FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Beverly Donohue, Chair
December 6, 2022 at 6:30PM via Zoom
The meeting can be viewed in its entirety at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GkM2QfLnsiw

Present*:* Beverly Donohue, Chair; Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Alex Bell, Kristen Berger, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Joshua Cohen, Christian Cordova, Kevin Corte, Kenneth Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Robert Espier, Sheldon Fine, Sonia Garcia, Audrey Isaacs, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Blanche Lawton, Sara Lind, Ira Mitchneck, Klari Neuwelt, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Seema Reddy, Andrew Rigie, Madge Rosenberg, Melissa Rosenberg, Peter Sampton, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer, Ethel Sheffer, Polly Spain, Erana Stennett, Anthony Thomas, Benjamin Wu. **Absent:** Daniela Alvarado, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Kristina Villarini, Howard Yaruss. **Board Office:** Maxwell vandervliet, Jessie Nieves and Alexandra Crawford.

Chair's Report:

- Beverly Donohue convened the meeting promptly at 6:30PM.
- New appointments were announced: Sonia Garcia, to co-chair Health & Human Services Committee; Mark Diller to co-chair Transportation Committee; Susan Schwartz to co-chair Parks & Environment Committee.
- Called on Ethel Sheffer to briefly discuss a new project she's been developing with her called Designing Streets that Work, a public safety project addressing public space.
- Changing the Public Safety Issues Task Force to a standing committee. Polly Spain and William Ortiz will continue as co-chairs and are soliciting those interested to contact them with reasons why they want to join the committee and what they can bring to it.
- The Bylaws Task Force will reconvene with a changed focus re: operational issues and will meet this month.
- Acknowledged the work Ken Coughlin has done along with the Chair regarding the helicopter issue, which included testifying, writing letters to elected officials, etc.
- Wished Happy Holidays to all.

District Manager's Report:

- Maxwell Vandervliet reported there has been an extension for virtual meetings until December 20th.
- He thanked Tevin Williams, who is leaving Senator Hoylman's office, for all his help and said he was wonderful to work with.
- The office is doing more calendar planning regarding holidays, and will send it out to all co-chairs when completed. Susan Schwartz was acknowledged for preparing a comprehensive list for the office.
- He introduced Alex (Alexandra) Crawford, who is a new staff member at the CB7 District Board office. Her experience includes working in the CB6/Manhattan District Board office. She is born and raised on the Upper West Side and said it was great to be back.

Public Session: *(began at 7PM)*

- The following elected officials and their reps were present and spoke (their remarks may be found on the YouTube of this meeting-link above):
- Senator Brad Hoylman; Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal; Assembly Member Daniel O'Donnell; Council Member Gale Brewer; Erik Cuello (Manhattan Borough President Mark Levine's office); Emmitt Sklar (Council Member Shaun Abreu's office); Hannah Weinerman (Congressman Jerry Nadler's office); Estelle Strykers Santiago (Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg's office); Sophia Secor (Senator Jose Serrano's office).
- Members of the public who spoke, included:
- Marianna Singh; Kaitlin Campbell; Monica Blum; Kate Madigan; Zach Campbell; Shelly Fine; Merritt Birnbaum; Anthony Perz; Christopher Tillotson; Giuseppe Tallini; Jack Bernatovicz; Dale Brown; George Morillo; Susan Morillo; Sonia Garcia.

Business Session *(began at 8:18PM)*
Parks & Environment Committee*, Natasha Kazmi & Susan Schwartz, Co-chairs*

1. Re: Riverside Park, reconstruction of several features between West 107th and112th Streets and the introduction of five new pickle ball courts.

WHEREAS, the site of this project is West 107th Street to West 112th Street within Riverside Park, immediately adjacent to the Henry Hudson Parkway (the "Site"); and WHEREAS, the project will improve paving conditions and accessibility, improve site drainage, reduce asphalt and enhance permeability of the Site, reconstruct the bluestone step ramp, replace the existing steel panel fence, install benches, and install sealcoat for five new pickleball courts; and

WHEREAS, the Site is an area that has not been restored in decades, and is difficult to be productively used by the public in its current condition; and

WHEREAS, the project is expected to be completed by middle of summer 2024; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan enthusiastically **approves** this project, which is much needed to enhance and improve the quality of visitor experience in this area of the park, as well as to make productive use of an area that is currently little used by the public.

Vote: 37-0-0-0

Joint with **Transportation Committee***, Andrew Albert and Mark Diller, Co-Chairs)*

2. Re: NYC Council legislation to replace horse drawn carriages in Central Park with horse-less electric carriages.

The following facts were taken into consideration:

In July 2022, Queens NYC Council Member Robert Holden introduced a bill that would replace the 68 horse carriages in Central Park with 68 electric carriages by June 1, 2024, thereby winding down the horses in the park and replacing them with electric vehicles. Holden's bill, Intro 573, is the latest in a long string of proposals to retire Central Park's horses. This resolution is in response to that proposed legislation. As of June 27, 2018, private and for-hire vehicles were banned from Central Park, reserving the paved roadways for runners, walkers, cyclists, skaters, pedicabs, horse carriages, as well as NYPD, Central Park Conservancy, Department of Parks and Recreation, and other NYC agency vehicles, some of which may be electric. Cars, NYC taxis, and other private and for-hire vehicles are only permitted in Central Park with prior authorization. The only for-hire vehicles permitted in Central Park are pedicabs and horse-drawn carriages. It is against the law for electric, non-electric, or motorized vehicles to operate on the Central Park roadways, but these appear with increasing frequency, especially delivery workers. Community Board 7 / Manhattan acknowledges the history of our city's iconic horse carriages in Central Park and their important role for New York City's tourism, commerce and history. Horse-drawn carriages have been in Central Park since it first opened in 1858; designer Frederick Law Olmsted created the pathways so carriages could animate the landscape for visitors. The horse-carriage drivers are represented by Transport Workers Union Local 100. According to their website, not a single horse has been killed in a traffic accident in the last 15 years. New regulations enacted in recent years have increased safety further. The horses are subject to some of the most extensive safety regulations in the country, and are overseen by five city agencies, including the Department of Health and the NYPD Mounted Police Unit. For example, carriage horses are not permitted to work in extreme heat or cold, in addition to other health and safety requirements.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan is **opposed** to the proposed legislation, Intro 573, which calls for a wind down of horse-drawn carriages in Central Park and the replacement of the horses with electric vehicles.

