

Preservation Committee Meeting Minutes

Jay Adolf, and Gabrielle Palitz, Co-Chairs

August 11, 2016

The Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, August 11, 2016, at the District Office, 250 West 87th Street, in the District. The meeting was called to order by co-chair Gabrielle Palitz at 6:30 PM, and was attended by Louisa Craddock, Meisha Hunter-Burkett, Peter Samton and Mark Diller.

122 West 69th Street, Christ and St. Stephen's Church (Broadway-Columbus Avenue). Application to add gates at the entry points to a garden, rebuild the columns at the main entry, add a pedestrian patio, and replace signage.

Presentation by Adrian Smith – Landscape Architect

- The grounds of the church campus include a lawn and separate garden area between West 69th Street and the church building, which is oriented east-west parallel to the street.
- The proposal includes installing gates at the entry points to the campus.
- Previously, stairs leading up to the main entrance to the campus were replaced with a ramp.
- Existing condition includes a retaining wall along the street separating the garden from the sidewalk. The garden is approximately 3' above the sidewalk.
- Proposing a path in the shape of a squared-off oval in the middle of the garden level. The path will be laid out in a herringbone pattern with red brick. The path will be accessed from short entry paths from the east and west of the oval.
- Proposal includes adding teak wooden benches anchored to the path.
- A low boxwood hedge (punctuated with taller boxwood plants at regular intervals) would be installed along the edge of the retaining wall above the sidewalk.
- Plantings in the refurbished garden would include mostly shade-tolerant trees and plants due to conditions at the site.
- The retaining wall will include restored/replaced taller piers made of Indiana limestone at the corners marking the main entrance path, and a double-gate will be installed between the piers. A single gate is proposed for a second entrance path at the east end of the garden.
- Gates will be constructed of wrought iron painted black.
- The patterns proposed for the gates will seek to emulate a decorative motif from existing wrought iron fencing on the east end of the retaining wall.
- The existing large wooden sign in the middle of the lawn is to be replaced with a smaller metal sign at the west end of the garden, on the west side of the main entrance path, above and behind the retaining wall.
- The new sign will be of wrought iron with details similar to a precedent taken from the Church of the Transfiguration on West 29th Street. The height of the sign will be 8'6" above the garden, which in turn is 3' above the sidewalk, so total height of the proposed sign will be 11'6" from the sidewalk. Sign will be installed / anchored in concrete behind the retaining wall.

Public Comment:

West 69th Street Association – Barbara Good, President – letter of support

- Enthusiastically supports the proposal, including the improvement of the garden itself and the increased accessibility to the entire site.

Peter Wright - parishioner

- Endorsing the proposal -- the current garden is a mess.
- Peg Breen, a noted preservationist, is on the Church's Vestry and is involved in the project, and approves of the proposal as well.

Diana Weinbroer - West 69th Street Association

- Enthusiastically supports the proposal.
- A gate is needed because homeless do congregate/sleep in the path/garden.

Committee Comments:

- Compliments on a sensitive proposal.
- Question the use of red brick which differs from the other pavers on the campus.
- Would have used limestone or another hue that would be more integrated with the surrounding walkways.

- LPC likely to limit its purview to the hardscape and sign.
- Orienting the sign near the main entrance is appropriate.
- No objection to the use of the ornamental red brick.

- Great improvement to the existing condition.
- Red brick picks up the colors from the church.

- Use of red brick has the virtue of distinguishing the garden space from the main entrance – a welcome distinction for the garden path.

- The precedent cited for the sign has significantly more curly/curved decoration than is consistent with the geometric decoration of the existing wrought iron at this site. The precedent is perhaps more delicate than would fit with the context.
A: The proposal intends for the sign to be an opportunity to have a special moment, with a different scale and medallion than the existing wrought iron.
A: Trying to be respectful of the landmark without requiring it to be an exact copy.

Resolution to approve as presented:

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/13/16.

164 West 74th Street (Amsterdam Avenue). Application to remove steps at the building entry and modify the doors to be ADA compliant; restore the façade; install new windows; infill portions of the light wells; expand the penthouse; and reconstruct the rear elevation.

Presentation by: Cass Spackleberg of Higgins Quasebarth, and Barry Rice, architect.

