

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Re: Tax Abatement for Theaters.

Full Board Vote: 34 In favor 0 Against 2 Abstentions 0 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion: For years, small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations have added value both culturally and economically to New York City's individual communities, and to the city as a whole.

The current economic climate, however, has made it extremely difficult for many of these small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations to stay in business.

The unprecedented cross-community board collaboration that has surrounded the crafting and support of this resolution is a unique phenomenon, clearly manifesting how vital and meaningful this sector is to communities throughout the City, and, therefore, the City as a whole.

In 2008, New York Innovative Theatre Awards released a widely publicized study that evaluated trends regarding performance venues from neighborhood to neighborhood. The study found that over the last five years this sector lost a number of theaters to development. Twenty-six percent (26%) of Midtown's small to mid-sized performance space inventory, and twenty-five percent (25%) of performance spaces located in the West Village are now defunct¹. And this just accounts for two of New York City's neighborhoods.

There is a "core" group of small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations that hold long-term leases. This "core" group is the life's blood of this sector, as the performing arts organizations within this group rent their spaces to performing arts companies that are unable to commit to long-term leases. As these "core" small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations continue to disappear, so does the whole sector.

It is, therefore, imperative that we look at innovative solutions that will help rescue, preserve, and subsequently stimulate the seriously threatened small to mid-sized non-profit performing arts sector – the heart and soul of New York City's cultural landscape.

New York City is known as a global cultural capital, due in large part to its unique fabric of small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations. In microeconomic terms, this sector boosts New York City by supporting neighborhood small businesses, and attracting both New Yorkers and tourists alike who flock to the City specifically for its vibrant performing arts scene.

Small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations have long been the foundation of New York City's arts and creative industries. These organizations are the primary incubators where new talent first emerges and is developed, and where real artistic risks can be taken.

The Arts also help the City retain talented graduates and attract investment from corporations that stay in or come to New York City in order to cull from an elite pool of creative workers, who, themselves, choose to locate in New York City for its thriving cultural scene.

¹ NYIT Off-Off Broadway Survey Program, pp.5-6

Local businesses such as restaurants and food markets, clothing stores, parking garages, and similar other retailers benefit from the influx of people brought into the community by small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations.

The City would ultimately reclaim the revenue from a real estate tax credit through the ancillary spending generated by the influx of people who would come to these locations with the specific intention of patronizing arts-related events, and who would spend money at local businesses.

Small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations throughout New York City's neighborhoods encourage community-friendly evening foot traffic, safe streets for our community residents, and help protect small business diversity.

Small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations improve the quality of life in local neighborhoods and are a source of pride for local residents and businesses.

Long-term donated and rent-affordable Community Facility F.A.R., and under market leased spaces would provide a safe haven for artists and small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations to create their art, protected from unwieldy and insurmountable rent hikes.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan strongly urges that our elected City and State officials consider the implementation of a real estate tax credit to benefit small to mid-sized non-profit theaters and performing arts organizations, in order to consequently halt, and reverse, the alarming trend of theater closures, and the rapid demise of this sector, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7 will work with all of New York City's Community Boards to support specific legislation in this context.

Community Board 7/Manhattan

Core Principles and Key Recommendations for the Proposed Riverside Center Project

February 4, 2010

Introduction:

This document is a summary of Community Board 7's leading responses to the proposed Extell Riverside Center project, now being considered for ULURP certification by the City Planning Department. This statement is intended to highlight core principles and key recommendations only, which should be read to apply generally to the entirety of the proposed design. The absence of a specific note or concern as to any particular aspect of the proposed design should not be interpreted as an acceptance or endorsement of those specifics. *The Core Principles and Key Recommendations below are not ranked or presented in priority order.* All are essential and valued by Community Board 7 and the community. We look forward to developing and sharing greater detail and specificity as the review process continues.

In the last two and one half years, we have met with the Extell team in well-attended public meetings and in smaller working sessions. We have also held numerous meetings with neighborhood groups and organizations within the community. The CB7 Riverside Center Working Group has particularly benefited from the excellent, tireless liaison and help offered by the staff of the City Planning Department, and from CB7's own technical consultants, BF&J and Kwartler Associates, as well as from planning and architectural experts within the community.

