

Members Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins	<i>Chairperson</i>
Maggie McManus	
Mary Mathews	
Paul Curley	<i>Alternate Voting Member</i>
Lisa Buckley	<i>Alternate Voting Member</i>
Paul Rozsypal	<i>Assistant Building Inspector</i>

Absent:

Toma Holley	
T. Robins Brown	
Donald Yacopino	<i>Building Inspector</i>

The Minutes of the July 17, 2012 Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting were approved.

-
- NOTE: An interim review of Luminesque on Main Street has been “approved as submitted” by Members Buckley and Curley.

1. 41 Route 59. State Farm Insurance. Application for four signs. The signs proposed are code compliant.

No public comment. Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Buckley to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 4-0.

The proposed signs are installing into existing sign boxes. The signs are consistent with other signage at the site.

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Buckley to approve the application as presented. Approved by a vote of a 4-0.

Note: Member Mathews arrived at 7:50.

2. 120 North Broadway. Steve Collazuol, owner, together with architect, Barry Terach. Site plan application for a side yard and rear yard addition to an existing building. The application complies with the VON Zoning ordinance.

No public comment. Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Buckley to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 5-0.

Motion by Member Buckley, seconded by Member Curley to approve the application as submitted with the following condition as agreed to by the applicants:

1. The slope of the western roof on the south facing gable end is to be altered to match the slope of the eastern roof on that same gable. The proposed roof line deviates from all other symmetrically gabled roofs on the structure. This condition met with Board opposition. The applicant has agreed to change the angle.

A revised drawing must be submitted to the Buildings Department for record.
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

3. 28 Second Avenue. Lars Jacobsen for Patricia Ann Homes. Renovations to existing dwelling to include new deck and a 7 foot extension on the second floor rear. The proposal is non-compliant and requires a variance.

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

Based on Board comments from prior meetings, the applicants have revised the drawings to reflect the following:

1. The rear elevation has been revised indicating that the column supporting the rear porch has been relocated to the corner;
2. On the front elevation, two awning-style windows on the left and right have been incorporated into the upper story;
3. The applicant has indicated that the siding will be fiber cement, color to be determined;
4. The railing is per the submitted specification.

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Buckley to approve the application as presented including the above notations.

This motion carries a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the required variances. The Board had no objections to the proposal noting most of the required variances were due to pre-existing non-conformance. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

4. 33 Route 59. Antonio Alfonso for Affordable Auto Clinic, Inc., presented by Benoj David. Application to replace lettering on existing sign. The proposal complies with the zoning code.

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

Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Curley to approve the application as presented with the following condition: The proposed sign is a modification

of an existing sign face. The applicant has agreed to insure that the sign is altered in a manner reflecting "good quality" crafting and materials. The prior alteration of the sign, authorized by the same applicant, was of unacceptable quality to the Board.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

5. 150 Burd Street. Kier Levesque for Alex Vursta. Proposal to demolish commercial structures and construct a mixed use building with commercial and residential units on the ground floor, residential above, and underground parking.

Numerous required variances:

(a) 22 Dwelling Units where 6 are permitted

(b) FAR of 2.4 where 2 is permitted

(c) 12 DU,s of less than 600 sq. ft. where 600 sq. ft. is required

(d) rear yard setback of 5 ft where 15 ft is required.

(e) parking variance regarding number of required spaces.

Public comment from the following neighbors: Michael Connor of 159 Burd Street, who was concerned about the fresh air intake on the front of the building. He was concerned about fumes as he is directly across the street from the proposed building, and he was also concerned about any kind of mechanical sound issues that might have impact on him. He suggested that an internal shaft run upto the roof for fresh air intake.

Public comment from neighbor Liam Joyce of 163 Burd St., who was in favor of having the site developed to bring mixed use and favored an upgrade to the building. He agreed with the Board that the building was in need of much more design development; it's too monolithic, and was hoping that it could have a more lively and interesting appearance and agreed that the building should reflect its mixed uses.

Board comments and concerns as follows:

1. Concerns regarding the overall scale of the building especially considering it's adjacency to diminutively scaled residences. The surrounding commercial buildings are 2, not 3 stories.
2. Objection to the device of a curved front façade. This is not a device common to the Village and seemed deviant.
3. Concern regarding the lack of denotation between the commercial use on the ground floor versus the residential units above. The proposed building does not reflect the proposed mixed use. It's consistent façade appears monotonous.
4. Concern about the extremely long and repetitious north facing façade, that faces Main St.
5. Concern about the location of the garage entry and the fresh air intake in the front façade.

The Board recommended that the applicant find a way to reduce the visual scale of the building both in length and height, and to address the other stated concerns.

The Board requested a site visit. The Planning Board will also be notified of the date and time.

The application is being held open for further review.