- The scope of the project includes restoration of the street façade and reconstructing an existing 1-story penthouse and rear façade.
- Portions of the proposed project would be minimally visible through a gap between buildings on West 73rd Street.
- The project site was formerly occupied by Phoenix House, now being converted to typical residential.
- The original structure when built in 1902 was larger -- 7 stories, originally used as a hotel, and later for a variety of institutional uses.
- The existing structure includes light wells on the east and west sides along the lot lines.
- The building features a Beaux Arts limestone front façade. Some decoration has been lost over the years.
- The existing condition includes columns at the main entrance beneath an entry portico.
- Proposing new wood windows to replace the metal non-original windows in place.
- Leaded windows in the light wells/side courts will be salvaged and re-installed elsewhere.
- The main front door will be replaced, as will the historic transom with wrought iron decoration.
- Proposal includes lowering the door opening and removing exterior steps so the main entrance will be accessible.

Barry Rice:

- Removing Phoenix House signage and replacing it with the original name of the building (“Marbury Court”), plus lettering for building number.
- Dropping the level of the first floor inside the building to be level with the sidewalk.
- Stretching the main front door to reach the new base. The existing doors are not original.
- Front wrought iron railings on either side of the main entrance will be restored.
- First two floors have a stucco covering that will be removed to expose the original limestone.
- Columns at main entrance will be polished.
- Existing penthouse has an elevator overrun and water towers.
- Proposal is to expand the penthouse to cover the entire width of the roof.
- Stone steps will be cut and installed at sidewalk level to provide access to the newly lowered front door; plinth supporting the columns will be extended down to sidewalk level.
- New penthouse will have occupied space, as well as a condenser farm, elevator overrun and an emergency generator.
- Height of the new penthouse would be the same as the existing – just full width.

- A metal screen in dark bronze metal on the top of the penthouse will permit the use of the roof of the penthouse as a terrace, and will enclose the condensers and mechanicals.
- Existing penthouse is a dirty red brick – changing to variegated brown brick similar to the rear façade.
- The new elevator overrun extends 10'2" above the terrace.
- In the rear, the existing condition includes a 10' deep courtyard to the rear lot line.
- The proposal would reduce the rear infill from 10' to 22' at the widest point – the rear façade will continue to be 10' from the rear lot line at each edge, and will chamfer inward to a depth of 30' from the rear line.
- The redesign of the rear façade is as of right, since it would reduce the level of non-compliance.
- The proposal would extend the interior footprint by infilling the light wells.
- Leaded historic windows currently located on windows into the light wells will be installed on the ground floor of the rear façade – will then be visible to residents in the donut. Will read as stained glass lit from within.
- Rear façade to be clad in greyish-brown brick, with every 5th course inset to give a rustication feel. Rustication effect begins at the level above the courtyard/terrace.
- Rear fenestration – at the rear lot line will have surrounds for the large windows.
- In the chamfer, the windows will be larger openings with metal surrounds in a bronze color.
- Visibility from West 73rd Street through the gap between buildings – by pulling the rear façade back to 22' from 10', a sliver of the railing above the penthouses becomes visible, but not the penthouse itself.
- Also a small sliver of the screen on top of the penthouse that encloses the mechanicals and condensers is visible from the north side of West 74th Street looking west and south (not directly across the street).

Committee Comments:

- Compliments.
- Lowering the level of the main floor is a tricky feat.
- Regret that the balustrade on the front façade that was removed long ago is not being replaced.
- This sort of reconfiguration is more typical in industrial buildings, not more modest buildings on this scale.
- Not concerned about the rooftop addition.
- Rear façade design is trying to challenge the front façade. Front is ornamental but understated. The chevron/chamfer is aggressive.
 - A: Building is a steel frame - creating the effect of peeling back to celebrate the metal.
 - A: Didn't want to emulate the elegant front.
- Concern for robust muscularity in the rear.
- Concern for excavation to the rear lot line.
- Clever answer to the complex issues of shifting volume. This works.
- Chamfer creates a cutaway effect of revealing a second building within the first.
- Almost futuristic building in the middle of the rear.

- Depth of garden.
A: 12' from the ground level –shallow garden.
- The effect of the reveal of the metal in the rear works in context. The height of the building and its context supports the heavy metal configuration on the rear façade.
- Oval windows on the lower level of the rear façade are out of place.
A: reflects an elliptical effect in the interior lobby.
- Would revisit the relative dimensions of the front door.

Resolution to approve.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/20/16.