As we stated in an April 18, 2008 letter to Mr. Gary Barnett, President of Extell Development Company, which contained an earlier, less detailed statement of our concerns,

“... we urge you now to take our comments and priorities seriously, since they reflect long term community concerns, as well as future planning and development needs of the Upper West Side. We hope that these statements and priorities will stimulate a genuine community consultative dialogue with you in advance of any certified application, just as we hope that city agencies will make use of our criteria and observations to guide them in their own technical and legal review of your application.”

In January 2009, Community Board 7 submitted detailed comments and testimony on the Draft Scope of Work for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. This response was also the product of careful deliberation and analysis by many individuals and groups.

We have been told that the Extell application may be certified for ULURP in Spring, 2010. We are of course well aware that the ULURP process will offer the official opportunity for participation and comment by the Community Board and the public, as well as for the Borough President, the City Planning Commission, the City Council and the Mayor. Nevertheless, as part of our planning process, we offer these comments and recommendations to you and to the City Planning Department, to the developer, and to others, in the hope and belief that a collaborative dialogue and articulation of priorities and needs can genuinely improve this private project for the community, the city and for the broader public, as well as for the applicant.

Core Principles for the Riverside Center Project

Zoning and Density

Provide for zoning and built density that is appropriate to the context and infrastructure, and is reflective of superior urban design.

Public Open Space

Create clearly defined open space that facilitates and encourages public use, activities and access, serving a broad spectrum of residents, neighbors and visitors. Delineate a clear distinction between public and private spaces that discourages the perception of building enclaves as separate from the rest of the city and neighborhood. Ensure minimum impact of wind and shadows on all public and common areas by careful placement of private buildings and by attention to building form.

Connectivity and Circulation

Create connectivity from the project to its surrounding neighborhood, to the waterfront and within the project itself by:

- Promoting access and circulation for pedestrians by means of mapped streets and public pathways;
- Promoting public and alternative modes of transportation;
- Minimizing the use and impact of autos and trucks.

Transportation and Traffic

Provide access to public transportation that links Riverside Center and Riverside South to the city grid, promotes mass transit, and reduces congestion and pollution from commercial and private vehicles.

Streetscape

Promote excellent and animated streetscape design and landscaping that emulates the best of traditional Upper West Side parks and public spaces, together with innovative 21st century examples of new green spaces that will work and welcome everyone.

Retail/Cultural Facilities

Create vibrant, innovative, and attractive retail at street level, and cultural facilities that serve local residents and can attract visitors from around the city. Develop cultural, educational, and community facilities and uses above ground and below ground that will create a public benefit and enhance life on the west side and in New York.

Housing

Promote social and economic diversity in housing type and income. Provide housing that is attractive and affordable to working class families.

Public Education

Increase public school capacity necessary to serve the current and future needs of the community (Community District 3).

Sustainability

Promote the highest standard of environmentally responsible practices, activities and uses that are not merely minimal afterthoughts but are integrated into every aspect of design, architecture, and infrastructure. Design to accommodate growing needs for clean and efficient energy production/distribution, waste management, and sanitation for the development and surrounding areas. Design an integrated transportation system that minimizes carbon emissions.

Key Recommendations for the Riverside Center Project

(Core principles relevant to each recommendation are noted *in italics*.)

Density

(Zoning and Density)

- Reduce overall density by at least 20%, by reduction in all buildings and in number of residential units, and/or by removing at least one building completely.
- Include a comparative analysis of the community low-density alternative, initially described in the SDEIS scoping document.
- Provide and justify FAR calculations for all buildings, including street mapping alternatives and building height reductions.

Site Plan

(Public Open Space, Streetscape)

- Consider alternatives that maximize public open space by rearranging building placement, perhaps flipping buildings 2 and 4.
- Consider placing the public school on 59th Street.
- Consider moving Building 4 to street front of 59th Street to increase public open space.
- Consider reconfiguring buildings to include at least one lower-rise building with green features on roof for public access.
- Place lobby entrances for all buildings along street fronts, especially around the perimeter streets of 59th, 61st, West End Avenue, and Riverside Blvd.
- Consider alternative site plans by community groups submitted to CB7, and posted on www.nyc.gov/mcb7.