Vote: 36-2-2-0

Business & Consumer Issues Committee, *Christian Cordova and Benjamin Wu, Co-Chairs*

3. Re: 286 Columbus Avenue (West 73rd – 74th Street.)

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan **approves** alteration application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by Kissaki UWS, LLC d/b/a To Be Determined. The proposed alteration is for an expansion to vacant adjoining space.

Vote: 36-2-2-0

Preservation Committee, *K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairs*

4. Re: 520 West End Avenue (West 85th Street.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for legalization of the construction, maintenance, and use of three (3) double metal garbage enclosures on the north Sidewalk of West 85th Street in front of the side yard.

The resolution is based upon the following facts:

1) The issue is the placement of three (3) large trash enclosures on West 85th Street, between WEA and Broadway. The location is on the side street, and they are currently placed on the sidewalk set back from the thoroughfare but outside the wall enclosure.
2) The committee was informed that DOT has cited this placement as an encroachment of the public thoroughfare.
3) The concern is the unsightliness of this array of black garbage enclosures in plain sight of and adjacent to the individual landmark and listed within the historic district at 520 West End Avenue.
4) The discussion focused on the number of the bins and whether these could be placed behind the low brick wall within the property and rolled out to the street for pick-up during collection days. The yard enclosed by the brick wall is currently used by a school.

5) The discussion followed as to the number and size of the bins and if a different color or within an operable screen / gate could camouflage the bins, still making them accessible to drop garbage at the top via a flexible lid.
6) Other means to maintain the area and cleanliness were suggested and included daily hosing the area and bins (full or empty), painting the bin cover a different color, as well as selecting a different type of receptacle that was also rat and roach proof.
7) The issue for the Preservation Committee is whether the committee would have approved these bins and their placement if the applicant originally came before the committee before placing the bins in the current location.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan **disapproves** this application as inappropriate to the character of the Historic District and Historic Building.
Vote: 35-0-1-0

5. Re: 471 West End Avenue (West 82nd - 83rd streets.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for front and rear facade restoration, refenestration, replacement and refurbishment, and the expansion of an existing rooftop addition.*
This resolution is based upon the following facts:

1) The subject building is within the Riverside Drive West End Historic District Extension 1 Upper West Side Historic District, and the project was introduced as an "as-of-right project" regarding zoning, as such does not need to comply with street-wall requirements.
2) The building in this application, constructed in 1885-1886 with alteration in 1912-1913 is a rowhouse designed by McKim Mead & White.
3) Originally three stories and a basement, a fourth story was added in 1912. The fire escape and roof railing were probably added in the 1930s when the building was converted into a multiple-family dwelling. The house appears as it did at the time of the 1939-40 tax photograph.
4) The exterior scope of work presented includes the following: general restorative facade repairs /repointing (brick and terracotta), restoration of the two the lower street facades, replacement of the lower floor windows at the entry level, mansard roof replacement/repair in copper, redesign of a sloped glazed window centered at the upper level of the roof facing the street, as well as a one-story addition. The rear facade is proposed to be all reconstructed in a new design as a "rain screen" with new wood replacement sash windows at the extended and uniform facade (no setbacks).
5) There are a few material changes with this alteration and addition:
    - The roof slates are to be replaced with copper roofing
    - The windows facing the street are proposed to be metal framed "Crittall" windows
    - Substitute patching material to simulate the sandstone at the street facade
    - New uniformly sized windows at the rear also by "Crittall"
    - In lieu of removal of the non-original stucco, the proposed scope includes a wythe of brick to cover the non-original facing
    - The additional floor and full height rear extensions are to be used for new spaces including a terrace and gymnasium among other enlargements of rooms at the basement level, an extension at the parlor floor and a new additional rooftop floor that is not visible from the street December 2022 Resolutions Page 3 of 4 Community Board 7/ Manhattan
6) The applicant described the precedents of the restoration and new work taken from adjacent brownstone details.
7) The new HVAC equipment and condensers are proposed to be at the new 5th floor rear level.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan **approves** this application as appropriate to the character of the Historic District as follows:

a. The scope of work for this project was approved as presented, conditional on the proposed new additions and window placement not interfering with existing apartment building windows, pending additional information relating to the rear yard placement of new windows in the extended rear facade and the location of rooftop HVAC equipment and mitigation efforts to reduce noise and heat during operation.
b. New window placement at the rear facade and in the narrow alley between the two properties that may impact noise and privacy close to the existing apartment windows needs consideration and confirmation that light and air will not be compromised or diminished and that the current conditions of light, air and privacy /

proximity will remain as existing. We suggest that there be further discussion between the new owner and those neighboring apartments potentially impact seek a mutually agreeable solution.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan:

- approves the portion of this application pertaining to the Annex's rooftop addition and the Main's window replacements; and
- disapproves the addition of the rooftop privacy screens as inappropriate to the character of the Historic District and Historic buildings.