313 Columbus Avenue (Corks on Columbus) (West 75th Street). Application to legalize signage.

Meisha:

- Current status – the applicant received a warning letter re installation of signage without LPC permits. No notice of violation has as yet been issued on the signage.
- Current status also includes a notice of violation for other storefronts on the same block and lot. Not related to this applicant.

Presentation by Raul Nunez, owner of the store.

- Changed signage from "Nancy's Wines" to "Corks on Columbus" when he took over the store.
- Did not change the existing façade structures.
- Existing Nancy's Wines sign was lit.
- The applicant hired a sign company to change the sign, and assumed it knew what was required. The sign company was not aware of the need for an LPC permit.
- The sign company is now out of business.
- It thus falls to the applicant to try to legalize.
- Does not have detailed drawings because the sign company is out of business.
- There are many lit signs in the neighborhood.
- Uncertainty from the applicant as to the exact dimensions of the sign board, the lettering, and the image of wine corks on the subject sign.
- Letters are metal framed with translucent plastic.

Committee Comments:

- Despite absence of clarity on size of letters, the photos reveal an appropriate condition.
- Regrettable that the sign company is AWOL.

Resolution to approve.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/6/16.

50 West 77th Street, d/b/a Scaletta (Columbus Avenue). Application for a vertical lift, removal of the terra cotta colored tile and addition of cement plaster to match the building.

Presentation by: Michael Gadaleta

- Building at SW corner of Columbus and West 77th Street owned by Equity Residential.
 - Restaurant is located in basement level of building, accessed only by steep stairs.
 - Restaurant is not handicapped-accessible.
 - Steps and adjoining walls and floor at street level and basement entrance are covered with 12"x12" orange-colored tiles, to be removed.
 - Vestibule and doors will be modified. Interior doors will become heavier exterior doors.
 - White wrought iron supports for awning will be removed to permit lift installation. New awning to be installed.
 - Building owner will install vertical lift at east side of entrance that will ride on a rail from street to basement entrance. Existing doors and glass walls at entrance to remain.
 - When lift is ridden up to street, lift will fold in on itself after 40 seconds and return to bottom of steps. The only permanent presence on the sidewalk, per DOT, will be the controls on a stanchion – about the size of a credit card.
 - Steps are five feet wide. Width of lift is 33 inches wide.
-
- Q: If steps are five feet wide and lift is 33 inches, is there enough room for other restaurant patrons when lift is in use?
A: It depends. It would be tight.
 - Q: Location very problematic. Why can't lift be located in areaway to west of entrance?
A: Areaway is not part of building.
 - Q: Concerned that this renovation may not have input from restaurant owner. Urges conversation between landlord and tenant about impacts on the restaurant, especially concerning the awning.
 - Q: Did you do a probe of the tile?
A: No. Hoping for articulated stone to match rest of facade. Will parge it if not articulated stone.
 - Q: The lift is in the way of ordinary access. Not convinced this is the only way it can be done.
A: Agrees to make some probes and also to revisit issues about the awning. Ideally, lift should have been in another location.
 - Awnings, iron work, signage all predated the designation, but if removed, no longer grandfathered.

Committee Discussion:

- Difficult scheme. Lift will interfere with pedestrians using the stairs.
 - Appreciate the need for ADA compliance.
 - Having a vertical lift in the areaway would be a better solution.
-
- There are too many unanswered questions, especially as between landlord and restaurateur.
 - ADA accessibility using the same entrance is to be admired.

Community Board 7/ Manhattan

- Landlord needs to have agreement with the tenant about the impacts of the proposed work and its effect on signage.
- May want to explore probes into the façade.
- Explore other manufacturers who could better accommodate a narrower lift.

Architect will return on 9/8/16.

Withdrawn

213-15 West 79th Street (Broadway – Amsterdam Avenue). Application to replace two pairs of second story terrace doors in kind at street level.

Presentation by: Mary Dierickx, historic presentation consultant, and Abbas Shah, architect.

- Subject buildings are in a row of Clarence True townhouses built in the 1890s.
- Ground floors modified for stores.
- Ca. 1959, the subject buildings were combined with a single entrance, and the storefront infill was expanded.
- Main entrances feature pairs of double doors with divided light.
- Proposal to replace with painted wood.
- Using the door at 215 as the template for replacement. Slightly different divided light.
- French doors leading out to terrace above commercial infill.
- Even though the French doors were present at the time of designation, the openings were originally windows.
- Beyond the scope of Staff level approval.

