

Members Present:

Maggie McManus, *Acting Chairperson*
Mary Mathews
Toma Holley
T. Robins Brown
Lisa Buckley , *Alternate Voting Member*

Also Present:

Donald Yacopino, *Building Inspector*

Absent:

Eileen Kuster-Collins

Minutes: The Minutes of the March 19, 2014 Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting were approved.

Board Reviews and Resolutions:

1. 296 North Midland Avenue. Section 60.77, Block 1, Lot 4. Applicant: Francesca Russo. Return after March 19, 2014 review. Site plan application for the demolition of existing garage and construction of new two-story addition.

In the reopening of the public meeting of February 19, 2014, Russo stated that structural conditions made it difficult to lower the ridgepole of the addition. She explained the revised drawings of 3/17/2014 and during discussion stated that they do not show the foundation of the wing. The foundation will be concrete and match the height of foundation of the main section of the house on the front and lessen in height on south and west sides to maintain the same elevation on the sloping site. The siding on the addition will be wood matching that on the house (but covered with replacement siding except in the interior of the existing garage). The plan is to restore the wood siding on the main block at a later date. The windows will have 4½" wide trim and a frieze board will be added to provide a visual separation between the first and second stories of the addition.

Board review was based on:

1. Presentation by and discussion with Russo on February 19, 2014 and April 16, 2014 resulting in an agreement on changes and conditions.
2. Design drawing revised 02/17/14 and other information in the application as revised.
3. Memorandum to ARB Members from the Building Inspector re "Architectural Review Board Agenda, April 16, 2004" and
4. Visual inspection of the exterior of the building and its neighborhood by ARB members.

ARB members found that revisions were made when feasible in response to the comments at the Feb. 19, 2014 ARB meeting. A recommendation was made by Brown to paint the foundation a darker color than the body of the building.

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

Decision and Findings:

By motion by McManus, seconded by Holley by a vote of 4-1 with Buckley voting No, approved the application as presented with the following modifications or additions to the revised drawings of 3/17/14:

- (1) The corner boards will be used throughout the addition to match the existing building.
- (2) The siding will be wood and will match the existing wood siding exposed on part of the building
- (3) There will be a frieze board applied at the floor-plate level to delineate the garage from the second story. The frieze board will be painted to match the other trim.
- (4) The new bathroom window in the west elevation of the existing building is approved.
- (5) The 4-panel garage doors will be wood. The upper panels will be glass or wood, at the applicant's discretion.
- (6) The foundation which is missing from the south and east elevation drawing will match the existing house's foundation with approximately 18 inches on the front (east elevation) of the garage and reduces in the back (west) to about a 6-inch exposure.
- (7) New windows will be two over one (1/1) or two over two (2/), at the applicant's discretion. All window trims will be 4½" to match the existing.

2. 132 Main Street. Section 66.38, Block 1, Lot 4. Robert Silarski for Bourbon Street. Site plan application to expand the use of existing building with a third floor addition.

The application was presented by architect Silarski. A third story will be added to the building with the brick matching the existing and bracketed cornice added. The front third-story windows will have segmental arches to add variety to the streetscape. The addition will not extend above the north 1-story rear addition.

Board motion was based on:

1. Presentation by and discussion with Silarski.
2. Design drawing for "Renovations to 132A Main Street" by S&Co Architecture + Design, not dated, and other information in the application.
3. Memorandum to ARB Members from the Building Inspector re "Architectural Review Board Agenda, April 16, 2004" and

4. Visual inspection of the exterior of the building and its neighborhood by ARB members.

Brown objected to the general aesthetics of the proposed renovation, noting that the building is architecturally more closely related to the building to its east due to the similar brick than to the building to its west. The proposed remodeling takes its inspiration from the building to the west, which has different brickwork. She suggested that it would be more appropriate for it to take its inspiration from the building to the west as the existing building in key features of brickwork and roofline more closely resembles the building to the west. The other Board members did not share this concern.

Comment by the public: Terry Garnier, a neighbor, spoke regarding the condition of the rear addition to building, which is behind the proposed renovation. The rear addition is in great disrepair and unkempt. The new owners have committed to repairing, replacing, upgrading the roof, painting it and cleaning up the back portion of the property. Silarski stated that he is not responsible for designing these repairs. No further public comment.

Motion by Mathews seconded by Holley to close the public portion. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

Decision and Findings:

By motion by Mathews, seconded by Holley, to approve 4-1, with Brown voting No, the application as presented with the following condition:

- (1) A sample of the stone color for window lintels and sills will be sent to the Building Department for review and approval by two ARB members.