Note that the votes on this Resolution were broken into three components:

A. Façade, **Approve**: 29-5-0-0.
B. Roof, **Approve**: 24-9-1-0.
C. Rear yard, **Disapprove** (based on bulk, material, configuration & height) 27-5-3-0.

6. Re: 340-344 West 72nd Street, Chatsworth Apartments & Annex (Riverside Blvd and West End Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a renewal and revision of a prior Certificate of Appropriateness for: a. window replacements and restoration of cresting and cornice elements at both the main and annex buildings constituting the Chatsworth b. construction of rooftop elements (pergolas, privacy screens, etc.) c. construction and expansion of an existing rooftop addition.

This resolution is based upon the following facts:

A. The Chatsworth Apartments consist of two adjacent buildings (Main and Annex) in the Beaux-Arts style designed by John Scharsmith and built in 1905-06. The buildings are individually designated landmarks and within the West End-Collegiate Historic District Extension and have a unique location at the foot of Riverside Drive and Riverside Park at 72nd street.
B. This application was presented as three separate scopes of work:
    1) Review and Approval of Window Replacements (on Main);
    2) A Roof top Element consisting of privacy screens (on Main and Annex); and
    3) A Rooftop Addition (on Annex).
C. This presentation was an update on the restoration participants and the status of the scope of work to be undertaken or completed. The applicant appeared before the Preservation Committee on December 3, 2013 wherein the rooftop additions on the north and south towers of the main building were disapproved as inappropriate to the historic character of the building and the Historic district; the rooftop additions to the annex were disapproved as inappropriate to the historic character of the building and the Historic district; the façade and cornice restoration work and the window replacement program were approved as reasonably appropriate to the historic buildings and the Historic District; and the conversion of several ground floor windows into doors was found to be inappropriate to the character of the historic buildings and Historic District.
D. The chronology of actions was noted by the applicant as follows:
    - 2013: Initial presentation and filing: 2013;
    - 2015- 2019: Work started under then ownership/leadership of HFZ and ultimately went bankrupt; and
    - 2020: Work resumes on the property but the work now includes restoration and improvements to both the Main apartment building and the Annex.
E. The current scope of work was stated as follows: Work at the roof of both buildings, Modifying the configuration of divided-lite windows on the façade of the Main building to awning windows, access to private apartments via roof additions; addition of a Pergola(s), Restoration and replication of the Cheneaux (Eaves-gutter with the profile of an elaborate cornice; also, an ornamented crest, as on the ridge of a roof, or associated with a gutter at the eaves).
F. The lower three floors would be re-fitted and/or restored as wood window sashing conforming to the original configuration. All other windows from the fourth floor and above will be in aluminum to replicate the operation and details, where feasible, in aluminum.
G. The privacy screens will be 8'-0" and only at the penthouse level on Main and Annex and will not increase the size of those apartments.
H. And, A 6'-0" set back at all pipe railings, which is only visible in the winter months.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan **disapproves** the application largely based on late submission of documents and inadequate information that was received after the committee had met.
Vote; 29-0-1-0

Transportation Committee, *Andrew Albert & Mark Diller, Co-Chairs*

7. Re: West 64th Street and West End Avenue, Project ID HWPR20MXC Location #16 by the Division of Infrastructure at the Department of Design and Construction for non-standard pedestrian ramp upgrades including curbs and sidewalk reconstruction, pavement markings, street lighting, and traffic signal work.

(Note that there was an amendment made by Ken Coughlin, which was voted on but failed by a vote of 12-13-4-0.)

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 / Manhattan **endorses** bump outs at West 64th Street and West End Avenue as a desirable change on behalf of the community, looking at the feasibility and incorporating it into the design plan.
Vote: 24-3-2-0

With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to end the meeting at 10:39PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Adler & Linda Alexander, Co-Secretaries

PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons
December 8, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

Present: K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairs; Jay Adolf, Page Cowley, Mark Diller, Klari Neuwelt, Madge Rosenberg, and Peter Samton. **Chair:** Beverly Donohue. **Non-Committee Board Members:** Robert Espier and Doug Kleiman (Vice Chair). **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

The Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, September 8, 2022, via the Zoom online platform. The meeting was called to order promptly at 6:30 pm by Preservation Co-Chairs Michele Parker and K Karpen.

The following discussions were had, and actions taken.

Re: 61 West 70th Street (Central Park West – Columbus Avenue). **Application #LPC-23-00406 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for (a) modification of the main entrance and area way to comply with accessibility requirements, and (b) an expanded rooftop addition and modifications to the rear façade.**

The subject building is 4-story plus basement townhouse constructed ca. 1890-91 in the Queen Anne and Renaissance Revival styles by architect Charles Buek. It is included in the Upper West Side – Central Park West Historic District. The front façade is primarily composed of smooth painted stone on the basement and parlor floors, and common red brick above, with stone lintels and details surrounding the windows on the second, third and fourth floors. There is a squared-edge bay window protruding from the second floor.

The stoop was removed pre-designation (ca. 1969), and the main entrance is through an enlarged areaway doorway leading to an internal hallway and stairs.

Presentation by: Yossi Melamed, architect.

Front Façade – Accessible Entrance

- Purpose of the front façade work is to install an ADA accessible entrance.
- An exterior ramp that meets ADA standards cannot fit in the areaway of the building, and an external lift is not permitted in this instance.
- The proposal is to raise the front door so that the lower transom is 2 feet higher than its current configuration and add a ramp down from the sidewalk through the areaway to a landing even with the raised front door.
- The existing non-original front door includes divided light panels flanked by tall, thin side lights on the rightside, and with a transom above.
- The proposal is to replace the existing door configuration with double doors with glass panels and retaining the side light. Raising the level of the door to meet the ramp will eliminate the transom in order to keep the top line of the doorway at its current level – even with the windows to the east. The materials for the proposed double doors will be wood with glass panels congifured to emulate the original doors on townhouses across the street.
- The project also includes modifying the pavers in the entrance areaway to serve as a ramp up to landing at front door; then adding a ramp inside the building to complete the rise to the elevator landing.
- The project will retain and repair the existing planter at edge of the areaway.

