

**Present:**

Eileen Kuster-Collins *Chairperson*  
Maggie McManus *Member*  
Mary Mathews *Member*  
Toma Holley *Member*  
Lisa Buckley *Alternate Member*  
Donald Yacopino *Chief Building Inspector*

**Application 1: 83 Main Street. Palmieri Wines & Spirits.** Application for one perpendicular and two ground floor window signs.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application dated 7/5/17;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

Members find the sign to be appropriate in design.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 signs are appropriate for the building, and are compatible with nearby buildings.
3. On a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 2: 174 Main Street. Riverfront Personal Training Company.** Application for one parallel sign and one freestanding sign to replace existing signage.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application dated 6/29/17;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant and architect;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The applicant noted the parallel sign will be in the same location as the existing sign.
2. Members noted the proportions of the sign on the freestanding sign post are more appropriate in design than the typeface presented for the parallel sign. The graphics on the parallel sign are all caps, all in a large font. Members noted this makes the sign less legible and is overbearing in scale on the building. The board requested the parallel sign letters reading "Rivertowns" and "Company" be reduced in size to be more consistent with the freestanding signage typeface, and to be a more appropriate scale. The space between "Personal Training" and the other wording

will be increased in dimension. The applicant stated that using lower case lettering is not representative of the company's graphics so all letters will remain in caps.

3. The applicant noted the sign background will be matte. The board requested the letters also be matte or satin finish.
4. The above requested revisions will be submitted for review by two members in the interim.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 with the conditions noted in Findings 1 to 4, the design, materials and placement of the proposed signs are appropriate for the building, and are compatible with nearby buildings.
3. On a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Buckley, the board finds that the application be approved.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 3: 79 Main Street. St. Kier Levesque or Giordano.** Continuation of application for exterior modifications.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and drawing dated 7/5/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant's architect;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

The board discussed the revised proposal, again noting the importance of this cornerstone building, and made the following comments:

1. The proposed window elevation on Main St. is more successful than the window elevation on Broadway. The windows follow the symmetry of the upper story on Main. On the Broadway elevation, the windows have no relationship to any rhythms, symmetry or divisions above and the effect appears out of character.
2. The proposed panels in the parapet relate to the proposed windows in the Main St. elevation but the panels are dissimilar to the windows on the Broadway elevation. The effect is disjointed. The window configuration on Broadway needs to be revised. Members suggested the double columns be transferred down from the upper story and the glass configuration be symmetrical to the window above on the second story. The glass framing needs to be substantial enough to carry the visual weight of the second story masonry.
3. The door heights need to relate to the adjacent window heights. The scale of the proposed doors appears dwarfed by the architecture. The board noted the quality of door material and hardware is critical to the success of the design.

4. The door configuration on Main St. is not appropriate. The door is offset in an opening that is in alignment with the second story bay above. The door should either be centered as a single door or be a centered double door.

The doors on Broadway need to be spaced closer together to visually read as a set of double doors. The architect indicated there is a wall separating the doors. The board noted that even with a separating wall, the doors need to be closer spaced. The spacing as shown between the doors is too similar in dimension to the column widths. It is visually confusing as it reads as a

column below the upper story window. This is not consistent with the architecture of the building.

5. Member Collins recommended the cornice above the windows be a continuous band with straight molding to carry the weight of the upper story. A photo of a Boston renovated building (375 Newbury St.) was referenced. Member Buckley recommended the molded panels are appropriate provided they relate to the window configurations. The panels should be inset framed panels as opposed to applied molding. Applied molding is not a substantial enough detail for the heavy detail of the building.
6. The board agreed the existing stucco material as a substitute for masonry is inappropriate to the character of village architecture. It was noted that the board has been consistent in requiring stucco surfaces be revised to a more appropriate material. Masonry is recommended. Synthetic limestone was suggested as a possible material.
7. Members objected to the proposed curved awnings. A majority of members felt the awnings should be omitted. The entry doors are inset so user protection is inherent in the design. Member Buckley noted that if awnings are required, they should be rectangular shed style awnings.

**Conclusions:**

1. The architect will consider board comments and return for further review.
2. Having no comment by the public, public hearing remains open for further review.

**Application 4. 34 Dickinson Avenue. John Riveaux.** Application to change garage doors.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning regulations.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application dated 7/14/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The applicant noted the doors will be fiberglass with glass inserts.
2. The board noted the doors are in the rear of the house and are not visible from the street.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Buckley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 notes stated in Findings 1 and 2, the proposed renovation is in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
3. On a motion by Member Holley seconded by Member McManus, the board finds that the application be approved.  
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 5. 8 South Broadway.** Rich DeDeo for Dunnigan , Brand & DeDeo, LLC. Application for alterations to front façade at ground level.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and drawings dated 6/30/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant's architect Amy Nowak;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;

5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board finds the proposal to be appropriate in design.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing is closed on a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 the proposed renovation is in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
3. On a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved.  
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 6: 49 Route 59. Chase Bank.** Application for construction of new bank building, subdivision and special permit for the merger of two lots and a special permit for the drive-thru facility.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal for building construction complies with zoning requirements.