Resolution to approve.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/6/16

22 West 96th Street (Central Park West). Application for window replacement.

Presentation by Matthew Viederman, architect, and Dan Sylvestor.

- Individual townhouse – project involves a duplex on the third and fourth floors of the townhouse.
- Top floor window has a double-hung window with a curved top; third floor are 1:1 rectangular windows.
- Proposal is to use fenestration that emulates the appearance of double-hung windows, but with a tilt-and-turn lower panel rather than sliding set of panels.
- Windows of this type cannot be approved at Staff level.
- Windows are painted wood.
- Plane of the top glazing is approximately even with the existing panes; the lower panels are slightly set back from the plane of the existing.
- These qualify for use in a passive house.

Resolution to approve:

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/6/16.

307 West 103rd Street (Riverside Drive – West End Avenue). Application for restoration of the front façade, rear yard addition, new windows and window replacement, and painted stucco surfacing on the rear façade.

Presentation by Peter Brotherton, architect, and Aaron Menninga.

- Townhouse – renaissance revival – ca. 1895.
- Donut is more or less intact, except a large apartment building sits directly behind the townhouse.

Front façade:

- Proposal will keep the existing blue stone in the areaway, but reconfigure it to maximize the extent of planting.
- Doors will be kept, including the existing red front door.
- Proposing to use simulated double-hung windows with the lower panel a tilt-and-turn.
- Front façade is painted a brownstone color; windows are painted a dark green. Will retain the color. Typical of the era to use dark green rather than black on the front windows.
-- recommendation to perform a paint analysis.
- Will restore original brick molds around the front windows.

Rooftop:

- Adding mechanical equipment – not visible.

Rear façade:

- Proposing a one-story infill in the L extension. The infill will be slightly recessed from the plane of the L extension. The infill will sit at the 30' depth.
- Proposing an overhang trellis across the rear facades.
- Proposing a planted green roof on top of the one-story infill of the L extension.
- Existing rear façade has two columns of punched windows up to the fourth floor, with three punched windows on the fourth floor.
- Proposal is to replace punched windows below with large picture windows on the L extension at the ground and parlor floors (6'8" x 7'4"), and a tall, thin slit punched window on the third floor, and larger punched tilt-and-turn single pane windows in a column on the back façade.
- Proposed rear façade cladding would be a simulated stucco product with 4" of "continuous" insulation, a drainage cavity, and then the synthetic stucco.
- Cladding will be smooth as compared with typical brick or stucco finishes.
- Color is a light grey.
- No joints in cladding because the joint does not perform well (allows moisture to penetrate).

- Adding a window on the east face of the L extension overlooking the top of the infill of the L extension on the parlor floor. The same east face of the L extension will also feature a series of vertical wood slits/panels running from the top of the new interior window to the top of the L extension.
- Reconstructing the roofline corbelling.
- Windows are aluminum covered wood, painted a slightly darker grey.
- Trellis is metal and wood.

Public Comment:

Joan Berton – next door neighbor.

- Share a common fence. Height of addition above the fence.
A: Appx 4’.
- Extension into the rear yard of the 1-story infill is appx 9’.
- Concern with diminution of the tiny amount of light and air that does get through to that garden space – feeling boxed in from the infill of the L extension.

Committee Comment

- Need to modulate the expanse of smooth stucco.
- Adding brick as an accent will add to the appearance.
A: But attaching brick will compromise the integrity of the insulation system.
- Stucco is a new material. Concern that this modern façade may start to look dirty or tired.
A: Trying to make a modern material look modulated cheapens the appearance.
- Rear fenestration is decidedly modern, with giant glass openings that are reminiscent of a storefront. Need some level of modulation.
- Not recommending punched windows everywhere, but perhaps there could be some way to break up the bold statement of the big plane of glass with a line or distinction, such as a mullion.
A: Important to make clear distinctions between new and old.
A: horizontal element could be possible.
- The scale of the L-extension infill seems sensitive.
- Agree that the top floor should agree with the top floors of the neighbors.
- Top floor windows on the rear façade should be 1 over 1 punched windows even if the windows below are more modern. Should also retain the window headers that currently match the windows on the rear facades to the east and west.
A: Energy efficiency concerns outweigh design appearance in this instance.
- Retaining the slit on the third floor also highlights the absence of modulation.
- Concern about the smooth stucco effect.
- The energy efficiency benefits are peculiar to the family living in the building; the aesthetics affect all neighbors.
- Is it possible to find cladding that would have a more variegated appearance?

