

**BROOKLYN COMMUNITY BOARD 6  
LANDMARKS/LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING  
OCTOBER 26, 2017**

**Attendance:**

J. Armer	P
P. Basile	P
P. Blake	P
D. Briggs	P
G. Faeth	P
P. Fleming	P
R. Freeman	P

B. Fuller-Goggins	A
V. Hagman	P
G. Kelly	P
A. Krasnow	P
Y. Lee	P
R. Levine	P
T. Miskel	E

M. Murphy	P
C. Pigott	A
M. Racioppo	P
A. Reeves	P
D. Scotto	A
M. Shames	P
R. Sloane	E

P = present, E = excused, A = absent

**Guests:**

S. Lonial – Chairperson of Community Board 6

L. Mariano

C. Reynolds

M. Buhl

A. Marchese

D. Marulanda

A. Schwartz

**\*\*\*MINUTES\*\*\***

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Legalization of an existing lamp post, fence replacement, signage and barrier free access ramp at 207 Berkeley Place, Park Slope Historic District.**

Presentation by the owner a G. P. Physician. He has lived in the neighborhood for 45 years – since 1974. He began private practice in 1979. He purchased 207 Berkeley Place in 2008 request to office and residence. All proper licenses were undertaken in 2008.

New regulations – has received a violation. Did not intend to violate any regulations – requested permission for all the changes.

Changes: - repairs all with permits and Landmark approvals.

- Facade
- Sidewalk
- Windows
- Door – change of color

Signs – on lamppost and wall were present at the time.

Legalizations: request to legalize these things

1. Sign on building – similar signs are on nearby buildings

2. Sign post – similar signs on posts
3. Fence – original fence rusted – new fence installed similar
4. Ramp – 9 inch slope – ADA ramp, no railing needed – Department of Buildings approved.

Question: What is the time line for the ramp?

Answer: 2009 built, not signed off until 2011.

Q: Why did the owner not go to LPC to do the 4 actions that are now requested?

A: It was not intended to go without.

Q: How is it possible that they did not go to Landmarks for major items at areaway entry? The Dept. of Buildings paperwork states Landmark District? Owner would know that they had to go – Why did they not?

A. Owner expected that DOB would tell them if more was required.

Q: Railing height is different – sign on building is larger from reference signs (building #) - ramp takes up more space from reference - lamppost is not historically relevant?

Comment: New railing is overall better than original one. Lamppost is not historic to Park Slope.

Comment: Changes are not terrible – only areaway with ramp across entire portion. Looks different!

Comment: Changes are not out of context. Some details are not quite right but it is not inappropriate. Ramp is not even visible or out of the ordinary. Problem: Why are we doing a \_\_\_\_\_ approval?

Mark Shames made a motion to legalize the Certificate of Appropriateness and Peter Fleming seconded.

**Vote: 10.....Yeas 5.....Nays 0.....Abstentions**

**Motion passed**

Motion to hold the record open until Landmarks Preservation approves was seconded by Jerry Armer.

**Motion approved: Unanimously**

**PUBLIC HEARING on NYC Department of Environmental Protection's Uniform Use Review Procedure application relevant to site selection and acquisition of property located at 242 Nevins Street, 234 Butler Street, and 270 Nevins Street for a combined sewer overflow control facility, commonly referred to as the Gowanus Canal CSO Facility (ULURP Application #C180065 PCK).**

Michael Deloche – Deputy Commissioner of Public Affairs at the Department of Environmental Protection. Want to work collaboratively. Many other parts of this project in Gowanus planning to coordinate with.

Elisha Weston – Public Affairs with the Bureau of Engineering

ULURP application for site selection and property acquisition for a CSO control facility. DEP's efforts to minimize CSO's throughout neighborhood.

Two tanks – 8M gallon at Head End. Head End at north end. 4M gallon at Owl Head. Certification: 9/18

1. Demapping Douglas
  - City to acquire property and another parcel

EPA - wanted detention tank to be located on the park. Why did not want to do that. EPA can override.

DEP – looked at Gowanus Planning Study.

- Head House: strains the overflow. Sewage detain
- Reduce overflow 76%
- Water that does go back into canal will have been through secondary team: Hazen, Brown & Caldwell – D Land – Selldorf Architects
- Underground tanks will have some public open space use
- Public open space will be guided by use, needs and neighborhood
  - o Strip along the canal – promenade
  - o Flexible use on top of tanks – needs access
  - o Sloped grade change to top of tank

DEIS – of 21 assessment categories – 6 screened out – 2 with potential impacts

Timeline – careful sequencing with National Grid. 7 year construction

Question: Building at corner of Butler Street. Landscaping shown but not part of ULURP. What is on the property? What about the buildings that are there? What is being taken? Who are they?

