance]**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM: Discuss BAZ packages and how to cut back on paper.

RICHARD A. SOSIS, CHAIRMAN  
BOARD OF APPEALS ON ZONING