Public Open Space

(Public Open Space, Streetscape, Public Education)

- Include destination attractions such as sculpture garden, performance space, and recreation features, as well as clear view corridors.
- Minimize shadows and wind on open spaces and sidewalks.
- Build in a gentle slope (or tiers) across the entire site for pedestrians and to provide variety of routes to the waterfront park.
- Provide a pedestrian bridge at 60th Street to Riverside Park.
- Remove the movie theaters and place underground at 59th Street in order to increase open space.
- Remove “parking spiral” near Building #4 and relocate Building #4 to street front to provide increased open space.
- Identify street level open space for public school.
- Promote open space views and circulation to the architecturally distinguished Con Ed Power Plant on 59th Street, looking toward future adaptive re-use.

Connectivity, and street access and circulation consistent with the city grid as much as possible consistent with the site plan (defined by West End Ave, 59th St., Riverside Blvd, 61st St.)

(Public Open Space, Connectivity and Circulation, Retail/Cultural Facilities, Sustainability)

- Establish 61st Street and 59th Street as major corridors to Riverside Park.
- Establish 60th Street as an internal pedestrian public way with easy public access from 61st and 59th Streets.
- Orient buildings and lobby entrances to face streets in order to complement natural flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
- Develop vibrant, active retail on street level.

- Create wide sidewalks (21 ft) with plantings, and benches to encourage pedestrian traffic.
- Remove “service” and “back door” elements on 59th Street -- minimize curb cuts and garage entrances.
- Add a traffic light at 59th Street at the west for access to park and to Riverside Center.
- Consider a site plan that takes into account access to and use of Riverside South Park in the scenario in which the highway is buried.

Vehicular Circulation, Alternative Transportation, and Parking
(Connectivity and Circulation, Transportation and Traffic, Sustainability)

- Maintain 61st Street, West End Ave, 59th Street, and Riverside Boulevard as vehicular corridors.
- Unify parking to one garage that serves the entire complex.
- Minimize points of access for underground loading/unloading (similar to Rockefeller Center).
- Maximize underground circulation to accommodate infrastructure needs.
- Reduce overall parking by at least 30%. Promote shared parking, zip cars and other measures to reduce automobile trips.
- Provide detailed information about current (in Riverside South and on the parking lots between 59th and 61st Streets) and planned parking capacity and utilization.
- Evaluate all proposed uses in terms of minimizing vehicular use and congestion and in terms of efficiency of surrounding street network.
- Provide for bicycle lanes within the development and connecting to the Manhattan Waterfront Greenway. Provide bicycle parking within buildings and along travel routes.

- Maximize opportunities for public bus service to replace current and future van services.
- Investigate the possible construction of light rail and a nearby Metro North station to serve the development and the surrounding area.

Mixture of Uses

(Retail/Cultural Facilities, Housing)

- Design for vibrant, varied, innovative retail that will attract and serve the community.
- Provide for mixed income housing in each building, a minimum of 20% affordable low and moderate income housing units.
- Consider alternatives to the hotel since there are several that serve the area.
- Place movie theaters underground.
- Eliminate below ground auto dealership, consider uses such as Children's Museum, cultural facilities, Chelsea Market, others.

Public Education

(Retail/Cultural Facilities, Public Education)

- Build a new public school facility to accommodate 1,250 students in grades Pre-K through 8 on the site and support all students in Community District 3.
- Design a public school with sufficient classrooms to meet applicable class size targets and provide dedicated separate space for science, music, art and assemblies, as well as typical allotment of space for administration, guidance and service-providers.
- Include an outdoor public school yard and play spaces appropriate to all ages served by the school that can be used both during the instructional day and for after school programs.

Environmentally Responsible Design
(Sustainability)

- Design for LEED Platinum.
- Explore co-generation options and other clean energy alternatives.
- Examine existing sanitation and waste management systems and develop alternatives that optimize efficiency and quality of life for the development and the Upper West Side.
- Account for flood plain potential in EIS.

RIVERSIDE CENTER MINORITY REPORT
February 23, 2010

We, members of CB7, disagree with the resolution of the board outlining the “core principles” and “specific recommendations” that should guide the approval of Extell’s plans for developing the Riverside South site, between 59th St. and 61st Street, West End Ave and the West Side Highway. We therefore submit this minority report, as provided for in CB7’s by-laws, to be circulated with CB7’s resolution.

