

Members Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins *Chairperson*
Toma Holley
Mary Mathews
T. Robins Brown

Also Present:

John Allgor *Building Inspector*

Absent:

Maggie McManus

—

The Minutes of the June 21, 2006 Nyack Architectural Review Board Meeting have been approved.

—

- 1 **82 Sickles Avenue. Sean Keenan. Continuation of discussion for construction of two new dwellings. Applicant Sean Keenan was represented by Jay Greenweld, the land surveyor for the application.** The applicant Sean Keenan was represented by the land surveyor, who stated that the architect was unavailable. Alterations to the front façade were presented. These alterations were in response to the Board's concern regarding the scale of the house on the western part of the property. This proposed structure is directly adjacent to a one and a half story cottage style house that is much smaller in scale. The revised drawing addressed the concern of scale to the Boards satisfaction. The applicant also presented information on material for the driveways that lead directly to the front facades of the proposed structures. The proposal indicated macadam as the main surface with a small section of pavers inserted at the transition to the sidewalk. Members of the Board noted that in the field meeting, (held between normal meetings in order to expedite the process), Mr. Keenan had agreed to revise the surface to be gravel or another less imposing material. The Board was concerned with macadam or asphalt as the material since this is an atypical driveway. The predominant driveway type on this street and throughout the village is between houses to a detached garage. In this application, the driveway is in

the front yard leading directly to the front face of the houses. The Board had suggested that a material that can be interpreted as material found in pathways would be more appropriate. Additionally, the new driveway inserted in front of the existing original house was proposed as all macadam. The original property prior to this approved subdivision presents a very park-like perception and the Board hoped that some of that perception could be maintained.

The applicant's representative stated that Mr. Keenan was presenting the application as submitted. He also stated that Mr. Keenan had made enough concessions to the Board and that he as the representative was instructed to inform the Board that if this application was not approved as presented, Mr. Keenan was prepared to initiate a lawsuit. Additionally, Mr. Greenwell stated that the plans had been approved by the Planning Board and that the driveways were not in the purview of the ARB. He also stated that this applicant had already been through an arduous process with the Planning Board and was not willing to return to amend the driveway material. Mr. Greenwell also stated that this was the third ARB meeting. The Board noted that the first presentation by this applicant was reviewed informally as a courtesy by the Board since the application was incomplete. Required site plans were not included in the application. Board members expressed surprise as at all previous meetings, the applicant and his representatives had indicated that they were willing to consider Board comments regarding the appropriateness of material for the driveways.

The application was open to the public; there was public comment by the neighbor to the west, Carol Weiss, who stated that the application had not been before the Planning Board twelve times as the applicant had stated. The applicant's representative corrected his prior statement, noting it was nine meetings before Planning. Also, Carol Weiss noted that the existing house to the east of hers is three feet higher and that she hopes this Board would take into consideration the difference in scale. No further public comment. The Board Chair suggested that clarification be obtained from the Village Attorney who was not present, regarding Board purview of material and the process required by the applicant to change the material. Upon receipt of that

information, the Board would render a decision. Board members agreed.

- 2 **80 South Broadway. Joseph Adams and Tim Murray for JT Staprem. Continuation of application to install a canopy, alter façade and enlarge rear of structure.** The Board made comments as follows:
 1. There needs to be a distinction between the stucco applied to the base of the building versus the stucco band that runs across the façade above the brick piers. The scale of the building without the distinction in material was considered inappropriate. The applicant is to come back with different color stucco samples for both sections of the façade for review;
 2. The applicant has indicated that he wants butt-joint glass in the front façade as opposed to divided glass as originally presented. The Board has requested specification sheets indicating the details of that glass;
 3. The Board recommends that the awning be a very simple awning with no scalloping on the apron in response to the request for the sleeker application of glass.
It was also noted that the drawings were still too lacking in detail for proper review to continue.
The applicant has agreed to hold this application open and to return with updated drawings and the requested details and materials.
- 3 **256 Main Street. Ned Visser for "La Boqueria". Continuation of discussion for application to install a new store front and to alter the façade.** Comment by Member Brown requesting that the applicant respect the existing integrity of the building and to reconsider the paint application. Comment by Member Mathews, that she did not oppose the concept of the proposed application but requested that the existing cornice and sign board of the building be incorporated into the design, and that the application of paint be toned down to be more weathered. Member Holley concurred with Member Mathews' opinion. The applicant has agreed to keep this application open and will return at a later date.
- 4 **102 Main Street. Chase Bank, represented by Margaret Miller. Application to install sign.** The new drawings show the sign to be reinstalled in the location originally shown on the drawings, which is the band right

below the top cornice. The applicant has also shown a photographic rendering indicating that the cornices and cupolas and bottom band are to be painted in a contrasting color from the façade to help define it more. The revised drawings also indicate pin mounted letters that are more three-dimensional letters than those originally proposed.

The application was open to the public, there were no comments made. Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Brown to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 4-0. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Mathews to approve the application as submitted. Approved by a vote of 4-0.

- 5 **89 Piermont Avenue, Lisa Baslow, represented by Jim Willcox, owner. Application to amend previously approved plans. Doors and windows have been relocated from the side to the rear foundation wall.** The application was open to the public, there were no comments made. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Brown to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 4-0. Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Holley to approve the application as submitted. Approved by a vote of 4-0.
- 6 **4 Bache Street. Nadja Hoyer-Booth. Addition of a deck with column supported trellis above addition of exercise pool.** The application was open to the public, there were no comments made. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Brown to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 4-0. Motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Holley to approve the application as submitted. Approved by a vote of 4-0.
- 7 **61 High Avenue. Gloria Franco. Preliminary site plan application for enlargement of an existing structure.** The application was open to the public, there were no comments made. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Mathews to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 4-0. Motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holley to approve the application with the following condition as agreed to by the applicant:
 1. That the bay window on the east-facing elevation is to align with the left side of the windows on the first floor below it. Approved by a vote of 4-0.

- 8 **82 Main Street. Black Bear, represented by Sam Gardner, the architect. Application for alterations to façade, signage and awnings.**

Comments by this Board regarding the following:

1. The location of the entry door is proposed to be in the same plane as the façade. It is requested that the door be set back into the façade as is typical to most commercial store fronts in the Village;
2. That the proposed awning be operable and that the applicant consider placing it between the outermost piers on the front lower façade;
3. That the quantity of the proposed light fixtures be reduced.

The applicant will take these comments under consideration and will return at a later meeting.

- 9 **162 Main Street. "Change." Application for alterations to façade, signage and awnings.** The application was open to the public, there were no comments made. Motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member Brown to close the public portion, approved by a vote of 4-0. Motion by Member Collins, seconded by Member Holley to approve the application with the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:

1. That the applicant is to submit an accurate drawing of the individual letter signage that is being mounted on the east-facing façade;
 2. That the applicant will present a drawing with accurate typeface and scale of the signage that is being applied to the awning over the entry door.
- Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Let the record show the meeting ended at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Kuster-Collins
Chairperson