

**Present:**

Eileen Kuster-Collins	<i>Chairperson</i>
Toma Holley	<i>Member</i>
Mary Mathews	<i>Member</i>
Lisa Buckley	<i>Alternate Member</i>
Donald Yacopino	<i>Chief Building Inspector</i>
Walter Sevastian	<i>Legal Counsel</i>

**Application 1: 9 South Broadway. Stacy Starr and Lisa Jenner for The Quilt Tree.** Continuation of application for a perpendicular sign.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Size and location of proposed sign complies with zoning requirements. Detailed mounting specs must be supplied. Bottom of sign must be 8 ft. above sidewalk. Three ground floor window signs have been installed without approval or permit.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant Lisa Jenner;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board reviewed the proposed signage and recommends the following: 1. The sign should be mounted to align with the window frame. 2. The signage should be off-set from the cornice and the window frame (no overlap or contact). 3. The sign can be reduced in size to comply with the 8 ft. required mounting height. 4. The board has no objection to the window signage provided it is compliant per inspector review.
2. The building inspector comments regarding mounting spec compliance must be met.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Buckley, approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 360-5.13D of the Village of Nyack Code. The board concludes that the design, materials and placement of the proposed sign are appropriate for the location, and are compatible with nearby area.
3. On a motion by Member Buckley seconded by Member Holley, subject to the agreed upon conditions set forth in Findings 1 and 2, the board finds that the application be approved.  
Approved by a vote of 4-0.

**Application 2: 50 Piermont Avenue. Dominic Pilla for Nyack Library.** Application to demolish front concrete stairs and replace with wood.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application dated 10/16/15 and drawings dated 10/15/15;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of architect Adra Bubes;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;

6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board reviewed the drawing and finds them to be appropriate in design. The board recommended that the lattice screen below the stairs be framed rather than raw edged. Applicants agreed.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Buckley seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 4-0.  
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 360-5.15C of the Village of Nyack Code. The board concludes that subject to the recommendations in Finding 1, the proposed alterations are in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.

On a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Holley and subject to the conditions noted in the findings and conclusions, the board finds that the application be approved as submitted.

Approved by a vote of 4-0.

**Application 3: 400 High Ave. John Krupa for Nyack NYLO LLC.** Application for amended approval for changes made to the exterior of the building.

**Building Inspector Review:** This is an application for amended ARB approval and recommendation to the ZBA for an additional height variance for rooftop structures greater in height than previously issued variance and a change in appearance to the building. Allowed height is 35 feet; previously approved height is 51.7 ft.

A concrete retaining wall has been erected that requires review.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant John Krupa;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The retaining wall was reviewed. Applicant stated that the retaining wall is justified to screen a large generator (not on prior application drawings) from neighboring residences. Hardscape for parking is shown behind the wall facing neighbors. The board agrees the wall is preferable to screen the equipment. The applicant states the parking area is not required. The board requests the parking be omitted if not required by the Planning Board. The board requests that a green buffer be installed in that area since green area was formerly present when the area contained a freestanding residence. The neighbors are now subjected to no greenery, hardscape, a generator and dumpsters. The board notes that visually, a green buffer would be desirable. The applicant notes the wall is to be black finished concrete and the board has no objections provided the wall is a backdrop for plantings.
2. The roof mechanicals were reviewed. The mechanicals are highly visible from many points in the village. The structure to house the elevator and mechanicals is also very large scaled for the building. All board members objected to both. The board suggests that the architect for the project review the existing curved elements at the top of the entry wall and extend or implement elements to raise the curved structure to screen the elevator bulkhead. The board requests the mechanical elements above the shaft be relocated.
3. The raised parapet on the rooftop was reviewed. The applicant notes that the rear of the building differs with the previously approved drawings. The third story is not black concrete to match the rest of the building. The horizontal black bands also do not cross the center of the structure as approved. The parapet is substantially taller by approx. 8 ft. Board members object to the visual impact of all elements. Member Buckley recommends that the parapet be removed, at least in the side sections. The applicant requests a

site visit to review since the parapet is in the rear of the building. The board asks the applicant to contact the building department to request a date.

4. The applicant agrees to consider board comments.

**Conclusions:**

1. The public hearing remains open.
2. The application remains open for further review.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.

---

Eileen Kuster-Collins, Chairperson