
BULLETIN

OF THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF STANDARDS AND APPEALS

Published weekly by The Board of Standards and Appeals at its office at:
250 Broadway, 29th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10007.

Volume 100, Nos. 20-21

May 20, 2015

DIRECTORY

MARGERY PERLMUTTER, *Chair*

SUSAN M. HINKSON, *Vice-Chair*

DARA OTTLEY-BROWN

EILEEN MONTANEZ

Commissioners

Ryan Singer, *Executive Director*

John Egnatios-Beene, *Counsel*

OFFICE -	250 Broadway, 29th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10007
HEARINGS HELD -	22 Reade Street, Spector Hall, New York, N.Y. 10007
BSA WEBPAGE @	http://www.nyc.gov/html/bsa/home.html

TELEPHONE - (212) 386-0009
FAX - (646) 500-6271

CONTENTS

DOCKET	283
CALENDAR of June 2, 2015	
Morning	285
Afternoon	286

CONTENTS

**MINUTES of Regular Meetings,
Tuesday, May 12, 2015**

Morning Calendar287

Affecting Calendar Numbers:

150-04-BZ 129 Elizabeth Street, Manhattan
131-11-A thru 464, 468 Arthur Kill Road, 120 Pemberton Avenue, Staten Island
 133-11-A
159-14-A thru
 161-14-A
128-14-A 47 East 3rd Street, Manhattan
245-12-A 515 East 5th Street, Manhattan
95-14-A 237 East 72nd Street, Manhattan
167-14-A 250 Manhattan Avenue, Manhattan
250-14-A thru 5401, 5031, 5021, 5310, 5300, 5041, 5030, 5040 Grosvenor Avenue, Bronx
 257-14-A
248-13-BZ 1179 East 28th Street, Brooklyn
284-14-BZ 267 Pacific Street, Brooklyn
124-14-BZ 1112 Gilmore Court, Brooklyn
264-13BZ 257 West 17th Street, Manhattan
266-13-BZ 515 East 5th Street, Manhattan
51-14-BZ 1369 East 28th Street, Brooklyn
204-14-BZ 55 Wythe Avenue, Brooklyn
324-14-BZ 198-30 Jamaica Avenue, Queens

Afternoon Calendar301

Affecting Calendar Numbers:

233-14-BZ 4545 Center Boulevard, Queens
260-14-BZ 100 East End Avenue, aka 106 East End Avenue, Manhattan

Correction302

Affecting Calendar Numbers:

217-14-BZ 245 West 17th Street, Manhattan

DOCKETS

New Case Filed Up to May 12, 2015

95-15-BZ

1203 Jerome Avenue, Jerome Avenue bordering Edward L. Grant Highway, Block 02506, Lot(s) 062, Borough of **Bronx, Community Board: 4**. Special Permit (§73-36) to a physical culture establishment(PCE) Retro Fitness, within two-story masonry building within an C8-3 Div. By R7-1 W/C2-4 zoning district. C8-3 Div./R7-1W district.

96-15-A

18 Colon Street, Westside 384.35 feet North of Billiou Street, Block 06569, Lot(s) 040, Borough of **Staten Island, Community Board: 3**. GCL 36 proposed construction of two new family dwelling on a lot not fronting a legally mapped street contrary to Section 36 of the General City Law. R3-XwithinSSRD district.

97-15-A

221 Douglas road, Southeast corner of intersection of Douglas road and Briggins Lane, Block 0830, Lot(s) 035, Borough of **Staten Island, Community Board: 2**. GCL36: proposed construction of building that does not front on a legally mapped street, pursuant Article 3 Section 36 of the General city Law. R1-1(N-1) district.

98-15-BZ

240 East 54th Street, South side of East 54th Street, 100 feet west of intersection of East 54th Street and Second Avenue, Block 01327, Lot(s) 029, Borough of **Manhattan, Community Board: 6**. Special Permit (§73-36) to allow a physical culture establishment (PC within the existing building for a one family , three-story residence for accessory parking spaces, located within the C1-9 zoning district. C1-9 district.

99-15-BZ

240 East 54th Street, South side of East 54th Street, 1100 feet west of intersection of East 54th Str. And 2nd Avenue, Block 01327, Lot(s) 029, Borough of **Manhattan, Community Board: 6**. Special Permit (§73-36) to allow for a physical culture establishment(PCE) operation as Blink in an existing commercial building located within an C1-9 zoning district. C1-9 district.

100-15-BZ

24 East 39th Street, 39th Street between Park Avenue and Madison Avenue, Block 0868, Lot(s) 051, Borough of **Manhattan, Community Board: 6**. Variance (§72-21) to propose a change of use in the existing building on the premises from a use group 2 apartment hotel to a use group 5 transient hotel which is located within an R8B zoning district. R8B district.

101-15-BZ

830 Hicksville Road, through lot between Hicksville Road and Frisco Avenue parallel to Beach 9th Street, Block 15583, Lot(s) 0011, Borough of **Queens, Community Board: 14**. Variance (§72-21) to permit construction of a two-story use group 4 synagogue contrary to underlying bulk requirements. R2X zoning district R2X district.