3. 9 West End Avenue. Section 60.77, Block 2, Lot 18. Applicant: Marion Impertore. Site plan application for a rear addition.

Architect Robert Hoene and Impertore and her daughter presented explaining the removal of the existing deck and the construction of a 1-story rear addition and new deck. The Board members suggested that the applicant consider additional windows to provide additional light and ventilation and asked for some changes to reflect the architecture of the existing building, refine the design, and to clarify the drawings.

Board motion was based on:

1. Presentation by and discussion with Hoene, Marion Impertore, and her daughter resulting in an agreement on changes and conditions.
2. Design drawings for Addition and Alterations to 9 West End Avenue by Robert Hoene, dated 03-4-2014, and other information in the application.
3. Memorandum to ARB Members from the Building Inspector re "Architectural Review Board Agenda, April 16, 2004" and

4. Visual inspection of the exterior of the building and its neighborhood by ARB members.

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

Decision and Findings:

By motion by Mathews, seconded by Buckley to approve, 5-0, the application as submitted, with conditions that were agreed to by the applicant:

- (1) Additional windows are added to the north and south sides of the addition.
- (2) In addition to the corner boards, the vertical boards will delineate the addition from the main part of the building at the joining of the addition and the main house.
- (3) The deck railing with balusters are a white composite material. The deck will have lattice screening below and this lattice will have a frame.
- (4) The applicant or architect will submit vinyl samples to be reviewed by two members of the board. There was a recommendation that the vinyl be a slightly different color than the trim; that if the trim is white, the body of the building be an off-white.
- (5) New drawings will be created and submitted to the Building Department to be reviewed by two members of the Board.

4. 184 Main Street. Section 66.29. Block 2, Lot 74. Applicant: Francesca Bozogormid. Application to amend previously approved plans for a new house.

Architect William Mandara and Bozogormid came before the Board because the structure that was built at 184 Main Street does not conform to the designs that were presented to and approved by this Board on and for which the building permit was issued. The owner changed architect during construction and made numerous modifications to the approved design. Some of the modifications were caused by the steeply sloping site. The main differences between what was approved and what was built were presented by the architect and the owner: They are as follows.

1. Problems with construction of the foundation resulted in a foundation different from the approved. The original porch was to be wood supported by brick piers with lattice between piers. It was constructed with a solid concrete foundation so it has unbroken walls with no openings.
2. The exterior railings on porches, steps, etc. were to be wood. Wrought iron railing was installed.

3. There is a heavy concrete railing and a metal gate on the lower section of the property near Main Street that was not on the approved plan.
4. The stairs and walk leading from the Main Street to the house were not built as approved due to construction problems. They were to be gravel and stone. The existing are concrete steps, walks and walls with ornate metal railings with considerable more visual impact than the approved.
5. The windows on the east and west sides of the building were to be multi-paned, double-hung mullioned windows. Single-pane casement windows were installed in all of the openings.

Board discussion was also based on:

1. Study of the previously approved design.
2. Design drawings by South Park Consulting LLC, William S. Mandara, Jr., of 10/12/13, 3/1/and other information in the application.
3. Memorandum to ARB Members from the Building Inspector re "Architectural Review Board Agenda, April 16, 2004," and
4. Visual inspection of the exterior of the building and its neighborhood by ARB members.

The ARB members consider changes 2, 3, 4, and 5 to substantially change the character of the approved design due to change in design, materials, and visual prominence of landscape hardscape not in the approved design. The location of the property provides it with high visibility within the Village. The applicant should have returned to the ARB for discussion and approval of modifications during the construction process. The change in the foundation was not considered to be an issue. The other modifications of the approved design are viewed by the ARB members as having considerable negative effect on the aesthetic quality of the approved design and is incompatible with the materials and the nature of the building's design as approved and with architectural details, materials, and character of other buildings in the area. They asked the architect to develop solutions to lessen the visual impact of the changes and make the end result closer to the approved design and more compatible with the neighboring architecture with particular emphasis on items 3, 4 and 5, which are viewed as causing the greatest dissimilarity with the area's architecture.

With the applicant's approval, the application will remain open. The applicant and architect will get back to the Building Department when they are ready to present their designs to mitigate the three main problem areas.

Public comment: A member of the public who did not want to identify himself, but is a neighbor, made a comment that he supported everything the Board was doing and he was very concerned that the structure was not built to what was previously approved.

Let the record show the meeting ended at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maggie McManus
Acting Chairperson