We are mindful that the developer has a right to develop the area according to a previously approved plan, but that elements of that plan are no longer viable, and that the developer—for practical and financial reasons—seeks a planning alteration which the City of New York can approve at its discretion. We also agree with the majority that the currently effective 1993 plan no longer meets community needs and should be altered.

We do not object to the fact that Extell seeks changes that would increase its profits from the project, but with the majority we agree that the value of the project to our community and to the city also needs to be increased, and that new plans that increase the profitability for the developer must also advance the interests of our community.

We recognize, with the majority, the difficulty of accepting alterations in plans that would provide greater profit to the developer without simultaneously providing key community benefits. The developer has made a number of proposals in the new plan that would allow greater density—that is more and larger units of housing—and would allow a higher intensity of use of the underground space, but has not included proposals that would significantly advance the community’s interest in affordable housing, and other matters. With the majority, we therefore oppose the proposed Extell plan as inadequate. However we disagree with the majority on the reasons why it is inadequate.

The majority has taken the position that the project as proposed is “too dense”, and that it should be reduced by 20% of the FAR. We disagree; the site can be planned to accept higher density without damage to the community. Higher density does equate to significantly higher potential development profits. We believe a portion of this advantage must be used to ensure that the development provide homes to families of varied incomes, and not solely higher incomes. We believe this mix should be self funded, using a portion of the additional profits made possible by the changed plan.

The majority position is that underground parking should be cut by 30%. We disagree. We see no reason to artificially limit the amount of residential (accessory) parking at this location because of its ready access to the West Side Highway. The additional cars can be handled with very little impact on local streets. The convenience of available parking will help attract multi-car suburban families to relocate to the city where they will most likely have a single car, with benefit to families and to the city and with a corresponding reduction in the impact of cars on our region. Further, this area was recently host to large parking lots of several hundred cars owned by families in CB7, cars mostly used for weekend travel. We think the parking garage should allow monthly parking for residents of our area under the rubric of accessory parking. Also, because of its proximity to the West Side Highway, the underground garage should include transient parking, which would assist the large and growing educational and broadcast institutions near this location, and some of the new office development in the upper 50s.

The majority wishes to extend the street grid into this area, with buildings and their lobbies on the streets, street walls, and store-fronts either throughout the area, or along WEA. It also objects to some types of businesses, and requests support for other types. We do not think the community is best served by requiring that the project area be stamped with the current street grid, although we agree that the developer should be permitted to construct commercial facilities along WEA and within the site, if so desired.

With the majority, we believe the proposed development is so large that the plans should include provisions for services and retail stores, schools and recreation.

The majority wishes the project to treat 59th Street as its front door, especially so that it would be hospitable to the potential redevelopment of the power station. We disagree, as 59th street is heavily used by trucks (with plans for the expansion of the SWAMP commercial refuse station), and is best used as an area for service providers, some retail and for service and garage entrance to the residential buildings. The majority proposes no alternative location for these functions.

The majority is concerned that the design not isolate the area from the rest of the community in the manner of some nearby super-blocks, and some other tower-in-the-park developments in CB7. We agree, and believe the current design—which will be changed to reduce the height of some buildings—reflects that concern. However, the majority has not emphasized the need to correct the problem that cuts this area off from the waterfront park—the elevated west side highway that effectively fences off the waterfront from our residential areas. We think the highway in this section should be buried and covered by park land, obviating the need for pedestrian bridges.

The majority calls for 21 ft sidewalks through the site, and provision for alternate transportation (presumably pedaled or power-assisted bikes.) We think pedestrian paths should be separate from bike paths, and path widths correspondingly reduced.

The majority calls on the developer to construct a 1200 seat public school on the site, and provide playground space for the school. We believe that an area should be set aside for a high quality facility, or several such facilities, and that the school(s) have the right to use some of the parking and recreation area. However, the Department of Education and the School Construction Fund—which currently fail to provide adequate facilities to our community--must become part of this planning requirement, as we cannot achieve what needs to be done solely by requirements on a developer who lacks authority over schools.

Similarly, the majority seeks below ground trash collections: the Department of Sanitation must become part of this plan. The majority seeks adequate public transportation. The TA and the MTA must become part of this planning.