102-15-A

1088 Rossville Avenue, Rossville Avenue at the corner of Poplar Avenue, Block 07067, Lot(s) 0001, Borough of **Staten Island, Community Board: 3**. Proposed construction of a building located partially within the bed of mapped unbuilt street, pursuant Article 3 Section 35 of the General City Law. R3-2/SRD zoning district. R3-2/SRD district.

103-15-BZ

21-51 Shore Boulevard, east side of Shore Boulevard on the corner of Shore Boulevard and 21st Drive, Block 00896, Lot(s) 0206, Borough of **Queens, Community Board: 1**. Variance (§72-21) to permit the vertical enlargement of an existing one family residence and conversion from one dwelling unit to two dwelling units contrary to Z.R. §23-141 (FAR) and Z.R. §23-45 (Front Yard). R5B zoning district. R5B district.

104-15-BZ

4452 Broadway, southeast corner of Broadway and Fairview Avenue, Block 02170, Lot(s) 0062, Borough of **Manhattan, Community Board: 12**. Variance (§72-21) to permit the development of a mixed-use residential building with ground floor retail use contrary to underlying bulk regulations. C2-4 & R7-2 zoning district. C2-4, R7-2 district.

DOCKETS

105-15-BZ

2102-2124 Avenue Z, south side of Avenue Z between East 21st Street and East 22nd Street, Block 07441, Lot(s) 0371, Borough of **Brooklyn, Community Board: 15**. Variance (§72-21) to permit the development of a four (4) story building consisting of Use Group 6 commercial offices on the first and second floor and community facility uses on the third and fourth floors. R4 zoning district. R4 district.

106-15-A

42-29 149th Street, parallel with Sanford Avenue on mapped buty unbuilt portion of Ash Avenue, Block 05380, Lot(s) 0013, Borough of **Queens, Community Board: 7**. Proposed construction of a building located partially within the bed of mapped unbuilt street, pursuant Article 3 Section 36 of the General City Law. R4-1 zoning district. R4-1 district.

107-15-A

42-31 149th Street, parallel with Sanford Avenue on mapped buty unbuilt portion of Ash Avenue, Block 05380, Lot(s) 0012, Borough of **Queens, Community Board: 7**. Proposed construction of a building located partially within the bed of mapped unbuilt street, pursuant Article 3 Section 36 of the General City Law. R4-1 zoning district. R4-1 district.

DESIGNATIONS: D-Department of Buildings; B.BK.-Department of Buildings, Brooklyn; B.M.-Department of Buildings, Manhattan; B.Q.-Department of Buildings, Queens; B.S.I.-Department of Buildings, Staten Island; B.BX.-Department of Building, The Bronx; H.D.-Health Department; F.D.-Fire Department.

CALENDAR

JUNE 2, 2015, 10:00 A.M.

APPEALS CALENDAR

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of a public hearing, Tuesday morning, June 2, 2015, 10:00 A.M., at 22 Reade Street, Spector Hall, New York, N.Y. 10007, on the following matters:

SPECIAL ORDER CALENDAR

173-92-BZ

APPLICANT – Simons & Wright LLC, for Bremen House, Inc., owner.

SUBJECT – Application January 17, 2014 – Extension of Term of a previously approved Special Permit (§73-36) permitting the operation of martial arts studio which expires on January 24, 2014; Amendment to permit the relocation of the facility from the 2nd floor to the cellar. C2-8A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 220 East 86th Street, 86th Street between 2nd and 3rd Avenues, Block 01531, Lot 38, Borough of Manhattan

COMMUNITY BOARD #8M

268-03-BZ

APPLICANT – Eric Palatnik, P.C., for Park Circle Realty Associates, owner.

SUBJECT – Application October 9, 2014 – Extension of Term (§11-411) for the continued operation of an automotive service station which expired on January 27, 2014; Waiver of the Rules. C1-3/R3-2 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 145-55 Guy Brewer Boulevard, south corner of Farmers Boulevard and Guy Brewer Boulevard, Block 13313, Lot 40 Borough of Queens.

COMMUNITY BOARD #13Q

3-15-A

APPLICANT – Edward Lauria, for Jeff Schaffer, owner.

SUBJECT – Application January 7, 2015 – Proposed construction does not front on a legally mapped street contrary Section 36, of the General City Law, and 502.1 2008, building Code. M1-1SRD zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 47 Trioka Way, west side of Trioka Way, 124.11' north of Winant Avenue, Block 7400, Lot 85, Borough of Queens.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3Q

7-15-BZY & 8-15-A

APPLICANT – Duval & Stackenfeld, for 180 Orchard LLC c/o Brack Capital Real Estate, owner.

SUBJECT – Application January 14, 2015 – BZY Minor Development (§11-332) to extend the time of construction for a minor development for a period of six months; Determination of common law vested rights. Building permit was obtained in 2005 and development was vested at date of Lower East Side rezoning in 2008. C4-4A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 180 Orchard Street, bounded by Orchard, East Houston, Ludlow and Stanton Streets, approx. 220' of East Houston, Block 00412, Lot 5, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3M

26-15-A & 27-15-A

APPLICANT – Law Office of Steven Simicich, for PeteRock, Inc., owner.

