



Village of Nyack Planning Board



December 8, 2025

Members Present:

Laura Rothschild – Chair - present
Jennifer Knarich - present
Samuel Hart – present
Kate Buggeln – present
Peter Voletsky - present
Catherine Friesen (alternate) – absent

Also Present:

Dennis M. Michaels, Esq. Village Attorney – excused absence
Manny Carmona – Building Department - present
Bob Galvin – Village Planner – present

Minutes from the November 3, 2025 meeting were previously distributed and approved. The Chair polls the Board for any conflicts. None heard.

Agenda Items

Item 1: 80 South Broadway. Continuation of Site Plan application for the demolition of existing gas station and construction of a new 4-story mixed-use building containing retail space on ground floor and 18 residential units on upper floors. Parking will be provided in cellar and in front of building.

Dominick Pilla, Architect, is representing this application. He states that he has provided renderings and Architectural plans. There has been much discussion about the land use process in the Village. He doesn't know why he is here. For 25 years the process in Nyack was the same – you went to ARB first, then Planning Board. He is only looking for a referral to ARB. This doesn't make sense.

The Chair asks if he wants to hear what the Board has to say? He said anything said here will be arbitrary. He's only here for a referral to ARB. The Chair refuted Dominick Pilla's assertion that the Planning Board's insights into the project would be "arbitrary" but that if has no interest in hearing the Planning Board's thoughts on the project then he is referred to ARB. The Chair then opens for public comment.

Matthew Toal, attorney, representing Keith Taylor of Hannemann's Funeral Home states

that Mr. Taylor's property at 88 S Broadway is a landmark building on the southwest corner of the subject property. This is a wood framed structure with open air windows which will be situated less than 5 feet from proposed structure. There is no exhaust for garage, no setbacks for second and third floors. The North side is a 3-story masonry building with open air windows on each floor facing this proposed building. There was a fire in this building years ago where these windows were used for rescue. A letter and photos have been submitted by Feerick Nugent MacCartney, PLLC that they would like to be made part of the record.

Dominick Pilla states that he agrees with most of what was said, but that these plans are not finished. These are Architecturals intended for ARB. I am forced to be here by the Village. Again, with this process, everything is changed. This project does not require any variances. I am here to go to ARB.

Bob Galvin states that typically this application would be rejected as incomplete without a Site Plan. The Land Use process changed in Nyack over a year ago to streamline the SEQRA process. Manny Carmona says maybe he should have considered this a whole new application, but he was trying to work with the applicant and save him some time by looking at this as a continuation. You should have withdrawn old application and put in a new application for this project. See Village Code 360-5.4.

Public comment remains open until next meeting on January 5th, 2026.

At this point Peter Voletsky announced that this was his last meeting. The Mayor decided not to renew his appointment. He wanted to thank the Board and others. He has thoroughly enjoyed his time on the Planning Board. The Chair thanked him for his service to the Village.

Item 2: 45 Route 59. Continuation of Site Plan application to construct a steel commercial building to be used as a cabinet and counter-top storage facility and small showroom for the public.

Action: Adjourned to the next Planning Board Meeting on January 5, 2026.

Item 3: 25 Ackerman Place. Continuation of application to amend previously approved Site Plan with the following amendments: to permit the use of an accessory building on a vacant lot (a garage with an attached greenhouse); to permit continued use of an accessory building on a vacant lot (existing shed); to permit continued use of an accessory building on a vacant lot (owner added another shed without a permit).

Action: Adjourned to the next Planning Board Meeting on January 5, 2026.

Item 4: 11 Fourth Avenue. Shenley Vital. Continuation of Application for Site Plan approval to demolish a detached single-family dwelling for a two-lot subdivision and to develop a new detached two-family dwelling on each new lot.

Action: Adjourned to the next Planning Board Meeting on January 5, 2026.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.

The Clerk/Secretary to the Planning Board of the Village of Nyack is hereby authorized, directed and empowered, by the Planning Board, to sign these Minutes, and to file a copy thereof in the office of the Village Clerk:


Mary Screene, Clerk/Secretary



FEERICK NUGENT MacCARTNEY ^{PLLC}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

96 SOUTH BROADWAY
SOUTH NYACK, NEW YORK 10960
TEL. 845-353-2000 FAX. 845-353-2789

www.fnmlawfirm.com

DONALD J. FEERICK, JR.
BRIAN D. NUGENT
J. DAVID MacCARTNEY, JR.
STEPHEN M. HONAN*+
ALAK SHAH*

JENNIFER M. FEERICK
CHRISTOPHER B. PAVLACKA
COLLEEN R. CANNING
MATTHEW C. TOAL
BRYAN T. CONWAY

OF COUNSEL
DAVID J. RESNICK
KEVIN F. HOBBS
MICHAEL K. STANTON, JR.

*LICENSED ALSO IN NEW JERSEY
+LICENSED ALSO IN CONNECTICUT

December 8, 2025

Via Hand Delivery

Planning Board – Village of Nyack
Nyack Village Hall
9 North Broadway
Nyack, New York 10960

Re.: PB Application – Site Plan for 80 South Broadway, Nyack (Owner, Tim Murray)

Dear Chairperson Rothschild:

This office represents the interests of Mr. Keith Taylor, the owner of the premises at 88 South Broadway, Nyack, New York 10960, which is located at the northwest corner of Cedar Hill Avenue and South Broadway in the Village of Nyack.