Respectfully submitted:

Thomas Vitullo-Martin

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Transportation

Re: 531 West End Avenue, a/k/a 300 West 86th Street.

Full Board Vote: 37 In favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** a new petition by Imico West End LLC to the Department of Transportation to construct, maintain and use a snow melting system beneath the sidewalk on both the West End Avenue frontage and West 86th Street frontage of the building located at 531-539 West End Avenue.

Committee: 8-0-1-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 2-0-0-0.

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Transportation

Re: Unenclosed Café Renewal Applications.

Full Board Vote: 31 In favor 1 Against 1 Abstentions 0 Present

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the renewal applications for the following unenclosed sidewalk cafes:

- **61 Columbus Avenue** (West 62nd Street.) Renewal application DCA#1190070 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by West 62 Operating, LLC d/b/a Rosa Mexicana, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 14 tables and 28 seats.
Committee: 10-0-0-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 2-0-0-0.
- **267 Columbus Avenue** (West 72nd – 73rd Streets.) Renewal application DCA# 1072082 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Classic Food, Inc., d/b/a Sido, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 3 tables and 6 seats.
Committee: 9-0-1-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 3-0-0-0.
- **316 Columbus Avenue** (West 74th-75th Streets.) Renewal application DCA# 806050 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 316 Restaurant Corp., d/b/a Pappardella, at for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk cafe with 10 tables and 20 seats.
Committee: 9-0-1-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 3-0-0-0.
- **441 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 81st Street.) Renewal application DCA# 1283635 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by JPS Ventures, Inc., d/b/a St. James Gate, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 3 tables and 8 seats.
Committee: 7-2-0-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 2-0-0-0.
- **513 Columbus Avenue** (West 84th - 85th Streets.) Renewal application DCA# 1167803 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by RLS Inc of NY, d/b/a Señor Swanky Speakeasy, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 28 tables and 57 seats.
Committee: 7-2-0-0. Board Members: 3-0-0-0. Public Members: 2-0-0-0.
- **2665 Broadway** (West 101st-102nd Streets.) Renewal application DCA# 1189644 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Kieffer & Norell, LLC, d/b/a Picnic, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 12 tables and 23 seats.
Committee: 8-1-0-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 2-0-0-0.
- **2737 Broadway** (West 104th-105th Streets.) Renewal application DCA# 1109932 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by The Westside of Broadway Rest Group, Inc., d/b/a Toast, for a two-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 15 tables and 30 seats.
Committee: 9-0-0-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public Members: 3-0-0-0.

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Transportation

Re: MTA service cuts.

Full Board Vote: 34 In favor 1 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion:

New Yorkers were recently put through terrible anguish in 2009, when the MTA threatened its customers with huge fare hikes and devastating cuts in service.

After a series of public hearings, where the public poured their hearts out about how these cuts would impact their daily lives.

These terrible cutbacks and fare hikes were largely mitigated with the State Legislature imposing a payroll ("mobility") tax on the 12-county MTA catchment area.

This tax is now not projected to produce enough revenue to enable the MTA to provide the current level of service, again forcing New Yorkers and suburbanites to risk losing their essential transportation services.

The State and City have cut their support over the years for student metrocards, leaving the MTA to fund the difference out of their already depleted coffers, the only transit system in the US to fund school transit.

These services are, for many New Yorkers, the equivalent of private automobiles in most other places in the United States.

This transit system is the engine that enables not just the City of New York but the State of New York to recover from the recession.

In CD#7 the proposed cuts in service are devastating, including the cutback of the M10 bus to Columbus Circle, the cutback of the M104 bus to Times Square, the loss of all overnight cross-town M66 bus through Central Park, shortened spans of service for the M11, M20 buses, the reduction in off-peak & weekend subway service from 100% to 125% of seated load, a 50% cut in overnight subway service, from three trains per hour to two.

Cuts of this type may well induce more people to use automobiles.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan abhors these service cuts as attacks on the New York way of life, as counter-productive to the stated goals of cleaner air, and better mobility for the region, and calls on our elected officials to support one or more of the following revenue generators as a means of supporting the MTA, so these annual crises can be averted, and proper planning can be accomplished:

- 1) Tolling of the free East & Harlem River bridges
- 2) A 1% gasoline tax dedicated to the MTA
- 3) Congestion Pricing, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT COMMUNITY BOARD 7 decries the attack on our most vulnerable citizens who utilize Access-a-Ride.