SUBJECT – Application February 17, 2015 – Proposed construction of buildings that do not front on a legally mapped street pursuant to Section 36 Article 3 of the General City Law. R3A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 57 & 61 Alberta Avenue, north side of Alberta Avenue between Victory Boulevard and Wild Avenue, Block 02637, Lot(s) 0019, 0020, Borough of Staten Island.

COMMUNITY BOARD #2SI

CALENDAR

JUNE 2, 2015, 1:00 P.M.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of a public hearing, Tuesday afternoon, June 2, 2015, 1:00 P.M., at 22 Reade Street, Spector Hall, New York, N.Y. 10007, on the following matters:

ZONING CALENDAR

264-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Eric Palatnik, P.C., for GS 149 LLC, owner; Crunch LLC, lessee.

SUBJECT – Application October 24, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to permit a physical culture establishment (*Crunch Fitness*) within portions of the existing commercial building. C4-4 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 436 East 149th Street, south side of East 149th Street, approximately 215’ west of intersection with Brook Avenue, Block 02293, Lot 46, Borough of Bronx.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1BX

319-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Eric Palatnik, P.C., for Shore Plaza LLC, owner; Staten Island MMA1, Inc., lessee.

SUBJECT – Application December 5, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to permit the legalization of a physical culture establishment (*UFC Gym*). C43 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 1781 South Avenue, within West Shore Plaza 1745-1801 South Avenue, Block 02800, Lot 37, Borough of Staten Island.

COMMUNITY BOARD #2SI

335-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Rothkrug Rothkrug & Spector, LLP, for Trizc Hahn, owner; Soul Cycle Bryant Park LLC, lessee.

SUBJECT – Application December 31, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to allow for a physical culture establishment (*Soulcycle*) within portions of an existing commercial building. C5-3(MID)(T) zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 1065 Avenue of the Americas aka 5 Bryant Park, 101 West 40th Street, northwest corner of Avenue of the Americas and West 40th Street, Block 00993, Lot 29, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #5M

Ryan Singer, Executive Director

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 12, 2015 10:00 A.M.

Present: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez.

SPECIAL ORDER CALENDAR

150-04-BZ

APPLICANT – Sheldon Lobel, P.C., for Shun K. and Oi-Yee Fung, owners.

SUBJECT – Application May 2, 2014 – Amendment of a previously approved variance to permit the construction of a four-story building with retail space and one-car garage. C6-2G zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 129 Elizabeth Street, west side of Elizabeth Street between Broome and Grand Street, Block 470, Lot 17, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #2M

THE VOTE TO CLOSE HEARING –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter; Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez...4
Negative:.....0

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 23, 2015, at 10 A.M., for decision, hearing closed.

APPEALS CALENDAR

131-11-A thru 133-11-A

159-14-A thru 161-14-A

APPLICANT – Rothkrug Rothkrug & Spector, LLP, for Dalip Karpuzzi, Luizime Karpuzzi, owners.

SUBJECT – Application September 6, 2011 & July 7, 2014 – Proposed construction of three two story dwellings with parking garages located within the bed of a mapped street, contrary to General City Law Section 35. R3-1 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 464, 468 Arthur Kill Road, 120 Pemberton Avenue, intersection of Arthur Kill Road and Giffords Lane, Block 5450, Lot 35, 36, 37, Borough of Staten Island.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3SI

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Application granted on condition.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez...4
Negative:.....0

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the decision of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated June 6, 2014, acting on DOB Application Nos. 520055216, 520059463, 520055225, 520194888, 520194904, and 520194897, reads in pertinent

part:

Proposed construction located within the bed of a mapped street is contrary to Section 35 of the General City Law; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this application on January 27, 2015, after due notice by publication in *The City Record*, with continued hearings on March 10, 2015 and April 21, 2015 and then to decision on May 12, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Vice-Chair Hinkson and Commissioner Montanez performed inspections of the site and premises, as well as the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, this is an application to allow the construction of a three two-story, two-family homes and three accessory parking garages that will be partially or entirely located within the bed of a mapped but unbuilt portion of Pemberton Avenue, south of Arthur Kill Road, between Elverton Avenue and Giffords Lane; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located within an R3-1 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the site comprises Tax Lots 35, 36, and 37; it has approximately 16,082 sq. ft. of lot area; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated April 15, 2015, the New York City Fire Department (“FDNY”) states that it has no objections to the proposed application; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated March 10, 2015, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (“DEP”) states that it has no objections to the proposed application; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated March 11, 2015, the New York City Department of Transportation (“DOT”) states that Pemberton Avenue is not presently included in DOT’s Capital Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that pursuant to GCL § 35, it may authorize construction within the bed of the mapped street subject to reasonable requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that pursuant to ZR § 72-01(g), the Board may waive bulk regulations where construction is proposed in part within the bed of a mapped street; such bulk waivers will be only as necessary to address non-compliances resulting from the location of construction within and outside of the mapped street, and the zoning lot will comply to the maximum extent feasible with all applicable zoning regulations as if the street were not mapped; and

WHEREAS, therefore, consistent with GCL § 35 and ZR § 72-01(g), the Board finds that applying the bulk regulations across the portion of the subject lot within the mapped street and the portion of the subject lot outside the mapped street as if the lot were unencumbered by a mapped street is both reasonable and necessary to allow the proposed construction; and

WHEREAS, accordingly, the Board has determined that the applicant has submitted adequate evidence to warrant this approval under certain conditions.