- Agree that the top row of windows should have headers and 1 over 1 to match the neighbors.
- Opposed to the rear addition infilling even a small amount in an intact row.
- Even a single story infill can easily become an invitation to add on top. Destroying the rhythm is a slippery slope.
- Intention not to use the green roof above the 1-story addition adds to concerns.
- Large openings while modern materially change the void to solid ratio, especially since the large glass planes are unmodulated.
- Front façade restoration, while reviewed at Staff level, is to be commended – will reunite the building with its neighbors.
- Endorses the desire to be more energy efficient.
- Use of modern materials and design can be appropriate in an historic rear yard, but the design must make it correlate to the Historic District.
- Need to show a bit more of what is expected to be a good neighbor in the group.

Application is being held over to Preservation on September 8th.

No action taken.

340 Riverside Drive (West 106th Street). Application for window replacement.

Presentation by David Obuchowski, architect.

- Most windows in the unit have already been replaced with tilt-and-turn casement windows.
- Three windows in the unit remain 1 over 1 double-hung.
- Proposed windows are aluminum grey-brown to match adjacent windows in the unit.
- Building has been using the same manufacturer, same color.

Committee Comment:

- Building should develop a master plan.

Resolution to approve with a recommendation for the building to develop a master plan.

VOTE: 4-0-0-0.

Calendared 9/6/16.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm.

Land Use Committee Joint with the Housing Committee Meeting Minutes

August 17, 2016

The meeting was called to order by Land Use Co-Chair Page Cowley and Housing Co-Chair Polly Spain.

Present:

Land Use Committee Members: Page Cowley, Co-Chair, Louisa Craddock, Sheldon J. Fine, Jeanette Rausch, Peter Samton, and Roberta Semer

Housing Committee Members: Polly Spain, Co-Chair, Robert Espier, Madelyn Innocent, Audrey Isaacs, Jeanette Rausch, and Susan Schwartz

Non-Committee Members of CB7: Klari Neuwelt

Agenda

1. **75 West End Avenue**, New York Sports Club (West 62nd – 63rd Streets.) Application #149-95-BZ to the Board of Standards and Appeals by TSI West End, LLC to extend the term of the previously granted special permit allowing the operation of a physical culture establishment (PCE) at the above subject premises. The extension will be for an additional ten-year term from the expiration of the previous grant on July 30, 2016.

The representing the applicant, TSI West End, LLC, was Frederick Becker, attorney for the applicant. The application is a request for a further ten-year permit. The original application was approved for Crunch Gym in 1996, which was taken over and became the New York Sports Club in 2004.

Page Cowley asked only two questions: Had their exercise program changed to include equipment and fitness regimes that created increased noise? And had there been any complaints from the residents adjacent to or above the present fitness space. Mr. Becker responded “no” to both questions.

There were no other CB7 attending committee member or other board member comments. There were no members of the public commenting on this item.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Land Use Committee **approves** of the request for continued operation of a physical Culture establishment/health club for New York Sports Club at 75 West End Avenue (West 62nd – 63rd Streets) for application #149-95-BZ to the Board of Standards and Appeals by TSI West End, LLC.

Land Use Committee: 6-0-0-0

Non-Committee Board Members: 3-0-0-0

2. **Riverside Center.** Applications by GID to HPD for Affordable Housing plans for:
 - 30 Riverside Boulevard (West 61st Street), Building #1
 - 10 Riverside Boulevard (59th Street), Building #3
 - 633-647 West 59th Street (Freedom Place), Building #4.

Kenneth K. Lowenstein Esq., Partner at Holland & Knight, representing The General Investment & Development Companies (GID) gave a brief history of the site. In summary, Mr. Lowenstein

Community Board 7/ Manhattan

explained the contemporary developmental history of the site, originally envisioned with different uses of an undefined nature in the early 1990's. The approximately eight -acre site was redesigned in its entirety in 2010 with comprehensive changes made to the entire complex by Atelier Christian De Portzamparc, as part of a unique planning concept with a central park in lieu of west 60th street that incorporated unusual architectural styled buildings under the then ownership of Extell Development Company. The project, including these three sites listed above, would include on site affordable housing. These three sites were recently sold and with the sale the individual building parcels were re-designed. Goldstein Hill and West became the architect of record for the three buildings and three replacement design architects were retained to create the three individual apartment towers. All three projects were described as conforming with the Portzamparc design envelope as planned with the park / open space continuing with the original landscape design by Mathews Neilsen Landscape Architects. The affordable housing all remains on-site.

