

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Preservation**

**Re: 26 West 95<sup>th</sup> Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a rooftop addition, rear addition, cellar and rear yard excavation.**

**Full Board Vote: 40 In Favor 5 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present**

*Committee: 5-0-0-0. Non-committee Board members: 3-0-0-0.*

The resolution is premised on the following facts:

The subject building is a 4 story Neo-Grec Renaissance Revival Rowhouse, built between 1892 and 1893, originally part of a row of buildings on the south side of West 95<sup>th</sup> Street and designed by Neville & Bagge.

The applicant is seeking approval for: a *rooftop addition; a rear yard addition; a backyard excavation; and installation of a stoop.*

### Rooftop Addition:

This application seeks approval of a 650 square foot rooftop addition composed of a brownstone-colored stucco on the front façade, and common brick to match the rear façade on the back, with a roof height of 10'4". The proposed rooftop addition will be set back from the front façade and the proposed restored cornice so that it will not be visible from the street. Party walls on the rooftop addition will also be brownstone colored stucco. Windows in the front of the proposed addition will be black metal: the front will be Pella wood and the back black aluminum cladding.

The rooftop addition as proposed is reasonably appropriate to the character of the Historic District.

### Rear Façade Extension:

With respect to the rear façade, the current condition is a standard "dog leg", or "L" rear yard extension on the basement, parlor and second floors. The neighboring townhouses on either side and throughout the grouping L-extensions, all of which project from the western half of the rear facades, sometimes referred to as an "A-A-A" pattern.

The proposal is to replace the L-extension with a full-width rear yard extension at the 30' setback from the rear lot line. The proposed extension would similarly be of a 3 story height (basement, parlor and second floors). The roof of the full-width extension would form a terrace at the top floor, and there would be second setback above the top floor to the rooftop addition. The original proposal included glass railings at the two rear-facing terraces, which the applicant has agreed to change to simple black metal railings.

The fenestration of the proposed rear façade consists two pairs of tall, thin French doors at the basement and parlor levels, with groups of three punched windows at the second floor with contrasting lintels above. The top floor of the rear façade will retain the existing punched windows and doors, also with contrasting lintels above.

The rear façade will be composed of red brick that surrounds the fenestration and spans between floors.

The proposed full-width rear façade extension, with the substitution of metal railings for the glass railings originally proposed, are reasonably appropriate to the character of the Historic District.

Rear Yard Excavation:

The proposed excavation consists of removing soil from the back yard to bring it to grade. The remainder of the proposal for the rear yard includes replacing an existing oversized wooden fence with a Code-compliant 6-foot wooden fence, install bluestone pavers. The applicant agreed to install planting beds and an overflow drain to capture water runoff at the perimeter. The application also includes a metal deck at the parlor floor with metal stairs descending from the deck to the rear yard. The applicant agreed that any lighting that may be installed will not include spot or flood lights, but rather “night sky” lighting.

The proposed excavation and rear yard installations are reasonably appropriate to the character of the Historic District.

Stoop Restoration:

The original condition for the front façade (and the other townhouses in the group) included a box stoop that descended from the parlor floor main entrance, then turned east into a portion of the areaway for the final few steps to grade. The stoop had been removed (as well as the ornate cornice at the top of the front façade) by the time of the 1930s era tax photo.

The applicant currently has a Staff permit from LPC for a box stoop. The applicant has been advised by the Department of Transportation that it would not approve the installation of a box stoop because it would not leave the required 5’ clearance on the sidewalk between the restored stoop and an existing tree pit.

The applicant thus proposes a straight stoop with newel posts and rails similar to the original, to be covered in brownstone-colored stucco. A straight stoop would avoid the clearance issues with respect to the existing sidewalk tree pit, and would be similar in materials and design to other straight stoops currently found on the block, albeit in different townhouse groupings.

While a straight stoop would be reasonably appropriate to the character of the Historic District and this contributing building, a box stoop with revised proportions and trimmed dimensions would be more in keeping with the history and character of the building, the block and the Historic District.

NOW, THEREFORE, Community Board 7/Manhattan resolves to approve the proposed modifications to this building as presented as being reasonably appropriate to the character of the Historic District, with strong recommendations that: (1) the glass railings on the rear façade be replaced with simple black metal railings; (2) the rear yard include semi-permeable pavers to assist in drainage; (3) the applicant explore substituting a box stoop with reduced dimensions and proportions that emulate the original condition but can fit within the clearance required for this narrow sidewalk.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Business & Consumer Issues**

**Re: 225 Columbus Avenue (West 70<sup>th</sup> Street)**

**Full Board Vote: 44 In Favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present**

*Committee: 7-0-0-0. Non-committee Board members: 1-0-0-0.*

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the new application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by 225 Rest Corp, d/b/a To be Determined.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Business & Consumer Issues**