Therefore it is Resolved, that the Board modifies the decisions of the DOB, dated June 6, 2014, acting on DOB Application Nos. 520055216, 520059463, 520055225,

MINUTES

520194888, 520194904, and 520194897, by the power vested in it by Section 35 of the General City Law, and also waives the bulk regulations associated with the presence of the mapped but unbuilt street pursuant to Section 72-01(g) of the Zoning Resolution to grant this appeal, limited to the decision noted above *on condition* that construction will substantially conform to the drawing filed with the application marked "Received May 7, 2015"- (1) sheet; and *on further condition*:

THAT DOB shall review and approve plans associated with the Board's approval for compliance with the underlying zoning regulations as if the unbuilt portion of the street were not mapped;

THAT the drainage plan for the site shall be submitted to DEP prior to the issuance of any DOB permit(s);

THAT DEP approval of the drainage plan shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the temporary certificate(s) of occupancy;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to specifically cited and filed DOB/other jurisdiction objection(s);

THAT the approved plans will be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted; and

THAT DOB must ensure compliance with all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of plan(s)/configuration(s) not related to the relief granted.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals on May 12, 2015.

128-14-A

APPLICANT – Bryan Cave LLP, for Alicat Family LLC & AEEE Family LLC, owner.

SUBJECT – Application June 6, 2014 – Appeal challenging DOB determination that the proposed off-street loading berth is not accessory to a medical office. C2-5/R7A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 47 East 3rd Street, East 3rd Street between First and Second Avenues, Block 445, Lot 62, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Appeal Denied.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative:0

Negative: Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez3

Recused: Chair Perlmutter.....1

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the subject appeal comes before the Board in response to a Final Determination, dated May 9, 2014, by Department of Buildings ("DOB") First Deputy Commissioner Thomas J. Fariello (the "Final Determination"); and

WHEREAS, the Final Determination was issued in response to the applicant's submission of a Zoning Resolution Determination Form (the "ZRD1"), in which the applicant

sought review of DOB's conclusion that the subject

[l]oading berth is not clearly incidental to, and not customarily found in connection with ambulatory diagnostic facilities (ZR 12-10) [and, therefore] is not permitted as accessory use to ambulatory diagnostic facility (ZR 36-61); and

WHEREAS, the Final Determination states, in pertinent part, that:

...the applicant has not demonstrated that off-street loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices, per the ZR 12-10 definition for "accessory uses." Since the off-street loading berth within the subject medical office is not a use which is clearly incidental to, and customarily found in connection with, the principal medical office use, the loading berth is not accessory to the medical office. Therefore, the above stated request is hereby denied and the off-street loading berth within the medical office, including any curb cuts providing access to the loading berth, must be removed; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this appeal on December 16, 2014, after due notice by publication in *The City Record*, with continued hearings on February 24, 2015, and April 28, 2015, and then to decision on May 12, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the premises and surrounding area had site and neighborhood examinations by Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Montanez, and Commissioner Ottley-Brown; and

WHEREAS, this appeal is filed on behalf of Alistair and Catherine Economakis (collectively, the "Appellants"), the occupants of the building known as and located at 47 East 3rd Street, in Manhattan (the "Building," which is owned by Alicat Family LLC and AEE Family LLC); the Appellant contends that DOB's issuance of the Final Determination was erroneous; and

WHEREAS, DOB and the Appellants have been represented by counsel throughout this appeal; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located on the north side of East Third Street, between Second Avenue and First Avenue, partially within an R7A (C2-5) zoning district and partially within an R8B zoning district, within the East Village / Lower East Side Historic District; and

WHEREAS, the site has 40 feet of frontage along East 3rd Street and approximately 3,080 sq. ft. of lot area; and

WHEREAS, the site is occupied by the six-story (with basement) Building; and

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

WHEREAS, in May, 2008, the Appellants pre-filed an Alteration Type 1 application to convert one of the Building's two basement-level commercial spaces into a residential one-car garage; and

WHEREAS, after DOB rejected the proposed plans, the Appellants withdrew their application for a residential garage on December 9, 2008; and

WHEREAS, on December 12, 2008, the Appellants pre-

MINUTES

filed an Alteration Type 1 application to convert the then-existing multiple dwelling into a single-family residence; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants' December 12, 2008 application did not include a change in use of the Building's basement-level stores and the plans filed therewith, dated December 5, 2008, do not depict a medical office or loading berth; and

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2009, the Appellants submitted a BC-1 Pre-Consideration and Reconsideration Application form related to the December 12, 2008 Alteration Type 1 application, in which the Appellants requested DOB's pre-consideration of an accessory loading berth with a 12 foot curb cut located in the basement of the Building; and

WHEREAS, in response to the June 15, 2009 BC-1, on July 14, 2009, DOB's Manhattan Borough Commissioner issued a determination that "no loading berth is required for doctor's office as per ZR 25-75"; and

WHEREAS, on October 20, 2009, DOB's Manhattan Borough Office issued a pre-consideration approval stating that it was "OK to accept accessory off-street loading berth since it is permitted for community facility use (Use Group 4)" and further noting that the subject "[l]oading berth shall not be used for accessory off-street parking"; and