Committee: 10-0-0. Board Members: 4-0-0-0. Public: 4-0-0-0.

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Business & Consumer Issues

Re: Applications to the SLA for a two-year liquor licenses.

Full Board Vote: 33 In favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the following applications:

- **2315 Broadway** (West 84th Street) Donizetti, LLC d/b/a Five Napkin Burger.
Committee: 5-0-0-0. Board Member: 1-0-0-0.

- **141 West 69th Street** (Columbus Avenue) Graffit USA, LLC d/b/a Graffit
Committee: 5-0-0-0. Board Member: 0-0-0-1.



RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Parks & Preservation

Re: 115 Central Park West (West 71st - 72nd Streets.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a window replacement.

Full Board Vote: 32 In favor 1 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion:

The Parks and Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan believes that the proposed windows manufactured by Traco and by Graham are out of scale in dimensions and/or profile with the Skyline windows that are permitted under the existing master plan, and that have already been installed in a substantial percentage of the building's windows since the master plan was adopted, and that the Traco and Graham windows would "read" from public ways appreciably differently from the Skyline windows.

The Committee believes that three options for window replacement (the Skyline windows mandated under the existing master plan, the Wausau brand windows approved at LPC staff level in connection with this application, and the Panorama brand windows proposed in this application) provide sufficient choice to residents and are likely to foster sufficient competition among vendors to meet the stated needs and interests of the applicant coop corporation, consistent with the application of appropriate standards with regard to the modification of the exterior of this prominent landmark structure.

The Committee believes that the proposed Panorama windows are reasonably appropriate to the historic character of the building and of the Historic District, and are an appropriately close match in appearance to the Skyline windows that are the sole option under the existing master plan.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the application to amend the window replacement master plan for 115 Central Park West to permit the Panorama brand window presented to the Committee, but **disapproves** the application with regard to the proposed Traco and Graham windows.

Committee: 7-1-0-0. Board Member: 2-0-0-0.

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Parks & Preservation

Re: 100 West 80th (Amsterdam-Columbus Avenues.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a 17' by 17' rooftop addition.

Full Board Vote: 29 In favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 1 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion:

The Parks and Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan believes that the proposed rooftop addition, while substantially visible from West 80th Street, is reasonably appropriate to the historic character of the building and of the Historic District.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the proposed rooftop addition for 100 West 80th Street.

Committee: 5-1-0-2. Board Member: 1-0-0-0.

RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Parks & Preservation

Re: 101 West 85th Street (Amsterdam-Columbus Avenues.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a wheelchair lift.

Full Board Vote: 31 In favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion:

The Parks and Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan, believes that the proposed wheelchair lift, modification of the areaway fence and conversion of a window to a door are reasonably appropriate to the historic character of the building and of the Historic District.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the proposed wheelchair lift, modification of the areaway fence and conversion of a window to a door at 101 West 85th Street.

Committee: 4-0-3-0. Board Member: 1-0-0-0.



RESOLUTION

Date: February 2, 2010

Committee of Origin: Parks & Preservation

Re: 143 West 69th Street, d/b/a A Cut Above and Noi Due (Columbus-Amsterdam Avenues.)

(Columbus Avenue-Broadway.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to install four signs: two mounted on the pony wall at the sidewalk level and two mounted on the building façade directly above each business.

Full Board Vote: 31 In favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present

The following facts and concerns were taken into account in arriving at our conclusion:

The Parks and Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan, believes that the proposed signs to be mounted in “saddlebag” fashion on the railings on the pony wall perpendicular to the building are reasonably appropriate to the historic character of the building and of the Historic District.

The Committee believes that the proposed signs on the building façade are too large, that they appear crammed into the masonry framework provided by the window sills, the decorative corbels at each end under the sills and the stringcourse in the masonry below, and that they are therefore inappropriate because they do not provide at least one inch of exposed masonry “border” on each side.

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

Approves the proposed signs perpendicular to the building to be mounted on the fencing at the pony wall, and

Committee Members: 7-0-0-0. Board Member: 1-0-0-0.

Disapproves the proposed signs to be mounted directly on the building façade.

Committee: 6-1-0-0. Board Member: 0-1-0-0.