DEP – Environmental, Planning and Analysis looking at direct/indirect impact. There are 19 businesses on the site.

- Eastern Effect
- 18 businesses – not considered an impact to \_\_\_\_\_
- Can relocate those businesses
- Do not have services that will impact if they are removed.
- Relocation is working with business – Eastern Effects is looking at Sunset Park

Question: How many square feet of commercial businesses?

Answer: Over 20% of manufacturing district has been lost through rezoning. NYC is not creating more area. Loss is critical.

- DEP – property – potential loss of 200,000 square feet.
- Staging area will revert to M zone

Question: What are the potential impacts?

Answer: DEP – 2 categories that may have no impact

- Mitigation
- Non-mitigatable – Historic impact (warehouse on site). Looking at how to salvage elements of the building. Archeological resources digging may find. Construction noise – duration of construction. Large project – temporary but long impact – Two sites at 282 and 285 Nevins Street.

Question: Why not use properties that are for sale across the street?

Answer: DEP – Current site is well situated to the enormous existing sewer lines. Site allows for continuous use – site by DEP contiguous with existing pump station.

Question: EPA suggested park?

Answer: EPA assumptions to use park did not take many factors into consideration. EPA consented to let DEP build the facility on the site selected.

Question: EIS is on line and public. ULURP scope is on line. Location was discussed at CAG (preferred) but the site was determined but this proposal is now what we have to support this.

Comment: Notification was not adequate – neighbors, EPA did not know.

Question: Milestones need to acquire property – willing seller or eminent domain. If milestones are not reached – businesses lost and nothing gained.

Answer: Acquisition completed by 2020. Construction – COE 2019, ME 2019

Question: Why 2 ULURPS with 2 sites?

Answer: RH-03 site – priority – because EPA would like to start there. Owls Head – similar time frame – a little behind.

Question: Were any other sites reviewed for quicker timeline?

Answer: Playground was much longer timeline.

Question: Could there be a change in shifting Head House and storage south and retaining historic building on the corner?

Question: What happens if this takes place but Thomas Green Park is being remediated as well?

Answer: A lot of work in small area.

Question/Comment: What is the agreement of owners?

Answer: 6-9 months – ULURP approval to closing.

Question: What consideration for 100 year climate change?

Answer: All mechanical equipment is above flood line.

Question: What about additional resiliency engineering design?

Answer: Site is too small – cannot protect community from storm surge. Storage will provide improvement in sewage system.

Question: What are the ULURP actions?

Answer: To acquire property and site selection – capital facility needs to do part. De-mapping is later.

What is the vote?

Question: Staging site – what happens to it?

Answer: City will lease property and return it to owner.

Question: What happens if properties are not acquired – “pivot” will have to happen because EPA requires it? What is back-up plan?

Answer: Pivot will mean acquisitions have not been acquired – so they will revert. DEP is confident to meet construction milestones.

Question: Regular maintenance of Head House – has the canal been considered?

Answer: No. Two trucks/per storm is potential – 30 yd. container assumed 40X per year.

Question: What happens if mitigation is not possible?

Answer: Can still move forward after impacts – as long as mitigation has been studied. If impact was noise – no dust or air impact.

Question: What does “Cleaning up the Map” mean?

Answer; Douglass Street is mapped between Nevins Street and the Canal so it would be easier to de-map it.

Question: What about future presentations on design?

Answer: Public Design Commission for city owned property will review project and the Community Board will be involved in that process.

Comment: Location and facility makes sense

DEP – Description of \_\_\_\_\_

A motion was made by David Briggs and seconded by Madelaine Murphy for Committee to accept DEP motion.

1. Commitment from the City for relocation support for displaced businesses. Specifically, Eastern Effects agreement to move must be done before ULURP approval.
2. CB6 strongly supports M zone - look to DEP – when staging area is done – DEP leave as M zoning.

3. Mitigation of construction noise must be addressed for residents of local buildings.
4. Consider alternative design to save historic structure.
5. DEP agrees to commit to come back to CB6 for all design and programming of the Gowanus area.
6. Removal of debris from Head House be removed by barge through canal.
7. DEP work with CB6 and DOT for construction debris mitigation – use of canal?

Comment: Express what we need to consent to in order to make this go through. Support regardless of conditions. Conditions are not disqualifying.

**VOTE: 14.....YEAS 1.....NAYS 0.....ABSTENTIONS**