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2010, the Appellants pre-filed a post approval amendment to the December 12, 2008 application to change the cellar from two stores, storage and a boiler room to a community facility, ambulatory loading berth, and boiler room, and submitted revised construction plans dated February 10, 2010 showing a loading berth of 442 sq. ft. and a medical office of 580 sq. ft.; and

WHEREAS, on May 27, 2011, the Appellants filed a subsequent post approval amendment to the December 12, 2009 application, increasing the size of the medical office to 640 square feet; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2011, DOB rescinded the October 20, 2009 pre-consideration approval, stating, in pertinent part, that, "the proposed loading berth fails to meet the definition of 'accessory' per ZR 12-10" in that, because of the relative size of the loading berth to the proposed medical facility, the proposed loading berth "is not 'clearly incidental' to the facility"; and

WHEREAS, on September 23, 2011, the Appellants filed a revised ZRD1 to increase the size of the medical office to 850 square feet and reduce the size of the loading berth to 429 square feet; and

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2011, DOB denied the September 23, 2011 ZRD1; and

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2012, the Appellants pre-filed an additional post approval amendment to the December 12, 2008 application, pursuant to which the area of the medical office was increased to 1,450 square feet and the loading berth was reduced to 396 square feet, together with a report, commissioned by the Appellants and prepared by Urban Cartographics, dated November 2, 2012 (the "UC Report") in support of the Appellants' contention that it is customary for medical offices to have accessory loading berths or off-street parking; and

WHEREAS, on February 28, 2013, DOB denied the Appellants' May 31, 2012 post approval amendment; and

WHEREAS, on October 11, 2013, the Appellants responded to DOB's denial of the May 31, 2012 post approval amendment and revised the plans submitted therewith to reflect a reduction in the area of the medical office, to 1,250 square feet (the "Medical Office"); and

WHEREAS, DOB denied the Appellants' October 11, 2013 submission on May 9, 2014 and ordered the removal of the subject loading berth (the "Loading Berth") which, as constructed, spans 396 square feet and is two stories tall; and

WHEREAS, on June 6, 2014, the Appellants brought the instant appeal; and

PROVISIONS OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Appellants and DOB agree that the Zoning Resolution provision at issue is the definition of "accessory use" set forth in ZR § 12-10, which provides in pertinent part:

Accessory use, or accessory

An "accessory use":

- (a) is a *use* conducted on the same *zoning lot* as the principal *use* to which it is related (whether located within the same or an *accessory building or other structure*, or as an *accessory use* of the land), and
- (b) is a *use* which is clearly incidental to, and customarily found in connection with, such principal *use*, and
- (c) is either in the same ownership as such principal *use*, or is operated and maintained on the same *zoning lot* substantially for the benefit or convenience of the owners, occupants, employees, customers, or visitors of the principal *use*.¹

WHEREAS, the Board notes that it is the Appellants' burden to demonstrate, based on evidence in the record, that a proposed accessory use meets the foregoing criteria (*see e.g.*, BSA Ca. No. 45-96-A (July 23, 1996)); and

DISCUSSION

A. THE APPELLANTS' POSITION

WHEREAS, the Appellants assert that the Loading Berth is an accessory use to the Medical Office in that it is located on the same zoning lot as the Medical Office and Building, is in the same ownership as the Medical Office and Building and is clearly incidental to, and customarily found in connection with the medical office use of the Premises; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants submit that the Medical Office will be occupied by an orthopedic spinal surgeon whose work involves surgery, rehabilitation, and out-patient treatment of non-surgical spinal disorder; and

¹ Neither party disputes that the Loading Berth is located on the same zoning lot as the Medical Office, or that the Loading Berth is in the same ownership as the Medical Office and Building. As such, subsections (a) and (c) of the definition of Accessory Use are not at issue in the instant appeal.

MINUTES

WHEREAS, the Appellants submit that the surgeon who will occupy the Medical Office intends to use the Loading Berth for patient services, including ambulances and deliveries, and

WHEREAS, the Appellants submit that approximately 20% of the surgeon's patients will arrive at the Medical Office by ambulette; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants have submitted letters from the surgeon who plans to occupy the Medical Office in support of the foregoing claims; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants offer the following arguments in support of their position: (1) that the Loading Berth is clearly incidental to the Medical Office notwithstanding DOB's argument that the Loading Berth is too large relative to the Medical Office to constitute an accessory use; (2) that loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices of the type at issue in this appeal and that in assessing this point DOB should consider the functionality of loading berths, rather than the term as used in the Zoning Resolution, such that off-street parking spaces used in connection with medical offices should support the Appellants' contention that loading berths are a customary accessory use to small medical offices; and (3) that the instant case presents the first instance in which a loading berth is claimed as accessory to a spinal surgeon's office to facilitate non-ambulatory patients and, as such, DOB must consider whether this new use is similar in function or type to other well-established accessory uses; and