**Re: 201 West 106<sup>th</sup> Street (Amsterdam Avenue)**

**Full Board Vote: 44 In Favor 0 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present**

*Committee: 7-0-0-0. Non-committee Board members: 1-0-0-0.*

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the new application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by Luke Guy LLC, d/b/a Calaveras Corner.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Business & Consumer Issues**

**Re: 15 West End Avenue (West 60<sup>th</sup> Street.)**

**Full Board Vote: 41 In Favor 1 Against 0 Abstentions 0 Present**

*Committee: 7.0-0-0. Non-committee Board members: 1-0-0-0.*

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the application to the SLA for a an Alteration and Class Change by Ivory & White Markets d/b/a Morton Williams.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Business & Consumer Issues**

**Re: 2450 Broadway** (West 90<sup>th</sup> Street.)

**Full Board Vote: 42 In Favor 0 Against 1 Abstention 0 Present**

*Committee: 7-0-0-0. Non-committee Board members: 1-0-0-0.*

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan **approves** the application to the SLA for a an Alteration by Carmine's Broadway Feast Inc d/b/a Carmine's. Alteration License to include next door lobby to serve delivery/outgoing drinks.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Transportation**

**Re: Asking for the DOT to not have a sponsor for a curb extension; specifically about the SW corner of 96<sup>th</sup> and WEA**

**Full Board Vote: 40 In Favor 0 Against 3 Abstentions 0 Present**

*Committee: 35-0-1-0.*

The intersection of 96<sup>th</sup> Street/West End Avenue is one of the most dangerous in CD7, with many vehicular/pedestrian crashes, vehicle/vehicle crashes, and many near-misses for several reasons.

It is a major access point to the only highway on the west side of Manhattan. Pedestrians crossing the intersection's western side receive a brief leading pedestrian interval and then quickly face vehicles turning west onto 96th Street from both the north and south simultaneously.

Additionally, located at the southwest corner of the intersection are P.S. 75 and the West Side Collaborative Middle School, which have a combined 1,400 students, many of whom cross this intersection on their way to and from school. The crossing guards have said that they believe that they risk their lives helping the children cross at the intersection.

DoT has implemented several efforts to make the intersection safer, however they require a maintenance partner and insurance for the installation of curb extensions. Members of CB7, Council Member Helen Rosenthal and community members have worked tirelessly and have been unsuccessful in finding a partner.

Manhattan Community Board 4 On August 3, 2020, faced with similar problems in getting curb extension on dangerous intersections when no partners were available, requested that DoT remove the requirement.

Curb extensions enhance pedestrian safety. The intersection at 96th and West End Avenue remains one of the most notoriously dangerous in our District.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/Manhattan requests that DoT change the requirement of a maintenance partner and insurance at the SW corner of 96 and WEA and immediately install a curb extension. The Board further notes that since curb extensions are proven to save lives, a community sponsor should not be needed to install a critical safety measure at a very dangerous intersection directly in front of an elementary school.

## RESOLUTION

**Date: October 6, 2020**

**Committee of Origin: Steering**

**Re: Amendment to CB7's Bylaws re-election procedures.**

**Full Board Vote: 42 In Favor 0 Against 1 Abstention 0 Present**

The bylaws of Community Board 7/Manhattan, adopted on February 5, 2013, and subsequently amended on February 5, 2019, are revised as follows:

Article III, Section C (1) is amended by adding at the end of the current provision the following:

Solely for the period October 1, 2020 through November 1, 2021, and solely in connection with Board elections conducted at meetings permitted to be held via virtual or electronic means instead of an in-person meeting, in the place of a signed, written paper ballot, voting shall be conducted by secure electronic means in the form of a Google Forms submission or an equivalent means. Each Member will be provided by the District Manager under the direction and supervision of the Elections Committee a secure and unique electronic authorization token to correspond with the Member's electronic ballot. Voting shall be conducted using these means during the meeting at which the election is held, and shall start and conclude at the times announced by the chair of the Elections Committee. Each set of candidates for office will be supplemented by an "abstain" option to allow Members to decline to vote. Members shall submit only one electronic Google Form or equivalent ballot. In the event a Member submits more than one such ballot, the Election Committee will tabulate only the first electronic Google Form ballot submitted by the Member. Members are advised to review carefully their Google Form or equivalent ballot prior to clicking to submit. Any Member who is unable to vote using the Google Form or equivalent electronic means will be called upon during the meeting and given the opportunity to announce her/his vote.

The Elections Committee will tabulate the results of the election and announce the candidates elected to office during the course of the meeting at which voting takes place.

This amendment will take effect immediately upon adoption by the full Board.