Mr. Lowenstein described the basic facts for each building followed by Mr. John Gagnier, Senior Vice President of GID who delved into the specifics of each building describing the housing percentages of condos, rental at market rate and affordable housing units as follows:

Condominium units:	263
Market rate rentals:	603
<u>Affordable units</u>	<u>270</u>
Total number of units:	1,136

Each building has two entrances leading to a linked lobby, so there is no distinction as to which entrance is used, but there are separate concierge desks, mail and package rooms and elevator banks for the rental tenants and condo owners respectively. The waiting areas in the lobby zones can be used by anyone. In terms of the level of design within the apartments, all rental units will have stainless steel appliances, washers and dryers and have identical air conditioning and heating systems. The average square foot of the affordable housing units are over 1,000 sq. ft. and more than 50% of the affordable units will be two bedrooms or larger.

As to the extent and level of building amenity the follow chart was presented:

Amenity	Rental (Landlord maintained)	Condo (Ownership maintained)	Shared*
Lounge/lobby areas	✓	✓	Lounge Areas
Media Games Room	✓	✓	Fitness Areas
Outdoor terrace	✓	✓	Children's Play Room
Dining/Party Room	✓	✓ [?]	Pool

* Available for an additional monthly fee to non-condo owners. The developer explained that the cost of these amenities and the member cost had not yet been calculated and that occupants of affordable units will be offered a discount.

Specific facts of each building were then stated by Mr. John Gagnier as follows:

Building 1: 30 Riverside Boulevard is designed by Kohn Pederson & Fox

160 condominium apartments (floors 19 to 37)
333 market rate rental units (floors 3 to 24)

157 affordable units not exceeding 60 % of the AMI with these apartments dispersed among the rental portion of the building.

The square footage allocation equates to 860,068 of residential sq. ft with 171,972 (20%) set aside for affordable housing and 688,096 sq. ft of non-affordable housing.

Building 3: 10 Riverside Boulevard is designed by Richard Meier Architects

56 condominium apartments
152 market rate rentals
64 affordable units not exceeding 60% of the AMI with these apartments dispersed among the rental portion of the building.

The square footage allocation equates to 406,501 of residential sq. ft. with 84,870 sq. ft. (21%) set aside for affordable housing and 321,631 sq. ft. of non-affordable housing.

Building 4: 633-647 West 59th Street (Freedom Place) is designed by Rafael Vinoly Architects

47 condominium apartments
118 market rate rentals
49 affordable units not exceeding 60% of the AMI with these apartments dispersed among the rental portion of the building.

The square footage allocation equates to 310,918 of residential sq. ft. with 62,558 sq. ft. (20%) set aside for affordable housing and 248,360 sq. ft. of non-affordable housing.

In the following discussion, the definition and matters relating to "affordable housing," the issues regarding who and how these costs compiled and who or which agency regulates them -- as a percentage based on income, size of the unit or number of occupants per unit -- are both a moral and ethical concerns.

The following questions were asked by Committee and Board Members present:

1. You described the platform that the buildings are constructed over the train tracks. What is underneath? And can you go underground between each apartment tower, say as a convenience or short cut?

Response: No

2. There are two entrances, but then two lobbies within each building. How is that not two doors?
Response: There are different types of ownership. The condos need to be separated because there are shareholders and this piece of real estate is owned and maintained differently than the rental units, which have a common single owner and different maintenance requirements. There needs to be two concierge areas to be able to serve each type of residential tenant or owner.
3. Will the doors be identified in a different way, say different building numbers? How will someone know where to go or be directed?
Response: This is way that we can provide a common lobby area within the building. The lobby is decorated with the same finishes, furniture art work, lighting etc. so there is no differentiation as to the appearance of the lobby once inside.
4. There were many remarks about adding signage and way finding which was taken as a bad thing. Also how to access the elevators etc. that were perhaps not clearly thought through. Many comments included trying to keep the elevator banks in the same location. For Building 1, this is easier to design and manage the different types of occupants as the condos are located in a tower at one end of the building so it made sense to keep this access somewhat separated as the elevator goes from 26 to the roof for the condos, by-passing the lower levels. Elsewhere the elevators only need to go to floor 25.
5. For Buildings 3 & 4 the lobby is much smaller for both types of residences and it appears to duplicate the same doorman/ concierge functions. Again there were suggestions to eliminate and have a single bank of elevators and a single concierge desk, package room etc. There was no easy answer because of the ownership and management issues.
6. There was a series of questions about the building addresses for each tower and this needed to be researched and reported back to the Community Board. While the Borough President can assign the address, a separate address would highlight the distinction between the types of residents in each tower as renters or owners.
7. Why do we need separate numbers or addresses? Many mixed tenanted types of buildings do not have this issue.
Response: Existing buildings that are changing ownership and converting from market rate to condos are de facto existing configurations and layouts and can be designated by unit. In new building construction, the building is starting out as combined building with different ownership for the renters and owners.
8. There were several comments regarding the free-form architectural styles of each respective building and that the actual design treatment of the entrances and the locations of the elevators were frankly moot, as residents will know where and which part of the building their residence exists, and visitors can approach either concierge desk for directions. Mail and packages will be sorted and find their right holding areas.