WHEREAS, in support of their argument, the Appellants have submitted and referred the Board to the UC Report, which was initially submitted by the Appellants to DOB in response to the agency's request for examples of loading berths which are accessory to medical offices, and which the Appellants contend shows "8 locations where medical offices are accompanied by accessory off-street loading berths and parking spaces used for loading purposes"; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants have also submitted two letters from transportation companies Sinai Van Service and Medi Trans (the "Ambulette Service Letters") in support of their argument that off-street parking services serve similar purposes to those served by off-street loading berths; and

1. The Appellants argue that the Loading Berth is "clearly incidental" to the Medical Office.

WHEREAS, the Appellants argue that the Loading Berth is clearly incidental to the Medical Office and that DOB's rejection of their application is based on an allegedly erroneous insertion into the Zoning Resolution of a size limitation upon accessory loading berths; and

WHEREAS, as to their argument that the relative size of the Loading Berth to the Medical Office evidences that the former is clearly incidental to the latter, the Appellants submit that the square footage of the Loading Berth and Medical Office are 396 square feet and 1,250 square feet, respectively, thereby establishing that the Loading Berth is incidental to the Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants argue that the "relative proportion of allowable accessory to principal uses runs a

spectrum" and note that the Board has allowed accessory uses that occupied as little as two percent and as much as 69 percent of the square footage of the lot; and

WHEREAS, specifically, the Appellants cite *2294 Forest Avenue*, BSA Cal. No. 14-09-BZ (August 24, 2010), in which the Board allowed for an automotive laundry totaling two percent of the lot area of the lot area of the site as an accessory to an automobile service station with an accessory convenience store; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants also cite *11-11 131st Street*, BSA Cal. No. 202-05-BZ (July 18, 2006), in which the Board granted a Special Permit to operate a Physical Culture Establishment with a proposed accessory therapeutic and relaxation service space totaling 8,058 square feet, in excess of the primary massage, exercise and aerobics square footage, of 3,548 square feet; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants maintain that the Loading Berth comprises 24 percent of the square footage of the lot and, therefore, is within the range of acceptable accessory use to principal use ratio previously accepted by this Board, and states that the Board "has ... recognized that there is no limitation on the amount of square footage an accessory use may occupy compared to the primary use"; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants further argue that notwithstanding that foregoing, DOB was in error when it held as dispositive the relative size of the Loading Berth to the Medical Office, and maintain that while the relative size of a proposed accessory use to its principal use is an appropriate consideration, it cannot be the sole consideration in the absence of a legislative mandate limiting the size of such proposed accessory use; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants maintain that DOB "was required to assess the propriety of the loading berth based on an 'individualized assessment of need' [quoting *New York Botanical Garden v Board of Standards and Appeals*, 91 NY2d 413 (1998)] reflecting its functional characteristic," an analysis, the Appellants argue, by which the proposed Loading Berth was clearly incidental to the principal Medical Office use; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants note that the *New York Botanical Garden* Court refused to create a restriction on accessory uses based on size and concluded, with respect to the use and tower at issue in that case, that "[t]he fact that the definition of accessory radio towers contains no ... size restriction supports the conclusion that the size and scope of these structures must be based upon an individualized assessment of need," *New York Botanical Garden*, 91 NY2d at 423; and

WHEREAS, in further support of their argument that relative size of the Loading Berth to the Medical Office cannot be dispositive to whether the Loading Berth is clearly incidental to the Medical Office, the Appellants cite *Mamaroneck Beach & Yacht Club v Zoning Board of Appeals of Village of Mamaroneck*, 52 AD3d 494 (2d Dept), *leave denied*, 11 NY3d 712 (2008), in which the Appellate Division, Second Department, held that a zoning board was not permitted to insert into the accessory use definition of a local

MINUTES

zoning ordinance an area requirement based upon the relative size of the proposed accessory use to other buildings on the property at issue; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants also cite *231 East 11th Street*, BSA Cal. No. 151-12-A (Nov. 20, 2012) to support their claim that DOB, in determining whether the Loading Berth is clearly incidental to the Medical Office, should have taken into account the peculiarities of the occupant, i.e., the proposed lessee's statement that some of his patients will arrive in a wheelchair or on a gurney, via ambulette, and that other ambulatory patients, many of whom are elderly and infirmed, would benefit from the use of the Loading Berth ramp to access the basement-level Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants conclude that, in light of the foregoing proposed use of the Loading Berth, such use is "intrinsically related in function and entirely subordinate to" the Medical Office and, therefore, is clearly incidental to such principal use; and

2. The Appellants argue that loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices.

WHEREAS, the Appellants maintain that (1) loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices and (2) to the extent that loading berths are not customarily found in connection with medical offices, off-street parking spaces, which are the functional equivalent of loading berths, are customarily found in connection with medical offices and, as such, the Loading Berth should be deemed an accessory to the Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants concede that a customary use is one that is usual to maintain in conjunction with a primary use, but argue, with reference to *231 East 11th Street*, BSA Cal. No. 151-12-A (Nov. 20, 2012), that "a use can be customary even though it is not very common"; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants argue that the Court's assessment in *New York Botanical Garden* was fact-based and turned "upon functional rather than structural specifics," *New York Botanical Garden*, 91 NY2d at 421 and, as such, the functional analysis for which they advocate, which equates accessory loading berths and accessory parking spaces, is appropriate; and

