BROOKLYN COMMUNITY BOARD 6 LANDMARKS/LAND USE COMMITTEE JANUARY 28, 2016

| ATTENDANCE: PRESENT: | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------|
| J. ARMER | P. BLAKE | D. BRIGGS |
| P. FLEMING | A. FREEMAN | R. FREEMAN |
| G. KELLY | D. KUMMER | R. LEVINE |
| S. LONIAL | M. MURPHY | M. RACIOPPO |
| A. REEVES | D. SCOTTO | M. SHAMES |
| J. THOMPSON | | |
| | | |
| EXCUSED: | | |
| T. MISKEL | R. SLOANE | |
| | | |
| ABSENT: | | |
| V. HAGMAN | Y. LEE | |
| | | |
| GUESTS: | | |
| K. MEISTER | L. SHAHON | J. CASSON |
| M. CASSON | D. MILLNER | A. SCHULMAN |
| W. HUAG | L. BURR | J. MELLON |
| M.BARRISH | | |

** MINUTES **

Presentation and review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a one-story rear yard extension and rooftop railings at 69A 7th Avenue (between Lincoln/Berkeley Places), Park Slope Historic District.

Applicant returned after erecting the mock-up on the roof.

- Proposal is to extend into rear yard to make the commercial part of the building more monetarily viable.
- No change to existing façade. Current owner actually fixed the illegal changes that had been made by the previous owner and has restored it to its' original landmark façade.
- Character of the block is commercial 1st floor use.

Proposal is to extend the 1st floor to the extent of the rear yard - also needs to install railings on roof as DOB code requires a railing due to relocation of mechanicals to the roof from the rear yard. Extension will match rear façade brick. Can't see the railing from any point. Rear extension will be visible by 1 foot over existing fences from the back yards.

Q. Peter Fleming: Will there be recreational use on the rear yard roof (1st Floor)?

A: No, any use would require a Certificate of Occupancy.

Q: Community comment: Submit letter stating it is a "terrible" idea from former property owner. Will change rear yards for all adjacent properties and "ruin" donut.

Community: LPC will take into account that this exists and could justify them to start approving other like projects which could compromise character of the rear yards of the Historic District.

Debra Scotto: If all commercial properties (7th Avenue) filled in lot, it would not affect the donut.

Neighbor: This is not correct and representation is inaccurate. Outraged by deck on the first floor roof - is not neighborly. Extension will create noise from rear yard of restaurant that neighbors it.

Debra Scotto: The ³/₄ inches between the rear extension and adjoining property is problematic. Can you create some flexible cover to protect the space?

Applicant: We can look into it.

Peter Fleming: Precedential argument doesn't apply because odd stretch of 7^{th} Avenue allows it – so it will not undermine character of Landmark District.

Community: Against the project

Community: Rear extension that exist pre-dated land marking so should not be viewed as why it should be allowed. Community: Against

Community: Many letters sent against project.

Daniel Kummer: The reason it is before us is the preservation of the donut and we have made decisions based on that. And, in this case, there is a "pristine" sense of the rear yards and it is incumbent on us to continue to protect them and motion to disapprove.

Jerry Armer: Seconded the motion.

Debra Scotto: We shouldn't deny this, donuts and back yards are silly for us to rule on and there is legal FAR due to the commercial overlay.

Bill: This proposal is reasonable and is allowable.

Peter Fleming: Is it commercial impinging on landmark or visa versa?

Sayar Lonial: Can we view this as a landmark issue with the understanding that commercial overlay allows it?

Bob Levine: Donut doesn't start until after commercial.

Jerry Armer: Must look at donut in its entirety but since there are non-commercial properties adjacent, vote to disapprove.

VOTE: 4.....YEAS 7.....NAYS 4.....ABSTENTIONS

Jerry Armer: Motion was made to approve as presented. David Briggs seconded. Bob Levine added -2^{nd} floor roof can't be used. Applicant accepted.

VOTE; 10.....YEAS 1.....NAYS 4.....ABSTENTIONS MOTION PASSED

Presentation and review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a two-story rear yard extension with deck at 620 6th Street (between 8th Avenue/Prospect Park West), Park Slope Historic District.

Applicant sent digital designs to the Board prior to the meeting. Notice was not given to the community. Decision to table due to lack of notice.

The minutes of the previous meeting held on January 7, 2016 approved unanimously

Motion to adjourn was made at 7:22PM. The minutes were submitted by Sayar Lonial.