9. The amenities, particularly the pool and children's play area should all be paid for by the developer and available to all tenants - owners or renters, without a fee.

In the compilation of the resolution the following criteria was agreed:

First the joint committees have agreed that there be a single resolution that covers all three projects and that each building is not subject to a separate resolution, as they all have the same issues and the same resulting concerns. Additionally, there is no comment as to the architectural design merit of each respective building.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Land Use Committee and the Housing Committee agree to a **conditional resolution for approval** unless the following information is not provided before the Full Board meeting on September 6, 2015:

1. That the developer provide both the square footage and the number of units of each type including the distribution of the affordable housing for each building and that these totals is not less than previously required in the original ULURP application.
2. That the developer considers with great care and confirms no distinguishing address, signage, differentiation at the entrance doors to the common lobby and no supplemental interior signage to call attention to the mixed use residential ownerships within each tower.
3. That the developer confirm and disclose the cost and fees on any shared amenities and the options available to renters and affordable housing tenants as to the ability to take advantage of these special services/amenities. In addition, that the developer memorializes in writing that should the buildings be subjected to a future sale that the stated fees and the formula for determining such fees to access the building amenities by tenants of the affordable housing units will remain in place; as to not cause them undo financial hardship.
4. That in the design of these three buildings, which will set a precedent in our community, that these developments and any future buildings with both owners and renters that there be an equity of service and amenity in the entirety of the design, where ever possible. While these towers have integrated the housing within a single building envelope and the entrance level may look uniform in appearance, access and shared facilities must have no differentiation and be the same. The developer is further requested to revise the design of the lobbies and reduce redundant elevators and duplicate concierge desks to provide combined and not separated areas within the lobby area.

Housing Committee: 4-2-0-0

Land Use Committee: 6-0-0-0

3. A brief update was provided regarding Congregation Shearith Israel regarding the Land Use Committee resolution that will stand as voted upon at the July meeting. The resolution has been circulated to the committee for review and comment. No pre-meeting is being considered and comments can be made by board members at the Full Board. Members of the public that attended the meeting and were concerned that there be sufficient time to ask questions and comment. A suggestion put forward which was considered appropriate is that each point of view be able to present their opinion and comment - both those in favor and likely to represent the congregation and applicant as well as those who oppose and represent the immediate neighborhood and community historic preservation concerns. This suggestion will be forwarded to the CB7 Chair, Elizabeth Caputo for consideration. Any announcements regarding the format for the Full board will be posted on the CB7 website.
4. A new concern brought to the Community Board 7 Office is Shaare Zedek, located at 212 West 93rd Street, and the reports that the synagogue has been sold and will be demolished for a new community facility and luxury housing development. A representative, Ronna Glaser, from the West Nineties Neighborhood Coalition, with seven other concerned members of this group, provided a statement regarding their position and the impact that the loss of this potentially eligible historic building will have on the community. Their summary statement and photographs were distributed at the close of the meeting along with photographs. Their position was very compelling.

Several Land Use and Housing Committee members asked questions and offered suggestions as to how to assist with contacting the owner of the land and notification and outreach within the preservation community including the Landmarks Commission and the Landmarks Conservancy. A letter from Peg Breen to the LPC had been sent to request reconsideration for designation of the building. Members of this group wanted to attend the Full Board and share their concerns at the Full Board. Penny Ryan, our District Manager has been communicating with Ms. Glaser and is aware of the immediate pressures and limited timeframe to attempt a rescue of this building from demolition.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Polly Spain and Page Cowley