Variances are required for accessory structure height; for lighting levels exceeding maximums; for parallel signs not facing a street. Inspector notes the detail of the blue tint lighting on north elevation is required.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and revised drawings dated 7/17/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicants;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board reviewed the elevations and find the revisions to the building appropriate in design.
2. Board requested the EIF material at the top of the elevations be scored to suggest stone work as opposed to stucco.
3. The board reviewed the signage and requested the following:
  - A. The blue wash on the canopy is to be omitted. The lighting in general is in excess and the blue wash is not in character with the appearance of the village.
  - B. The small sign over the door on the south elevation is to be omitted. It is a redundant sign and there is a large quantity of signage on the site.
  - C. The board had no objection to the balance of signage.
4. The requested revisions will be documented and submitted for record.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing is closed on a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 notes stated in Findings 1,2 and 4, the proposed construction is in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
3. 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 with the conditions noted in Findings 3A-C and Finding 4, the design, materials and placement of the proposed signs are appropriate for the building, and are compatible with nearby buildings.
4. On a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Mathews, with a positive recommendation to the ZBA for the required variances, the board finds that the application be approved.

**Application 7: 249-259 Main Street. Bob Silarski for JED Realty.** Preliminary application to demolish existing buildings and construct a multifamily building, subdivision and special permit for the merger of two lots. Request for recommendation to ZBA for area variance for driveway access from residential zoning district.

**Inspector Review:**

Applicant appears with a preliminary application seeking comments on building design and proposed materials.

A more complete site plan is being developed for the Planning Board. Variance sought for a four-story building where three stories are permitted.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and drawings dated 6/30/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. Testimony from the public: Letter from Patricia Patterson in support of the project.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board discussed the requested demolition of two existing houses. Although the board does not advocate demolition, the board understands the face of Main Street is changing to more consistent street-line multifamily development. This proposal is consistent with the changes occurring.
2. The board discussed the visual impact of proposing four stories within the height restriction of an allowable three-story building. The architect stated the four stories compliant in height, but not in allowable stories would render a smaller scaled building with three stories at the Main Street line and a four-story rear section with greater setback from Depew. This is build-able because of modular type construction and the heights inherent to it.  
Members agreed this is visually preferable to a much larger three-story/closer to Depew building that would be proposed to be compliant with the three-story restriction. The overall scale of the proposed structure was considered by the board as more appropriate in scale than a substantially larger, compliant building.
3. The architectural elements were discussed. Members agreed the overall concept of a more contemporary building utilizing modern materials is appropriate in design.
4. Members expressed concern about the composition of the elements in the elevations. Members felt the composition to be excessively utilitarian in appearance. The architect noted that Nyack has industrial loft like buildings and the board felt these elevations do not successfully reference those types of buildings.
5. The architect presented photos of projects utilizing the proposed materials and members felt the building elements in the photos to be more appropriate than those proposed. Members felt the rhythm, flatness, repetition of spacing, lack of diverse treatment of elements, to be problematic in the proposed drawings. The photos referenced by the architect show multiple reliefs, thicknesses of framing, mullion formations, and diverse spacing of elements in one elevation. The board felt this lent a complexity to the building that provides visual interest. The board suggested the proposed design consider some of these elements.  
The repetition of two over two windows directly adjacent to a single unit repeated across the elevation and with consistent spacing between, renders a monotonous façade.
6. Member Buckley suggested the design could be pushed to be more contemporary in design and members agreed- with the condition that quality of design and detail is critical to contemporary designed building.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no further comment by the public, public hearing remains open for further review.

2. The architect will consider board comments. As this is a preliminary review, the application remains open and continues for further review.

**Application 8: 11 Prospect Street. Marc Comito for Comito Homes, LLC.** Application to amend a previous approval by constructing a rear yard, second floor balcony.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application dated 7/11/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board finds the proposal to be appropriate in design.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Buckley seconded by Member Mathews, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 the proposed renovation is in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
3. On a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved.  
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 9: 11 Burd Street. Degenshein for Bartaco.** Application to amend previously approved plans.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and site plan dated 7/26/17;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board finds the proposal to be appropriate in design.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 5-0.
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 the proposed renovation is in harmony with and compatible with the existing design and architecture of the Village.
3. On a motion by Member McManus seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved.  
Approved by a vote of 5-0.

