

Members Present:

DRAFT

T. Robins Brown

Mary Mathews*

Toma Holey

Maggie McManus

Lisa Buckley

Alternate Voting Member

Paul Burley

Alternate Voting Member

Donald Yacopino

Building Inspector

Absent:

Eileen Kuster-Collins

Chairperson

**Left at 8:45 p.m. and resumed the role of Acting Chair for the last application*

The Minutes of the January 16, 2013 Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting were approved.

- **[Item 1] 235 High Avenue. Continuation. Eric Osborne, architect, for David Makan. Site plan application for the demolition of existing single-family dwelling and the construction of a single-family dwelling.** When presenting the plan and looking at the variances and the manner in which the plan was not in conformance with the requirement, dimension standards, and with the overall feeling of the Board that the scale of the house needed to be similar to the other two houses to the left, and the requirement to have either a driveway that goes to the back or other parking (that they would not be allowed to have parking in front of the house), Mr. Osborne said that he would go back to the drawing board.

Public comment from Marilyn Taylor, 237 High Avenue, saying she was very concerned about the drainage plan and the house being over-scaled. She would appreciate a smaller-scale house and a driveway bypassing the house for parking in the back.

The application remains open. The applicant agreed to return with a revised plan, and was given the opportunity to submit to the Building Department a request for an interim workshop meeting for the design.

- **[Item 2] 143 North Broadway. Kier Levesque for Thomas & Kate Whitney. Site plan application for the construction of a front porch and rear-entry addition.**

No public comment. Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holey to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Holey to approve the application as presented, with the condition that the porch posts and decorative trim be brought in line with the Queen Anne style of the main body of the house. It was strongly suggested that more traditional Queen Anne colors be used on all the trim and posts.

A positive recommendation will be made to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the variances. The new plans will be brought to the Building Department for interim review by two members.

Approved by a vote of 6-0.

- **[Item 3] 2 Aldine Lane. Jodie Tassello and Bianca Beldina, builder. Site plan application for the construction of a deck on the rear of dwelling.** The Board had a lot of questions about the materials and also the detailed elevations for the rear of the building.

No public comment. Motion by Mr. Holey, seconded by Member Buckley to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Buckley to approve the application as presented, with the condition that a detailed elevation of the back of the building showing all pertinent openings for the new sliding door and window, and specifications of the change of siding and any new doors be submitted to the Building Department for interim review by two members.

Approved by a vote of 6-0.

- **[Item 4] 73 South Broadway. Robert Silarski for Dance with Passion. Also present were Roxanne Peek and Rick Ritto, the new owners.**

No public comment. Motion by Member Holey, seconded by Member Brown to close the public portion; approved by a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holey to approve the application as submitted, with the condition that the perpendicular sign be moved on the façade so that the space from the main sign is equal in distance from both the south side and north side, right to right and left, and that the lights be changed. The plan shows that they are white, and the gooseneck lights are now going to be black.

Approved by a vote of 6-0.

- **[Item 5] 400 High Avenue. Continuation of site plan application to demolish an existing manufacturing structure and construct a 132 room hotel and signage.** Application presented by Joseph Siegel for NYLO Nyack and Howard Dean.

In response to the board's request that the appearance of the North elevation (most visible to the residential neighbors) be a more appropriate residential scale, the mass has been relieved by moving the central pavilion forward (increasing the projection of the central section).

On drawing #10, the center column of windows are asymmetrical while all the others are symmetrically treated with heavy dark borders on either side. The board felt that it would be less discordant if the central windows were to be treated in an different way from the others. The applicant's representative said he believed that this had been taken care of and that the drawings will reflect further revisions. See drawing #14 (Northwest elevation). The appearance of the windows on this central pavilion must be clarified.

Comment from Ms Pari who owns the adjacent single family house. She said this project is great, that it will put Nyack on the map and will bring people into the area. She likes the sign concept and the rows of flags. However she expressed concern that her tenants would object to construction noise on Saturdays.

Comment from neighbor Mary Eckman, 320 High Avenue, who was also concerned about construction duration and noise and believes some of her neighbors would want to move out of their apartments. She said that notice of the meeting was not properly posted.

Comment from Raymond King who really likes the aesthetics of the banks of flags and has no objection to the large surface-applied NYLO Nyack signs.

SIGNAGE

The Board reviewed the proposed signage in detail. The members expressed their individual viewpoints, without taking a formal vote on any of the signage.

Removed from consideration:

The applicant agreed to delete two of the three parking signs. These are surface applied sign #7 on the north elevation and banner sign #9 on the south access to the parking garage.

The Board members expressed a unanimous, favorable view with respect to the following signs:

1 Two surface applied signs - NYLO Nyack (east & west elevations)

2 Two wall-mounted metal banner signs, internally illuminated (south elevation)

3 Wall-mounted entry sign – NYLO – main entrance (south elevation)

4 Window sign – NYLO Nyack – secondary entrance (north elevation)

A majority of the Board members expressed favorable opinions toward the following signs, with certain exceptions or concerns noted:

5 Two double-sided and wall-mounted banner signs for future restaurant. Member Curley questioned the advisability of approving a sign without knowing the exact content of the sign. Member Brown said the board could and has approved the overall shape, size, and material of signage without the specific text.

8 Surface applied parking sign – South access to parking garage. Member Brown objected to the overall size and said Village Code did not allow parking signs to be used as advertisement space. Members Curley and Mathews believed that the configuration of the sign, which echoes the NYLO Nyack sign was a design motif, not an advertisement for the NYLO brand.

#10 Flag(s) and flagpole(s). Whereas the Board agreed in principle to flags flanking the front entrance (south elevation) it is not clear how many flags are being requested and the applicant was not able to say for sure. In addition to the number of flags, the Board would like better visuals - a perspective rendering for instance.

The Board did not express a majority or consensus opinion regarding the following sign:

6 Surface applied bike rack sign on the North side of the building facing east. Member Brown objected to the appearance, the size, and the position of this sign. She feels it would encourage cyclists to go the wrong direction on a one way road and would pose a danger. Members Curley and Mathews thought that this would not be a problem, as with parking sign # 8, it continues a light hearted design motif and the size is appropriate as such. Members Holley and Buckley did not object to the position or the design, but thought the sign could be smaller (3' x 3' instead of 5'10" x 5')

There was no material discussion regarding the following sign:

The Board could not begin to consider the free-standing pole sign without perspective drawings of the sign in context and in relation to the structure. It is proposed for the furthestmost west side of the property facing the NYS Thruway. The immensity of the sign (24 x 24 ft) with the top being 45 ft above the ground is too large to envision. A site visit would be appropriate.

The lighting plan was not reviewed.

The application remains open. It is the applicant's intent to come before the March ARB for final approval having had an interim Workshop Meeting.

Let the record show that meeting ended at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Acting Chairperson