

Members Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins *Chairperson*
Mary Mathews
Maggie McManus
T. Robins Brown
Paul Curley *Alternate Member*

Absent:

Toma Holley
Donald Yacopino *Building Inspector*

The Minutes of the June 15, 2011, Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting were approved.

1. 91 Main Street Harbor Hill. Application for a parallel sign. Horizontal strip lighting is permitted in the DMU District per the application; however, the applicant indicated that they would prefer a backlit sign. The Board concurs. The sign application was presented by Brian O'Connor of Frohling Sign. 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 McManus, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the application with the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The signage height is to be reduced. The maximum height for the letter H on each word is to be 22 inches. The applicant has indicated that they will reduce the other letters;
 2. The applicant has stated that all of the railings will be painted a matte black finish.
 3. The vinyl lettering that is applied to the lower street front windows is to be removed;
 4. The applicant must indicate all of these changes on a drawing and submit them to the Building Department for review and approval in the interim by a minimum of two members.
- Approved by a vote of 5-0.

2. 5 South Broadway. Nail-Holic Foot Spa. Application for one parallel sign and a window sign.

No public comment. Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Curley to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 5-0. Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member McManus to approve the application with the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The height of the telephone number on the window sign is to be reduced to four inches with a lighter weight or thinner font applied;
2. Per a recommendation by the Board: The wording of "Foot Spa" on the main parallel sign, - the applicant has stated that he may opt to list the word "Spa" with a capitalized S.
3. The sign will be mounted centrally as indicated on the drawing submitted.

The applicant has noted that they are going to change the color of the façade backboard.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

3. 59 South Midland Avenue. Jonathan Fanning. Application to install window. Previous owner had covered over the garage door opening. The applicant has installed a window where the garage door once was. Drawings indicate brick veneer surrounding the windows. The proposal complies with zoning requirements.

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 Brown to approve the application as submitted. The applicant has indicated the in-fill around the windows is to be brick to match the existing.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

4. 248 Main Street. Maura's Kitchen. Application to install two parallel signs, one on Main Street and one on Midland Avenue. The proposed signs meet zoning requirements; however, there are at least ten illegal signs in the windows which must be either removed or applied for.

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 McManus to approve the application with the following condition as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The signage material, both the background of the sign and the vinyl lettering, are to be of a matte finish with no sheen.

There is a recommendation by the Board that more space be allowed in the parallel sign between the top line and the lower line of text for better visual legibility.

2. Per the Building Inspector's comments, all existing signs in the windows are to be removed.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

5. 39 Central Avenue. Stanford Kay. Application to install skylights in east and west roof. The proposal complies with zoning requirements. The application was presented by neighbor Andy Stewart.

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

Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Curley to approve the application with the following condition as agreed to by the applicant's representative:

1. The trim color on the skylight which is noted as a Velux trim will be a dark color to blend in with the roof.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

6. 140 Main Street. Stella Luna Salon. Application for one parallel and one perpendicular sign. Stella Luna sign proposed to replace the MB Salon sign on the group sign on the southeast corner of the building. The perpendicular sign is to be installed on the existing bracket previously installed for Gracies Ravioli sign. The proposal meets zoning requirements.

Please note that the applicant is also requesting that the Board review a sketch that indicates the following signage on the door: The address number; a note saying to step down through the threshold; and a phone number along the bottom of the door. Additionally proposed is the Stella Luna oval logo to be applied to the picture window in the entry elevation. The applicant has indicated that all will be a light gray vinyl. The Board has no objection to the proposed signage provided that it complies with code review per the Building Inspector.

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

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Brown to approve the application, including the proposed sketch for the window and door signage subject to Building Inspector's review and compliance approval. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Since the Building Inspector is absent from this meeting, the applicant will deliver the sketch to the Building Department in the morning.

7. 152 Main Street. My Buddy n Me. Application for one perpendicular and two ground floor window signs. The proposed signage is 2.22 sq. ft. greater than permitted. A variance will be required if signs are not reduced in size. The applicant has agreed to reduce the window signs to be code compliant and will work out the sizes with the Building Department.

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

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Curley to approve the application with the following condition:

1. The window sign will be reduced to be code compliant per Building Inspector's comment and subsequent review.
 2. The signage will have a satin finish with no sheen;
 3. The edge of the perpendicular sign will be covered by a solid brown border so the core of the sign will not be exposed.
- Approved by a vote of 5-0.

8. 90 Sixth Avenue. Kier Levesque for Greg Miller. Mr. Miller is the contract purchaser. Continuation of site plan application for

construction. By current dimensional standards the property is substandard with respect to the existing lot of 4,000 sq. ft. where 5,000 sq. ft. is required, and existing lot width of 40 ft. where 50 ft. is required. These two variances are required, as well as a variance for the west front yard where 3 ft. is shown and 20 ft. is required. Revised drawings have been submitted based on the June 7, 2011 ARB workshop. 287 sq. ft. portion of floor below grade not considered a cellar shall be included in the FAR calculations, resulting in a FAR Calculation of .420.

Public comment by the following: A letter submitted by neighbors Laurie Steinhorst and William Nagle at 98 Sixth Avenue expressing their concerns about the views of the river from their house and not wanting to have the property value impacted. They felt the house was still too big for the site. They're also concerned about the setback of the property in all directions and the safety of the driveway from the turn on Grand Avenue. They are asking that the ARB consider the impact.

Public comment from neighbor Marc Comito who was concerned about the variance and questioned whether or not the Board had considered that a 3 ft. side yard variance where 20 ft was required was extreme. He questioned the compliance calculations regarding FAR. He questioned the safety of having the house close to a guardrail that was erected due to a safety incident. The property owner to the north, Paul Shein, requested information about the drainage provisions. He was concerned that moving the house closer to the road would create drainage issues and was concerned about having a retaining wall and water run-off. The Board advised that he address these issues at the Planning Board, and the architect stated that all of these issues were addressed in his drawings.

The Board at prior meetings had presented specific objections and concerns regarding the following proposed items: 1. A parking area in the front façade under the first floor; 2. The scale of the house; 3. The height of the roofline; 4. The style of the architecture; 5. The setbacks, 6. The front yard having a parking area; 7. The front yard having no greenery and paved with impervious material; 8. The entry stair being monolithic and not weaving into the landscape. All of these items were considered by the Board as being excessively dissimilar to the existing context of the neighborhood.

The issues were addressed in subsequent proposals: 1. The parking was removed from under the house allowing the house to drop down; 2. The size of the house was reduced; 3. The height of the roofline was lowered; 4. The architectural style was altered from a rigid vertical colonial to a cottage style with dormers; 5. The architect noted that the setback on the left side would not crowd the street as there is a wide swath of adjacent treed property owned by the Village that is to remain; 6. The parking was relocated to the right side of the house in a driveway; 7. The front yard will be planted with greener; 8. The entry stairs were staggered and better blended into the landscape. Some Board members still felt that the lot was tight but did not think the proposal was visually detrimental to property values. The Board also took into consideration that the side yard-required variance is adjacent to Village-owned property that is planted, so the perceived visual dimension between the street line and the property line is approximately 13 more feet. The Board considered that issues of scale, appropriateness, and visual appearance had been appropriately addressed by the applicants. It was also noted that concerns by the public regarding safety, and zoning calculations were not the purview of the ARB and would be addressed by the other Land Use Boards.

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

Motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Brown to approve the application with a positive recommendation to the ZBA for the required variances with the following condition as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The entry door roof will be shifted to be centered over the entry door to improve the axis line and have the front look more proportional.

Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Let the record show the meeting ended at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Kuster-Collins
Chairperson