Minutes of: <u>Sept. 22, 2010</u>

Date Approved: <u>Oct. 13, 2010</u>

Date Filed/Village Clerk: _____

September 22, 2010 TUCKAHOE ZONING BOARD AND BOARD OF APPEALS TUCKAHOE VILLAGE HALL – 7:30pm

Present: Kevin McBride **Acting Chairperson**

> Member John Santos Nicolas DiSalvo Member David Kubaska Member

Gloria Rosell Absent: Member

> Philip Allison Member John Palladino Member

Also in Attendance:

John Cavallaro Village Attorney Bill Williams **Building Inspector**

Acting Chairman McBride announced the agenda as follows:

Item #1 Approval of Minutes of the June 9, 2010 meeting. Item #2 24 Oak Ave. **Area Variance** Item #3 1 Midland Ave. Adjourned Item #4 85 Yonkers Ave. Adjourned Item #5 138-140 Columbus Ave. Adjourned

Acting Chairman McBride introduced two new members to the Board. He welcomed Member DiSalvo and Member Kubaska. He also offered his prayers for the health and speedy recovery of two long time members of the Board, Member Rosell and Member Allison.

Acting Chairman McBride stated that the members that were present for the June 9, 2010 meeting are not present, so therefore, the approval of the June 9, 2010 minutes will be held over until next month's meeting.

Area Variance Item #2 24 Oak Ave.

Acting Chairperson McBride summarized the variances requested with this application. Lot area and width area variance, side yard variance, rear yard variance, FAR, nonconformity use.

Page 1 of 2 Sept 22, 2010

Gregory Colbert, owner, noted that he was a resident of Tuckahoe for 12 years. The house is a Victorian style built in the 1920s. He would like to raise a family in this house, but needs to improve the living space and update the home.

Michael Picciello, architect, noted that the existing home had very small rooms. To keep with the character of the house, a rear extension was proposed. He stated that he kept the addition to a minimum so the applicant could still have a rear yard. There is no possible alternative to increase the dwelling area without impacting the side yard and rear yard. There is no neighbor in the rear and there is an existing large retaining wall. There will be no view of the extension from the street.

Acting Chairman McBride asked if the roofline would stay the same. Mr. Picciello said yes.

Acting Chairman McBride asked about the parking plans.

Mr. Picciello noted that the existing property has no driveway and no parking. The idea was researched to take down the stonewall, but after consulting with an engineer, it was determined that not only would it be a major financial burden, but also would require major excavation.

Acting Chairman McBride voiced his concern regarding the parking. The increase in the percent of the FAR without parking spaces would be difficult to approve.

Mr. Picciello stated that there is not a flat piece of property at this site. There is a steep grade and a 7-8ft. retaining wall. If a parking spot could be squeezed there, one would be there by now.

Acting Chairman McBride asked if the FAR could be reduced.

Mr. Picciello stated that if the FAR could be reduced, it still would not affect the site. There still would not be any space for a parking space. This is a very difficult site with many challenges.

Mr. Picciello stated that even if a parking space could be provided, that would require the Village creating a curb cut, which, by creating a cub cut the Village, would lose a parking space on the street. There is a serious parking issue and to take a space off the street just to make a space on the site would not be wise.

Bill Williams, Building Inspector, stated that the Village Board of Trustees grants permits for curb cuts. He stated that the Village may not grant a permit in this case to disturb two street parking spaces to get one off street parking space.

Member Santos motioned to open the public meeting, seconded by Member DiSalvo and carried by the Board with a vote of 4 -0.

No Public Comments

Acting Chairman McBride motioned to keep the public hearing open, seconded by Member Santos and carried by the Board with a vote of 4 -0.

There being no further comments from the public or business before the Board, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Sept 22, 2010 Page 2 of 2