

Members Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins	<i>Chairperson</i>
T. Robins Brown	
Mary Mathews	
Toma Holley	
Paul Curley	<i>Alternate (voting member)</i>
Lisa Buckley	<i>Alternate (observing member)</i>

Absent:

Maggie McManus

Donald Yacopino *Building Inspector*

The Minutes of the March 16, 2011, Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting have been approved by two members.

1. 14 Central Avenue. Michael Printz. Application for a front porch.

This addition of a front porch requires a variance for a front yard encroachment.

Members recommended that the applicant not extend the current roof line forward as proposed. The proposed roof makes the house imposing and further forward in the street line than other properties. The board suggested that a more typical shed roof porch be considered. This would minimize the impact of the required variance. Members also suggested that the entry steps stay aligned with the porch perimeter and not be pulled forward. The applicant will consider Board comments and return for review. The application remains open.

2. 142 Fifth Avenue. Matt Burke. Application to amend previously approved plans.

The proposal complies with zoning requirements. Members agreed that the proposed extension of the gable roof to enclose the north top floor terrace was acceptable. The proposed roof and siding is preferable to the notched parapet wall. The applicant noted that the materials will match existing. The applicant needs to note materials and dimensions of the roof overhang and submit to the DOB for record. The Board requested additional information regarding the windows on the east elevation. The applicant needs to show enough of the east elevation with dimensions to understand the alignments and sizes of the existing and proposed windows. The applicant has agreed to hold that portion of the application open and will resubmit drawings.

No public comment. Motion to close the application regarding the roof extension only, made by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Brown,

approved by a vote of 5-0. Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the roof extension, approved by a vote of 5-0.

The application for the window alterations on the east elevation remains open.

- 3. 29 Dickson Avenue. Donald Hammond. Application to amend previously approved plans.** The proposal complies with zoning requirements. No public comment. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Mathews to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 5-0. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the application as submitted. Approved by a vote of 5-0.
- 4. 65 Main Street. "Baumgarts Cafe". Application for a perpendicular and a ground-floor window sign.** The perpendicular signs on the north and east facades have been omitted. The proposal is for a perpendicular sign and a transom sign on the north façade. The proposal complies with zoning requirements. The Board requested that a scaled drawing of the north elevation be submitted for review. The drawing should indicate the location of the proposed perpendicular sign with dimensions. There was concern about obstruction of the view corridor down Main Street. Also, the applicant noted that the signage proposed over the entry door is a different size than what is shown on the drawings. The Board asked that the drawings show the correct size in scale on the front elevation. The Board requested that the Building Inspector check compliance as the building is not being built to comply with the approved drawings. The light fixtures and the elements on the front façade do not comply with what was approved by the Board. The application remains open, and the applicant will return for further review.
- 5. 65 South Broadway. Dorit Kramer for "Art Cafe of Nyack". Application to install six (6) awnings, one to include a logo to match the existing logo on the awning facing Broadway.** The proposal complies with zoning requirements. There was majority consensus by members of the Board that the awnings on the south side of the building were redundant to the shutters and were inappropriate for the architecture. Member Brown had objections to obstructing the existing bay on the front of the building with awnings, stating that the clarity of the architecture and nice details would not be seen. No public comment. Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holley to close the public portion. Approved by a vote of 5-0. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the application with the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:

 1. The front awnings are approved as presented;

2. The awnings on the south side of the building are to be omitted;
3. The Board requested that the applicant be cognizant of the potential color difference between the new awnings on the front façade and the existing Art Cafe sign on the left side, and that if there is a distinct color difference, that the existing signage be replaced or the color be matched closely.

Approved by a vote of 4-1, with Member Brown voting negatively.

6. 150 Main Street. "Small Frys". The applicant failed to appear.

7. 77 South Broadway. Maria Luisa. Application to install a unique flower shape design ornamentation above the door. The proposal complies with zoning requirements.

No public comment. Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Holley to close the public portion. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Holley to approve the application as presented. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

8. 96 Sixth Avenue. Greg Miller. Application for the construction of a single family dwelling.

The lot requires numerous variances for the size of the lot, the width of the lot, and for the front yard setback, as outlined in the Building Inspector's report. Letters were submitted by adjacent neighbors: 1. Marc Comito at 87 Sixth Avenue, questioning whether or not this needs to be considered a three-story building because of the major exposure of the basement level. His letter articulates his calculations for dimensional compliance and he requested that the Building Inspector do another evaluation based on his concerns.

2. Laurie Steinhorst at 98 Sixth Avenue, who writes that they are concerned about their property value being diminished due to the obstruction of river views, and feels that the house will have a major impact. She also stated that the house is extremely vertical with a long staircase and not in character with the neighborhood.

Further public comment from: Laurie Steinhorst who felt that she heard a whole series of comments about why things can't be done on the house and suggested then that perhaps the house should not be built. She was highly concerned about the impact on her property values, the views; the verticality of the house would diminish her property values greatly. Mr. Comito further stated that perhaps one idea would be to delete the basement so that the house could be set further down into the hillside because the height is obstructive; it is much too high above ground. He stated that he also heard a number of "can't do's" by the applicant that indicates a substandard property. He asked that the applicants should consider whether the lot is suitable for building.

Paul Shein and Susan Hendricks of 55 Tallman felt that proportionally the house does not fit in with the neighborhood, and stated that they also heard

the applicants saying a lot of can'ts in their proposal, what they couldn't do, and that is an indication that the house should not be built.

Majority consensus by Board members: the house was too vertical for the site, that the style of the house was appropriate to the Village of Nyack but that it was inappropriate to this particular site. Having a car port with parking in the front was atypical to the Village. The house to the east is a cottage-style house that is nestled down into the hillside and the more vertical Victorians are much further down the block, having less impact on the height of the hill. The house to the west has a Dutch gable with dormers so that the second story looks like a roof, and it has less vertical element. Low roof type houses flanking this house on two sides rendered this proposal inappropriate. Members felt that this would feel like a vertical tower.

The Board also stated that the staircase in the front was too wide, too long, too imposing, not countrified enough, and that it needed to weave it's way through the landscape as the other houses on the streetscape do.

After lengthy discussion and many concerns regarding required variances, size, scale, verticality, height, parking in the front of the house, the applicant has decided to hold the application open, take Board comments into consideration, and decide whether or not he wants to proceed with this proposal.

Let the record show the meeting ended at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Kuster-Collins
Chairperson