Rooftop Addition

- The existing condition consists of a penthouse with an elevator overrun above.
- The elevator overrun is clad in stucco to contrast from the primary and rear main facades.
- The proposal is to extend the penthouse to the rear. The proposal is to double the size by extending the rooftop addition to the rear to be coplanar with the main rear façade and set back from the rear façade of the existing L extension.
- Not visible from any public way.

<u>Committee Comments and Questions</u>:

Madge:

- Q: How will the ramp be congifured?
- A: The ramp will slope down from the sidewalk then upward to meet the stairs in the new lobby.
- Q: Will the building remain a multi-family dwelling?
- A: Yes

Klari:

- Q: Will the ramp slope down from the sidewalk lot line to a raised landing?
- A: Yes.
- Q: Is the sidelight at the front door still needed with glass panels in the door?
- A: The owners want want more light in hallway.
- Need to correct the drawing to properly reflect the sidelight.
- Q: How will the larger penthouse be situated?
- A: It will be set back 11 feet from the rear façade.

- Concern that the right side of the new penthouse is coplanar with the rear façade below.
- A: Will consider adding a continuation of the coping stones below the new penthouse windows to continue the line distinguishing the main rear façade from the addition.

Jay:
- Front doors – suggest adding grillework to doors to replicate the existing grilles on the areaway window guards.
- Concerns regarding window configurations are personal preferences not relating to appropriateness.

Page:
- Q: How will the existing planter in the areaway be repaired?
- A: Will be repaired and increased to a 24" height.
- Concern for narrow ramp with railings flanking – hard to get sofa into the building.
- Cabinets in rooftop kitchen will obscure the view from the rear casement windows.

Mark:
- Concern for the inclusion of a glass rail at the front façade.
- Q: Are the existing casement windows on the main rear façade being replaced?
- A: No – retaining existing fenestration below the addition.
- Q: Will the project add a railing on the L-extension terrace?
- A: The current parapet is deep and may be sufficient for Code. The right part of new penthouse will be co-planar with the floors below.

Resolution: Resolution to approve as presented with recommendations to (a) expand front door glazing and eliminate sidelight; and (b) continue coping stones between the coplanar rear façade.
VOTE: *Committee: 5-3-0-0; Non-Committee Board Member: 2-0-0-0 .*

Re: 400 West End Avenue, Apartment 7A (West 79th – 80th Streets)**. Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a certificate of appropriateness for window replacement.**

The subject building is an 18-story plus penthouse apartment building in the Art Deco style constructed ca. 1930-31 by architects Margon and Holder. It is located in the Riverside Drive - West End Historic District Extension I. Its two primary facades (facing West 79th Street and West End Avenue) are principally composed of dark red brick with a two-story stone base, stone details on individual windows on upper floors, a decorative stone surround to the main entrance, and other decorative elements.

The applicant's proposal concerns windows in the West 79th Street and West End Avenue facades.

Presentation by: David Mabbott, architect.
- Original condition was steel casement windows with divided light – two operable divided light windows flanked by sidelights and with transom above.
- The existing condition consists of non-original aluminum 1:1 double-hung replacement windows that have outlived their useful life.
- The applicant's apartment includes 6 windows facing WEA; 5 windows facing W 79th.
- Proposed windows will include a more historic and detailed brick mold. The window color will have a dark bronze anodized finish. The proposed windows will be 1:1 double-hung that will mimick the existing aluminum dimensions (but will not be an exact match because due to changes in manufacturing processes with modern aluminum windows.
- Proposing windows with aluminum cladding on the exterior with wood on the interior. Proposing Colby High Performance windows.
- LPC previously approved (ca. 2019) similar 1:1 double-hung windows on the 15th floor of this building. Expects other owners will make similar applications going forward.

Klari:
- Q: Is it correct that no original windows remain?
- A: Correct. Aware of the 15th Floor replacement – no other record.

Michele:
- Q: Useful life of the proposed replacement windows?
- A: 60-70 years.

Mark:
- The original windows were much more beautiful and were an important part of the façade, but since none remain, it would be folly to require this one applicant to revert to the original, especially given the previous LPC approvals.

Page:
- Good choice of window manufacturer and model.

Peter:
- Q: How do these proposed windows relate to others on the façade?
- A: Aluminum exterior will look the same.

Resolution: Approve as presented
After deliberation and discussion, a motion to approve the application as presented was made, seconded and adopted.
VOTE: *Committee: 8-0-0-0; Non-Committee Board Member: 2-0-0-0.*
Calendared at LPC 1/10/23.

Re: 340-44 West 72nd Street "The Chatsworth" (Riverside Drive). **Application #LPC-23-04483 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for the renewal and revision of a previously issued and expired certificate of appropriateness to construct a rooftop addition.**

The application concerns The Chatsworth, a complex of interconnected apartment buildings constructed ca. 1902-06 in the Beaux-Arts style by architect John. E. Scharsmith. The main Chatsworth apartment building (344 West 72nd Street) is a 12-story apartment building. The companion building known as the Annex (340 West 72nd Street) is an 8-story tower linked to the main Chatsworth building at the base.

The Chatsworth is an individual landmark, designated on September 11, 1984. The designation report notes that these buildings are "exceptionally handsome apartment buildings" that are "notable for their Beaux-Arts inspired design." The designation report details the symmetry of the facades on the main and Annex buildings. The Chatsworth is also located within the West End-Collegiate Historic District Extension.