1. Neighboring Fire Access Windows must be Preserved

We have previously advised the Planning Board on our client's situation and familiarity with that submission is presumed. Nonetheless, the applicant's site plan should not be the only document explored tonight because the site plan alone is inadequate to glean a proper understanding of what is being proposed by the applicant. A review of the architectural plans, in tandem with the site plan, is needed because, among other things, the two adjacent buildings have fire egress windows (which also afford light and ventilation) that require access be maintained.

You will recall that situated on 88 South Broadway is the Hannemann Funeral Home, which is housed in a beautifully maintained landmark building constructed at the turn of the 20th century. 88 South Broadway is contiguous to and located to the south and west of the applicant's property. To the south, 88 South Broadway has a combustible wood frame structure, with open air windows and a utility space for mechanicals which each face the applicant's property. The combustible wood frame structure will be situated less than five feet from the proposed new construction. (To the west, 88 South Broadway has a parking lot that is one story above the proposed new construction's ground floor.)

Directly to the north of the applicant's property is a row of masonry buildings (all three stories in height), also over 100 years old, consisting of commercial storefronts in a uniform straight line along the sidewalk with residential apartments occupying the second and third floors of the buildings. The property immediately contiguous to the north is 78 South Broadway and it also has open air windows facing the applicant's property on each floor of its structure inclusive of the ground floor that will be situated less than five feet from the proposed new construction. You may recall that there once was a fire at 78 South Broadway that used the windows facing the applicant's property for rescue purposes. They also serve light and ventilation purposes.

The proposed new construction's zero lot line at the ground floor will block off emergency access windows on each of its immediate neighbor's properties to the north and south, independent of any five-foot setback on the second and third floors. This creates an unacceptable, serious life safety hazard for the neighboring properties. Photographs of the existing conditions are supplied for your review.

Irrespective of whether the applicant proposes to install sprinklers throughout the new construction, the loss of these emergency access windows could have catastrophic consequences for the neighboring properties. Sprinklers are designed to offer only a few minutes of fire defense which is believed to be sufficient to allow fire departments time to deploy to the site. Sprinklers are not designed to suppress the fire, but to slow its spread to allow occupants to exit. Responding fire departments are the ones to flood a fire with water to suppress it. If the neighboring emergency access windows are blocked, the applicant's new construction is a safety hazard whenever a fire is confronted on its or the neighboring properties.

2. The Applicant's Fire System Should Be Reviewed

We note with some concern that, in addition to blocking the fire access windows of the two neighboring properties, the applicant does not propose any exhaust system for underground parking to clear the air in the event of a fire.

In the event of a car fire, there is no second means of access or egress from the proposed commercial units – no access whatsoever is provided at the rear. Generally, the five foot setback for the second and third floors is intended to provide an exit from those floors. With the first floor at ground level having no setback and no second means of access or egress another life safety hazard is presented.

3. Lateral Support Must be Considered

The site plan does not depict the location of the pillars along the property line shared with 88 South Broadway. Instead, those pillars are left off the site plan in spots in favor of detailing the proposed set-back for the second and third floors. The proposed new construction will undoubtedly have pillars supporting the construction coming from the basement upwards that will run along the shared boundary line with 88 South Broadway. No construction easement has been proposed and no showing of how the lateral support for 88 South Broadway's property along the applicant's southern or western borders will be maintained is provided.

4. SWPPP Plan

88 South Broadway's parking lot to the west has weep pipes extending through the retaining wall at the rear of the applicant's lot. Covering up the pipes will introduce an opportunity for erosion that could compromise the soils supporting the neighboring improvements. We ask the Planning Board to demand that the applicant provide a storm water management plan for the site. It cannot be ignored.

5. Rear Access

The northern neighbor at 78 South Broadway has large trees in the rear that will have no access for maintenance purposes if there is no space afforded between the new construction and 78 South Broadway. A five-foot separation at ground level between the applicants northern and southern neighbors (inclusive of the rear border) should be considered instead of a zero lot line development.

6. Miscellaneous

We note that the applicant's plans are incomplete. This proposal so substantially deviates from what has previously been proposed that this application should be referred to and considered anew by the Architectural Review Board ("ARB"), before this Board is asked to act upon it. No decisions should be made until a complete set of plans is submitted and considered and the ARB has been heard from.

This revised project plan once again proposes a vehicle parking lot in front of the building along South Broadway (see this office's letter to your Board of February 21, 2025). Vehicle traffic will be required to drive over the pedestrian sidewalk to access the parking lot. The construction of parking lots in front of the buildings on Broadway and Main Street in the Village is not favored. The current placement of the parking lot is visually unappealing and the car traffic across the sidewalks will conflict with and discourage pedestrian use of the sidewalks along South Broadway.

Also, the Village Engineer Eve Mancuso's comments should be read into the record. Likewise, if any comments have been received from the Rockland County Planning Board Engineers, those comments should be disclosed and read into the record. And, if the Village's Building Inspector has supplied the Planning Board with notes on the application, those notes should be disclosed and read into the record. If the Planning Board does not recite what material is received into the record and reviewed, significant life safety concerns like those raised here may go unaddressed. Accordingly, we request that the materials received and considered be listed and read into the record.

Finally, we reserve the right to provide further comment upon receipt and review of a complete set of plans.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen M. Honan













80 SOUTH BROADWAY, NYACK, NY

PLANNING BOARD SUBMISSION | NOVEMBER 10, 2025



PROPOSED RENDERING (FRONT ELEVATION) LOOKING SOUTHWEST



PROPOSED RENDERING (FRONT ELEVATION) LOOKING NORTHWEST



PROPOSED RENDERING (AERIAL VIEW)