6. 1 Spear Street. River Rowing Association. Site plan application for the construction of a Boat Shelter in the WF Zoning District. Site plan application for the construction of Boathouse with roofed boat racks, oar storage rack and wood framed deck to river. The Village Board has referred the application to the Land Use Boards.

Public comment from Clifford and Calvin Parker of 39 Piermont Avenue who objected to having their views blocked by a two-story structure, stating that the original proposal was for a storage facility and it now has a second story that's being used for purposes other than storage. They are long term residents who are very concerned that their view will be compromised.

Comment from James Dress at 3 Main Street, the Clermont Building, who was concerned about the building blocking views towards the tree line along

the inlet. He is opposed to the height of the proposed structure and does not understand why the Village of Nyack has a duty to provide interior rowing to a private association with impact on the taxpayers. He also expressed concern about the parking and the building taking up parking. Overall, his comment was that the building proposed is too high.

Board comments as follows:

1. The building elevations are not shown in context of the surrounding properties. The Board has requested an elevation drawing indicating the line of the terrain as it slopes behind the building including the outlines of adjacent houses and the impact of this building in terms of height on the view. The Board also requested a site visit with the presenters.
2. The Board questioned the necessity of a roof top deck that served to increase the height. Also questioned was the necessity of a second story deck as a functionality of a second floor that is proposed for indoor rowing during inclement weather.
3. The Board questioned the necessity of the proposed height of each floor of the building and its impact on the overall height.
4. There was concern regarding the building hindering access to the land on the inlet side of the building.
5. There was no objection to the proposed materials and design. Neither material nor design were discussed or reviewed in depth. The Board is awaiting investigation of the above stated concerns that may impact design.

The architect presenting for the River Rowing Association stated that he will return to this Board with the requested drawings and additional information so that the Board can better understand: how the building is sited; impact on views; sight lines; clearer drawings of the rack storage that is east of the main structure; and design details in general.

The application will remain open.

7. 20 Fifth Avenue. Andrew Gale. Site plan application for a side and rear addition. The existing house is a single family house on a corner property. An area variance is required.

Public comment: A letter was submitted by neighbor Cynthia Turner of 8 Hart Place, who stated that the elevation on Hart Place is significantly important and that she prefers that the elevation not be compromised by a required setback on the Fifth Avenue elevation.

Comment by Meryl Harris of 15 Hart Place who supports the proposal in its entirety, including the elevation facing Fifth Avenue.

Comment by Corliss Uecker of 29 Hart Place who stated that the corner existing building has always had a strange relationship to Hart Place. The front faces the school and the side faces Hart Place awkwardly. Ms. Uecker supported the proposal, stating it would give the building greater presence facing Hart Place. She was in support of the structure being flush on the front façade and was in favor of the original plan.

All felt the Hart place elevation facing them has greater significance than the front facing façade.

Board comments: Board concerns from prior meetings were addressed successfully with the exception of the front façade. The scale and verticality of the rear façade; the proportions of the rear elevation; the materials on the proposed extension were all revised to address Board concerns. There was Board consensus that the continuous extension of the front façade without a break in material was problematic. The continuation of the front facade roof line, dormer, and siding, was perceived as violating the symmetry of the façade. The Board felt the front elevation facing Fifth Ave was of major importance and the integrity of the original façade should be maintained. The front façade presents a Dutch colonial gambrel roofed symmetrical structure. The proposal violates that identification. To continue the second floor dormer without a break violates the integrity of the house; the symmetry would be lost and the scale of the front façade would be changed so drastically that it was detrimental. The Board argued strongly in favor of a setback, versus the architect and the applicant's argument that the setback created a strange reveal on the upper west facing cornice. The Board did not agree that that cornice played a major factor. They felt it was secondary to the importance of the front façade.

Considering the comments from the public, the Board felt that by setting back the front façade a minimum six inches to create the break from the original façade, there would be no detrimental impact on the elevation facing Hart Place. The proportions were not compromised, the elevation still has a presence, and the architect's argument that the small cornice reveal was too insignificant was not agreed with.

Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Buckley to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 5-0.

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Buckley to approve the application as submitted with the following condition as agreed to by the applicant: A minimum six-inch setback on the south, front façade will be maintained. The break-line setback is to be applied to the upper roof; dormer extension; and siding. It is up to the discretion of the architect and the owners to determine if the lower story roof maintains a break-line. Revised drawings are to be submitted to the Building Department in the interim for review by two members.

Also included in this motion is a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the required variances. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

8. 29 Dickinson Avenue. Donald and Ronna Hammond. The applicants did not appear.

9. 7 South Broadway. Agnet Dinger. Application to replace an existing awning. The proposal complies with zoning ordinances.

The applicant submitted a revised drawing labeled "Revised Drawing A". The revised drawing shows the "pink entourage" logo relocated to the center of the canopy; and the scalloped apron being changed to a straight apron.

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

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the application with "Revised Drawing A" as submitted.
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Let the record show the meeting ended at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Kuster-Colins
Chairperson