The Landmarks Preservation Commission in or about 2014 issued a certificate of appropriateness for various types of restoration and alteration work on the main and Annex buildings. Much of that work was left uncompleted before the C of A and related permits expired. The current applicant, a successor in interest to the prior applicant, seeks to renew that certificate and those permits, some of which have been deemed susceptible of approval at Staff level.

The instant application concerns the proposal to construct a rooftop addition on the Annex. The 2014 C of A, issued over the objection of CB7, called for a full-width addition set back from the primary façade, and consisting of multiple large rectangular windows framed by patinated copper in an arrangement that evoked the classical symmetry of the mansard roof and windows on the main Chatsworth building. The 2014 application also called for the restoration of the ornate copper cornice at the Annex roof line that had been lost over time.

The current application seeks a partial-width rooftop addition set back from the primary façade to be composed of common light-colored brick with 6 tall rectangular modern casement windows with transoms above facing the primary façade and covering the eastern three-quarters of the proposed addition's front wall. The windows would be framed above and below in the same common brick, and the front wall of the proposed addition would include a painted plain metal door for fire egress. The current proposed addition would cover the western three-quarters of the Annex's roof. The rooftop composition would leave a gap between the eastern edge of the proposed addition and the eastern edge of the roof of approximately one-fourth the width of the Annex roofline. The Annex's classic raised wooden water tower behind the addition would be partially visible through the gap.

The current proposal also calls for the restoration of the Annex's copper cornice, to be enhanced with decorative details.

The Chatsworth main building and Annex sit at the foot of Riverside Park at the very point that Riverside Drive turns to meet West 72nd Street. As a result, the proposed rooftop addition on the Chatsworth Annex is plainly visible from various vantage points along Riverside Drive, from a distance on West 72nd Street, and within Riverside Park.

Presentation by Cas Stachelberg and Sarah Sher of Higgins Quasebarth, Preservation Consultants.
- Before CB7's Preservation Committee in November.
- Responding to confusion at Full Board as to exactly what is being voted on by LPC.
- Since the November Preservation Committee meeting, portions of the application have been identified as susceptible of LPC Staff-level approval.
- In addition, since the November meeting, the applicant has eliminated the proposed privacy screen on the roof of the Main Chatsworth building.
- Thet only item now before the Commissioners at public hearing is the rooftop addition on the Annex. There is no change in the Annex proposal itself from last month.

Recap of the Rooftop Addition Proposal:

- Proposal – rooftop addition is smaller in footprint and set back further than the one approved by LPC in 2014.
- The application includes restoring the Annex's copper cornice – this is considered restoration work that can be approved by Staff.
- The existing bulkhead is only a few feet behind the new proposed addition, and the proposed new addition would be only 1.5 foot wider than the existing structure, so the sight lines will not be significantly different than the current configuration.
- The gap left by narrowing the proposed addition will create a line of sight to the existing Water tank which remains visible.
- The proposed addition will only be visible from deep within Riverside Park.
- The addition will be clad in brick to match the brick façade below.
- A pipe railing will be installed on the upper roof. That roof will not be occupiable space, so a simple railing will suffice.
- The addition will have tall thin panels of wide glazing on the front of the proposed addition wrapping around to the east side. Not quite floor to ceiling, so there will be courses of brick above. The window dimensions will be 6 units x 7.5' tall + 1.5' transom spanning 34 feet across the proposed rooftop addition. The windows will be placed across ¾ of the width of the front façade skewed to the left or east side, and a smaller access door will be installed on the right or west side of the addition's façade.

Committee Questions and Comments:

At the outset, the Co-chairs and the Committee members expressed appreciation to the presenters from Higgins Quasebarth for returning to the Committee to clarify the current state of the application and to address any areas of confusion at the full Board meeting.

Because of the timing of the LPC public hearing, it was understood and agreed that only a Committee Resolution would be presented at the LPC public hearing, which would then be presented at the CB7 January full Board meeting.

Klari:

- Q: Is it correct that LPC Staff has indicated that it can approve the round chimney to be constructed out of metal rather than brick?
- A: Correct.
- Q: confirming that all privacy screens have been removed from the proposal. Mock-up still includes privacy screens.
- A: didn't change the mock-up but removed from the proposal and drawings.
- A: Staff is permitted to approve smaller privacy screens that are not visible (4')
- Q: Metal door on side of front of addition.
- A: Egress path – may be a fire rating issue. Common space, not part of the apartment.
- Concern – CB7 disapproved any rooftop addition in 2013 because the existing façade was perfect.
- LPC granted permission for a lotline-to-lotline extension.
- Partial width addition – considerably less appropriate because it is not symmetric.
- The proposed addition will still be visible despite changes. Quite visible within the Park.
- The lovely, restored cornice will not sufficiently disguise the addition behind.
- The pipe railing on top will add to the visibility of the addition.
- The prior rooftop addition approved by LPC in 2014 evoked the mansard of the Main Chatsworth building. That correspondence is lost in this proposal.
- Troubled by these changes.
- A: Current condition is visible in much the same as the proposed. Also seeing the same amount of the water tower.
- A: Will pull back railing as far as Code will allow.
- A: Didn't mockup the cornice, so will be even less visible.
- Concern: 2013 permit from LPC highlighted that addition was full width, and that the outdoor kitchen would be in the rear – LPC was very specific in citing width as part of the approval.
- Concern: Prior owner spent cash on renovating the apartments, not restoring the cornice. Concern is that the project will focus on building the new addition, but the cornice and other decorative and restoration work will not be completed.
- A: The project will need LPC approval at signoff at the end, and LPC won't sign off without the cornice. LPC will require restorative work to be completed.