**Application 10: 55 Gedney Street. TZ Vista.** Continuation of Site Plan application for the construction of three multilevel, multifamily buildings.

**Building Inspector Review:**

Proposal complies with zoning requirements.

**Board Review Based Upon:**

1. The application and drawings itemized below;
2. Inspector review;
3. Testimony of applicant;
4. ARB member's knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. No testimony from the public.
7. Member Buckley recused herself from the hearing.

**Board Findings:**

1. The board has been charged with analyzing if the proposal achieves the design guidelines outlined in 360-2.5B(2)(c)[6] of the WF Zoning code. The board reviewed each element of the guideline.

Review based on:

Drawings TS-001 through PH-2 dated 6/27/17;

Renderings "View 1" through "Lydecker Street View" dated 6/28/17;

Video rendering presented by the applicant at the meeting;

The Architectural Review Board finds the following regarding the proposal achieving the requirements of the guideline:

[a] *Gedney Street*

- [6] [a] i A;  
ii A, B;  
iii B, D, E

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [a] iii Building facades and massing.

- iii A and C

Items are not fully achieved within the proposal. The intent of the guideline is to encourage use of materials, appropriate scale, and architectural treatments that are in harmony with the architecture of the village and the adjacent architecture.

The board notes that the applicant has been successful in treating the lower two-story brick clad elements of the façade successfully but has been less successful in the treatment of the upper levels. The scale of the penthouse elements including surface treatments, large scale timbers, use of a heavy pergola at the top level, scale of panels, light coloration of the upper stories, scale of railings, scale of window divisions - do not successfully achieve the request to make that portion of the façade less dominant than the lower stories. The board has noted the importance of acknowledging the scale of the adjacent dwellings in the area and minimizing the visual imposition of the height and presence of the upper stories. This has not been fully achieved.

[b] *Main Street*

- [6] [b] i A, B;  
ii A, B, E;  
iii A, C, E

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [b] ii Landscape Treatment

ii C, D - *Landscaped areas should ... create a gateway. The entrance to the pedestrian access to the riverfront should be defined to clearly communicate the public nature of the pedestrian path. The entrance may include a landscape feature such as a gate, trellis, and/or a small seating area.*

This item has not been achieved within the proposal. The design does not clearly identify that the site is welcome to the public. It is not clearly identified as a gateway to the public. The board opined that the elements proposed for the Main St. approach are not successful in clearly identifying this.

[6] [b] iii Building facades and massing.

iii A, C, E

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [b] iii B, D

Items are not fully achieved within the proposal. The intent of the guideline is to encourage use of materials, appropriate scale, and architectural treatments that are in harmony with the architecture of the village and the adjacent architecture.

The board notes that like the Gedney Street elevations, the proposal successfully addresses the scale of the street level facades but is less successful on the upper levels. The use of dominant cantilevered corniced balconies, heavy pergolas, light coloration, tall scale window divisions, large timber scaled casing, do not achieve a scale that minimizes the impact of the upper stories and allows the building to be in keeping with the character of the area.

[c] *Waterfront*

[6] [c] i A, B

ii A

iii C,

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [c] iii Landscape Treatment

iii A,B - *The entrance to the pedestrian access to the riverfront should be defined to clearly communicate the public nature of the pedestrian path. Access path .... Establish an implied transition between the public right of way and adjacent dwelling units...*

Items are not fully achieved within the proposal. Entrance to the pedestrian access does not define the public nature of the pedestrian path. Gedney Street does not have any indication of the public nature of the paths. Delineation between public and private space is not adequately detailed.

[6] [c] iv A, C, F

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [c] iv Building Facades and Massing

iv A, C, F

Items are achieved within the proposal.

[6] [c] iv Building Facades and Massing

iv B, D, E

Items are not fully achieved within the proposal. The intent of the guideline is to encourage use of materials, appropriate scale, and architectural treatments that are in harmony with the architecture of the village and the adjacent architecture.

The board notes that like the Gedney Street elevations, the proposal successfully addresses the scale of the street level facades but is less successful on the upper levels. The use of dominant cantilevered corniced balconies, heavy pergolas, light coloration, tall scale window



Regular Meeting  
Architectural Review Board  
Hall, Nyack NY

July 26, 2017  
Nyack Village

divisions, large timber scaled casing, do not achieve a scale that minimizes the impact of the upper stories and allows the building to be in keeping with the character of the area.

**Conclusions:**

1. Having no comment by the public, public hearing remains open for further comment.
2. Applicants have agreed to consider board comments and will return for further review.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 pm.

---

Eileen Kuster-Collins, Chairperson