WHEREAS, specifically, the Appellants maintain that that loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices by virtue of their functional equivalence to off-street parking spaces, and that "it is appropriate to look for evidence of 'customary' use at both accessory loading and parking notwithstanding the fact that the Zoning Resolution distinguishes the two" (emphasis in the original); and

WHEREAS, the Appellants further state that:

... the function that loading berths serve – patient pick up and drop off and medical deliveries – is customarily found in connection with medical offices whether in the form of loading berths or parking spaces used for loading and regardless of the formalities attending the occupancy's filing in Department records; and

WHEREAS, in support of their argument that off-street

parking spaces and off-street loading berths are functionally equivalent, the Appellants referred the Board to the Ambulette Service Letters which, the Appellants argue, establish that "off-street parking spaces serve similar purposes to those served by off-street loading berths – they function as places for vehicles and ambulettes to stop briefly to discharge or pick up patients"; and

WHEREAS, in support of their argument that such uses are usually maintained in conjunction with medical offices, the Appellants referred the Board to the UC Report which purportedly "reflects 8 locations where medical offices are accompanied by accessory off-street loading berths and parking spaces used for loading purposes" and to certificates of occupancy showing multiple locations within a mile of the zip code (10003) in which the subject site is located which purportedly shows loading berths or parking uses accessory to medical offices; and

WHEREAS, in response to objections raised by DOB that the UC Report is not constrained, geographically, to an appropriate radius of the subject site, the Appellants argue that the Board has rejected an outright geographic limitation when considering whether a proposed accessory use is customarily found in connection with a principal use and is required to "tak[e] into consideration the over-all character of the particular area in question," *New York Botanical Garden*, 91 NY2d at 420; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants further argue that such "particular area" should not be, and has not been, constrained to the immediate area of the proposed accessory use, that so restricting an inquiry is bad public policy, and that medical offices and loading berth and off-street parking uses accessory thereto do not vary by neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, based on the foregoing, the Appellants conclude that "[t]he broader purpose of parking spaces includes their use for the more limited purpose of loading and unloading," that their reliance on evidence of accessory parking at medical offices, coupled with purported evidence that such parking is "often used for loading and unloading" is consistent with the functional analysis prescribed by the Court in *New York Botanical Garden* and, finally, that taken in the aggregate, the off-street parking spaces and loading berths cited by the Appellants are sufficient to demonstrate that the loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices; and

3. The Appellants argue, in the alternative to a finding that loading berths are customarily found in connection with small medical offices, that the subject Loading Berth is a novel accessory use to the Medical Office and should be permitted even if loading berths are not customarily found in connection with medical offices

WHEREAS, the Appellants note the well-established law that in order to be customarily found in connection with a principal use, a proposed accessory use must "be 'commonly, habitually and by long practice ... established as reasonably associated with the primary use,'" (citing *Gray v Ward*, 74

MINUTES

Misc2d 50, 55-56 (Sup. Ct., Nassau Co. 1973), *aff'd* 44 Ad2d 597 (2d Dept 1974) [internal citations omitted]; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants argue, however, that where there is no such longstanding use, this Board can and should recognize novel accessory uses where appropriate, “lest accessory uses be frozen in time and thus limited to those that existed when zoning was first enacted”; and

WHEREAS, thus, the Appellants urge this Board to find that the Loading Berth is a novel accessory use to the Medical Office;

WHEREAS, the Appellants support this position by arguing, in the first instance, that the Zoning Resolution recognizes the relationship between loading berths and medical offices by requiring loading berths at hospitals and related facilities with a floor area in excess of 10,000 square feet, and not prohibiting off-street loading berths for smaller facilities, and, thus, that “[t]he refusal to recognize a customary connection between medical office and loading functions effectively eviscerates the provisions governing permitted accessory off-street loading berths” in that, had the drafters of the Zoning Resolution intended to prohibit loading berths for medical offices of a certain size, they would have done so explicitly; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants further support this position by arguing, in the second instance, that New York courts have developed an analysis by which they determine whether a proposed use constitutes a novel accessory use, and that employing that analysis in the instant matter compels a reversal of the Final Determination; and

WHEREAS, specifically, the Appellants cite *Dellwood Dairy Co. v City of New Rochelle*, 7 NY2d 374, 375-376 (1960), in which the Court of Appeals ruled that a coin-operated milk vending machine located in the basement of an apartment building in a residential zoning district constituted an accessory use thereto, reasoning that “[t]he use of a milk vending machine is but a different method of doing a traditional service for a householder. It is a common experience that new times bring not only new problems but new ways and means of dealing with old ones” and further reasoning that “[t]he presence of a milk vending machine ... in the basement of an apartment building which is not accessible to the general public, can have little, if any, adverse application to the character of the residential neighborhood”; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants maintain that because the Loading Berth, like the vending machine at issue in *Dellwood Dairy Co.*, will not adversely affect the character of the Building’s residential district, and because it functions similarly to accessory parking, which is not permitted at the site, it should be recognized as a novel accessory use to the Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants maintain that the foregoing application of *Dellwood Dairy Co.* is consistent with *New York Botanical Garden* in that it recognizes function, as opposed to structure or form, to determine the propriety of the proposed accessory use; and