Page:

- Both buildings are symmetrical. The proposed 2014 addition was also symmetrical.
- Problem with this proposal is that the addition is off to oneside.

- It is not appropriate just to bring the terrace to the front of the building.
- Has to be symmetrical.

Mark:
- Concern for asymmetry
- Concern that the materials are thoroughly inconsistent with this individual landmark. Might be ok somewhere else.

Jay:
- Ready to approve.
- Visibility has been exaggerated – the addition is only minimally visible and will be hidden by the restored cornice.
- Rooftop additions throughout the district are often asymmetrical.

K:
- While the full width addition would be lovely, the partial width is not inappropriate.
- Spent considerable time looking at this building.
- Satisfied that with the restored cornice this rooftop addition will be appropriate.

Peter:
- Q: Height of addition?
- A: 11'9" to the top of the brick. Pipe rail above – set back. 3'6" .

Madge:
- Skylights were not included in visibility studies.
- A; Existing skylights can't be seen – the skylights on the current proposal will be set back as far or further.

Public Comment

Teri Darwish:
- Regarding the North elevation on the 9th floor – the finish has been changed from prepatinated copper to brick to match the side. Thought copper paneling was to match the Main Chatsworth.
- A: Restored copper cornice with a contrasting material behind will make the cornice more legible. Will look better and respect the restored element.
- A: most rooftop additions use more modest, utilitarian materials.
- Q: proposal cites chimney that needs to be raised. There are perhaps 5 chimneys on the Annex – will any others being raised?
- A: The square chimney on the Annex will be raised in Brick.
- Q: Will the elevator and stair bulkheads be visible?
- A: Bulkheads now will be incorporated into the addition – so there will be no increase above the proposed volume of the addition.
- Q: the south end of the addition shows additional tall thin windows on the east and southern elevations.
- A: south elevation of the proposed addition on the Annex was mocked up and was not visible from West 71st Street. A brick margin band runs around the entire rooftop addition.
- Q: elements on the roof of addition?
- A: There will be skylights that will be set back as described.

Resolution: The proposed rooftop addition's plainly visible disruption of the symmetry of the primary façades of the Annex and of the main Chatsworth building, the elimination of the homage of the prior design approved by LPC in 2015 to the symmetry of the mansard roof and embedded fenestration of the main Chatsworth building, and the height, bulk, irregular fenestration and mixture of materials of the rooftop addition now proposed for the Annex, all render it inappropriate to the character of this individual landmark as well as of the Historic District in which it is located.
VOTE: *Committee 5-3-0-0; Non-Committee Board Members: 0-1-1-0.*

Adjourned: 9:50 pm

HOUSING COMMITTEE

Louisa Craddock and Kristina Villarini, Co-Chairpersons

Joint with **SENIOR TASK FORCE, Roberta Semer, Chair**

December 12, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at the following link:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PuAwe3-557Y&t=1529s

***** Please note, meeting minutes will be forthcoming. *****

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Andrew Albert and Mark Diller, Co-Chairpersons
December 13, 2022 at 6:30 PM via ZOOM
The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l3WED5gMZCY

Present: Andrew Albert and Mark Diller, Co-Chairs; Alex Bell, Elizabeth Caputo, Ken Coughlin, Sara Lind, William Ortiz, Andrew Rigie, Erana Stennett and Howard Yaruss. **Chair:** Beverly Donohue. **Absent:** Jay Adolf. **Board Office:** Maxwell Vandervliet and Jessie Nieves.

1. **West 97th Street Greenmarket** (Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues.) **2023 SAPO Application #683657 by Greenmarket/ GrowNYC to the Mayor's Street Activity Permit Office for an event permit to hold a greenmarket on Fridays.**
Committee voted to a**pprove** Greenmarket for another year.
Committee: 8-0-0-0; Non-committee Board members: 6-0-0-0

2. **MTA Updates.**
Andrew Albert provided update on station agents, OMNY machines, police presence, accessibility, etc

3. **Begin consideration of a previously introduced resolution calling for cross-town protected bike lanes within Community District 7 with a view to a full discussion and vote at a future meeting.**
Committee held a discussion on fact-gathering before moving forward on this resolution.
Proposal to do field work and other research before voting on a resolution.

4. **New business.**
   - Mark: Gilder Center opening - will do a meeting to address the opening and traffic/safety implications
   - Howard: obstructed vehicle license plates - put on agenda for next month a proposed resolution asking for cars with obstructed plates to be immediately towed
   - Susan: several schools around W 63rd Street that go into Central Park to use athletic fields and they cross the drive and there's lack of compliance with traffic light - request to put this on agenda
   - Alex: follow-up from previous resolutions from DOT
   - Colleen updates: working very closely with CPC and Parks on bike lanes in park; working hard on a proposal for 72nd St cross-town bike lanes

Community members
   - Maxine DeSeta of "UWS for Parking" - more than 500 members. Speaking in opposition to W 103rd Str
     - Herb Alter and Amy Rabbitt spoke on the same issue
   - Colleen Chattergoon confirmed that extensive outreach was done

Meeting adjourned at 8:13

BUSINESS & CONSUMER ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Christian Cordova and Benjamin Wu, Co-Chairpersons
December 14, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at the following link:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aUt7_RWDtYA

***** Please note, meeting minutes will be forthcoming. *****

YOUTH, EDUCATION & LIBRARY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2022 at 6:30 pm via ZOOM

The Meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dEmjquHt1BA

Present: Courtney Clark Metakis and Kristen Berger, Co-chairs; Alex Bell, Mark Diller, Beverly Donahue, Blanche Lawton, Ira Mitchneck and Seema Reddy. **Non-Committee Members:** Barbara Adler, Robert Espier and Roberta Semer. **Board Staff:** Maxwell Vandervliet and Alex Crawford. **Excused Absence:** Audrey Isaacs.

Discussion of DNS/Budget Priorities

- Roberta Semer: Provides updates on DNS/Budget Priorities process for upcoming year
    - Need to have completed to degree possible in June
    - Jan/Feb - reach out to different groups work with to get feedback
    - Will send forms for each of areas covered, bullet points, letters, looking to make this easier / streamlined
- Beverly Donahue: Look for MBP's office – process for them to distribute their capital dollars from last cycle will be posted after the holidays, should keep an eye on that and see if any of our requests would fit into that criteria. Typically have not tapped that avenue of that process. Also, CM Gale Brewer is running her community budget request process, those both present us with other avenues beyond city planning cycle to try and move items that may fit. (And CM Sean Abreu)
- Kristen Berger: Followed up on one DNS issue. SCA said: whole city is on target for 50% of our buildings to be accessible within next 4 years. I said District 3 is not there. They thought it was. GB said – no it's not.
- Ira Mitchneck: Some schools listed as fully accessible are not. Actually errors.

Discussion of Delayed DOE Reimbursements to Early Childhood Education Programs

- Courtney Clark Metakis: Chancellor Banks announced they'd be launching quick response teams to deal with early childhood education programs with back payments owed. That was 5 weeks ago. And then questions about the process overall.
- Nyla Kamlet, Director of PlayTogether NYC
    - Very small private school that contracts with the DOE. 2 classes – 3K and UPK.
    - Very small budget, still owed money from 2 years ago. When DOE changed rate of payment to teachers, had to pay it forward and DOE never reimbursed us for that. Right now we're waiting for start up money for our new classroom because the DOE, entitled to 15k but afraid to buy furniture, etc. because I'm not sure I'm going to get that money. But if I don't spend that money, then it might be taken away. Hard thing to know what to do. Because we're a small school, we don't have that kind of budget.
    - Communication with DOE – via email. We might get a response that says 'we're working on it.' That's the only response.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: Important to note I also spoke to a larger school, still having issues. Carrying things because large line of credit, but still making choice. So size exacerbates the issue, but issues have effect even at larger schools.
- Mark Diller: Mayor's recent announcement of bringing up special needs 3k/upk teachers to pay parity. Another facet? Cost structure itself?
- Nyla Kamlet: our costs are going up, but budget, no – food, rent, keeping asst. teachers need to be paid a higher salary, we're locked in to what we can pay them, high turnover, difficult to fill those positions.
- Mark Diller: Are you at risk of – because of DOE inaction – of at some point no longer eligible for the reimbursement?
- Courtney Clark Metakis: Fear of spending, use it or lose it.
- Nyla Kamlet: It's almost January, so with supplies, if I'm going to buy it, should have bought it. Still affecting our budget. And also the money I'm still missing, I had to pay it forward, it's still affecting our budget.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: timeline for rolling calendar dates where it gets increasingly problematic.
- Nyla Kamlet: every school is different; our operating budget covered now – teacher salaries, supplies, insurance, is covered right now. It's the extra things that budget hasn't been solidified.
- Alex Bell: Are they breaking a contract? Or is it a gray area.
- Nyla Kamlet: Beyond something I would know the answer to
- Mark Diller: That would be a breach (not paying you). But slow payment, that's something that companies, that's how they get their working capital.

- Ira Mitchneck: This is not a unique policy on the city. DOE did this for years to one of the PTAs I was involved with. Ran up balances for 5 years with them. Problem for a lot of social service providers. Problems getting paid. Going after the city legally is a good thing if you have 5 years to wait.
- Beverly Donohue: It would be good to flowchart the city pay process for UPK but also the myriad of private/non-profit concerns. It wends its way through the DOE, who has certain approvals, their contract department, then goes to the comptroller, have zealous reviewers who are out to end fraud and abuse at the expense of small firms just doing business on a shoe string. One thing that might be helpful, I can revive some of my contacts from yore and help us develop that. So we can see where this stands. This could be the Comptroller's office as the major concern.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: CM Julie Menin, sponsoring a bill. Didn't have a list of those schools with delayed payments, part of the problem – that list doesn't exist. I think something we should be adding to our list – support of that bill. Really hard to expedite the process when there doesn't seem to be anyone tracking the process.
- Roberta Semer: Think this is a Comptroller question. Think it behooves us to work with CMs, to let the Comptroller's office know that we want to know why – why this money is not being sent. Don't want Nyla's school to miss out on funding, also don't want a bad player to get money they don't deserve. Can send letter to Comproller and say our schools are having this problem and please advise.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: can we send a rapid response teams in the direction of these schools.
- Mark Diller: Wondering whether MOCS is a party to this, or would be interested in this. I think MOCS approves the contract, and then Comptrollers office registers the contract. And then all of them expect the money to be paid, might not be happy to learn money is not being paid.
- Robert Espier: Founding members of Borinquen Health Center—had reimbursement for expenses issue constantly. Bridge loans – at our expense. Costs not recuperated ever so always in the hole.
- Beverly: Wondering if we want to support the City Council legislation?
- Courtney Clark Metakis: Agreed.
- Roberta Semer: Covered this in DNS?
- Courtney Clark Metakis: No, it's more focused on special education salary parity
- Roberta Semer: Then we need to broaden it this year
- Courtney Clark Metakis: Let's discuss language of resolution on bill.

Resolution in support of bill passes: *Committee Members: 7-0-0 Non-Committee Members: 3-0-0*

New Business / High School Meeting Topic for January

- Kristen Berger: Started to send out invitations, topic for January is District High Schools. Don't have a topic, just get them to meet. We want them to start to connect, and then we can tease out if there are common issue we can pursue together. Just a first step.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: Not a topic I'm aware we've done.
- Kristen Berger: Feel high schools fall through the cracks, CEC3 doesn't cover high school. Council on Citywide High Schools has maybe a dozen members and represents the entire city, and doesn't have a record of being proactive.
- Mark Diller: Couldn't agree more, caution is – let's invite them.
- Kristen Berger: We already invited Citywide Council President and Manhattan rep.
- Beverly Donohue: Also reaching out to Manhattan Principal Superintendency?
- Kristen Berger: Right now focusing on parents. Right now, have many superintendents, under different things. So there are 4 superintendents over our schools. But if we do principals we'll invite them.
- Roberta Semer: Think this is brilliant, we do represent them. If they're under umbrellas, invite heads of those umbrellas to come. I personally would invite everyone. As a CB, we should know what the hs, problems are. They should know us and we should know them.
- Kristen Berger: Don't get a lot of love from electeds because they don't represent their constituents. Are our constituents.

Meeting concludes: 7:27pm

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Beverly Donohue, Chair

December 20, 2022 at 6:30 PM via Zoom

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at the following link:
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC_n3st90mFiSeRVUl4m8ySQ

Present: Barbara Adler, Andrew Albert, Richard Asche, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Christian Cordova, Kevin Corte, Louisa Craddock, Beverly Donohue, Sheldon Fine, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi (arrived late), Doug Kleiman, William Ortiz, Seema Reddy, Susan Schwartz, Polly Spain (left early), Roberta Semer and Benjamin Wu. **Non-Committee Board Members:** Joshua Cohen, Ken Coughlin, Robert Espier and Madge Rosenberg. **Board Office:** Max Vandervliet. **Absent:** Kristen Berger, Mark Diller, Michele Parker, Anthony Thomas and Kristina Villarini.

Chair's Update:

- Beverly Donohue, Chair, convened the meeting at 6:32PM.
- She reminded those who are up for reappointment by the Borough President that they must get applications submitted to his office by March 17th.
- There are now 45 members of our board, as Daniela Alvarado and Madelyn Innocent have resigned.
- A volunteer committee is needed to pilot the use of hybrid meetings. Public members would be very limited to about five total. Co-chairs were asked to discuss volunteering with committee members and let the Chair know.
- Using the clock for timing speakers: This item was discussed by the executive committee and all thought very helpful. We will start using timers at Full Board, and any co-chairs who also want to make use of the timer also may do so. Number of minutes allotted will be determined by number of speakers, agendas, etc.
- The Chair asked for votes for the following, noting that these are not Resolutions, merely votes, and do not need Full Board approval:
    1. **Creation of a Public Safety Committee**, which will be evaluated after six months:
       Committee: 16-0-0-0. Non- Committee Board Members: 4-0-0-0.
    2. **Extension for one year of the Senior Task Force:**
       Committee: 18-0-0-0. Non- Committee Board Members: 3-0-0-0.
    3. **Reconstitution and extension of the Bylaws Task Force:**
       Committee: 18-0-0-0. Non- Committee Board Members: 1-2-0-0.

District Manager's Report:

- Max Vandervliet reported that the office will begin Zoom trainings for board members who would like a refresher. An email will be sent out.
- The 2023 calendar was sent out noting conflicting committee dates with holidays. Edits from co-chairs should be sent to the board office by the end of the week.
- The District Manager will send out invites for those who want to be on the Public Safety Committee, which will be limited in size.
- Alex Crawford, Community Coordinator, has taken over the CB7 Newsletters. One additional newsletter will report on what committees are doing, and a secondary, targeted newsletter will address seniors in the upper portion of the district.

Discussion of J-51 Tax Exemption and abatement for a proposed Resolution *(this discussion begins 29 minutes into the YouTube recording)*:

Louisa Craddock (Housing Committee co-chair) and Richard Asche (Land-Use co-chair) Presided over this discussion:

The proposed Resolution, based on one CB9 adopted, was to reauthorize and update the J-51 program, designed to provide tax relief for buildings with middle or low-income tenants, as well as coop or condo apartments with a low-assessed valuation, and to incentivize building owners to make desired capital improvements. The discussion was extremely complicated and complex, with several board members making comments. In the end, the draft Resolution was withdrawn without prejudice and sent back to the Housing Committee, where it will be further discussed in January.

Co-Chairs reports from the standing committees including Resolutions coming to Full Board + upcoming agenda items for Committees *(this discussion begins at 101:45 into the YouTube recording)*:

- Preservation: 2 Resolutions
- Housing: 0 Resolutions, J51 discussion
- Transportation Committee: 1 Resolution
- Business Consumer Issues: 3 Resolutions + Street Fair approvals
- Youth, Education, Libraries: 1 Resolution
- Parks & Environment: 0 Resolutions (Note Jan. & Feb. dates will change due to holiday conflicts.)
- Land Use: 0 Resolutions
- Health & Human Services: 0 Resolutions
- Public Safety: 0 Resolutions
- Budget & Strategy: 0 Resolutions
- Senior Task Force: 0 Resolutions
- In-Person/Remote task force: 0 Resolutions

With no old or new business, and with a motion made and seconded to adjourn, the meeting ended at 7:59PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Adler & Linda Alexander,
Co-Secretaries

LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Richard Asche and Kevin Corte, Co-Chairpersons

Wednesday, December 21st, 6:30 PM

The meeting can be viewed in its entirety on YouTube at the following link:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zbjya0_JVrU

***** Please note, meeting minutes will be forthcoming. *****