B. DOB’S POSITION

WHEREAS, DOB maintains that the Final Determination was properly issued because, *inter alia*, the Loading Berth does not satisfy the definition of an “accessory use” in that it is neither (1) “clearly incidental to” nor (2) “customarily found in connection with” the Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, DOB also argues that the Appellants’ function-based argument is inapplicable to the instant matter; and

1. DOB argues that the Loading Berth is not “clearly incidental” to the Medical Office.

WHEREAS, DOB cites *Gray v Ward* for the proposition that in order for a proposed accessory use to be “incidental” it must be “subordinate and minor in significance” as well as “attendant or concomitant,” *Gray v Ward* 74 Misc2d at 54; and

WHEREAS, DOB maintains that the Loading Berth is too large and too prominent to meet the foregoing requirement and, as such, it is not “clearly incidental” to the Medical Office; and

WHEREAS, in support of this argument, DOB cites the following resolutions of the Board: *1221 East 22nd Street*, BSA Cal. No. 14-11-A (Oct. 18, 2011), in which the Board found that “... DOB may place a quantitative measure to ensure that the accessory use remains incidental to the primary use”; *11-11 131st Street*, BSA Cal. No. 202-05-BZ (July 18, 2006), in which the Board noted that “square footage may be a relevant consideration in some cases involving ... primary uses [other than Physical Culture Establishments]”; and

WHEREAS, DOB notes *246 Spring Street*, BSA Cal. No. 315-08-A (Oct. 5, 2010) for the proposition that “what constitutes a loading berth for purposes of calculating floor area inherently goes beyond the floor space devoted to the loading berth itself, and may include some ancillary spaces as well”; and

WHEREAS, DOB notes that the two-story Loading Berth contains 396 square feet of floor area and is larger on the first floor of the Building than at the basement level, so that the “loading berth’s upper part seems to span 627 square feet” and “takes up 47% as much as space as the medical office ... [and, on the first floor of the Building] the loading berth appears to take up 157% more space than the medical office” and concludes that, accordingly, the Loading Berth is “simply too large and too significant to have a reasonable incidental relationship to the [Medical Office]”; and

2. DOB argues that the Loading Berth cannot be accessory to the Medical Offices because the Loading Berth structure was proposed before the Medical Office was proposed.

WHEREAS, DOB argues that, because the Loading Berth was initially proposed as an off-street residential garage in a pre-filing submitted in May, 2008, and, as such, the proposed use of the subject structure predates its purported principal use, the Medical Office, the Loading Berth cannot be an accessory use thereto; and

MINUTES

WHEREAS, in support of this argument, DOB cites 2368 12th Avenue, BSA Cal. Nos. 24-12-A and 1470120A (Aug. 7, 2012) for the proposition that “in order to determine whether a use satisfies the Zoning Resolution’s §12-10 definition of ‘accessory use,’ the principal use, upon which the accessory use depends, must first be identified”; and

3. DOB argues that the Loading Berth is not “customarily found in connection with” the Medical Office.

A. DOB maintains that loading berths are not customarily found in connection with medical offices in the East Village, the Manhattan Core or the City of New York.

WHEREAS, DOB maintains that “loading berths are not ‘customarily found in connection with’ medical offices of this size, and that the Appellants have presented no evidence showing otherwise”; and

WHEREAS, DOB maintains that New York courts look to the immediate neighborhood to determine whether a proposed accessory use is customarily found in connection with a principal use, and notes that the UC Report does not show any examples of loading berths associated with medical offices in the East Village, the immediate neighborhood of the Building; and

WHEREAS, DOB argues, in support of its position that the loading berths must be customarily found in connection with medical offices in the immediate neighborhood of the Building, that neighboring property owners within the East Village / Lower East Side historic district have different expectations with respect to off-street loading berths than property owners in other areas of the New York City; and

WHEREAS, specifically, DOB notes that the designation report for the East Village / Lower East Side historic district contains only one reference to a loading berth, thus, it would be reasonable for the Building’s neighbors not to expect a loading berth at the Building; and

WHEREAS, DOB asserts, based on a WebMD physician directory, that there are 44 orthopedic surgeons and 1,527 physicians in the East Village area within a mile from the 10003 zip code in which the Building is located and, within a three mile radius of that zip code, 280 orthopedic surgeons and 7,535 physicians, and argues that if, notwithstanding the large number of such offices located in and around the East Village, the UC Report does not show any examples of loading berths associated with medical offices in the neighborhood, then such uses cannot be said to be “customarily found in connection with” medical offices; and

WHEREAS, DOB further notes that the UC Report does not show any examples of loading berths associated with medical offices in the Manhattan Core; and

WHEREAS, DOB argues that those sites identified in the UC Report which show off-street parking associated with medical offices are not probative because such medical offices are located miles from the Building in neighborhoods

which differ in character from the East Village; and

WHEREAS, with respect to the Appellants’ reliance on 231 East 11th Street, BSA Cal. No. 151-12-A (Nov. 20, 2012) for the proposition that “a use can be customary even though it is not very common,” DOB notes that in that case, the Board’s reasoning turned on the fact that ham-radio towers are uncommon and maintains that the Appellants have not, and cannot, assert that small medical offices are similarly uncommon; and

B. DOB rejects the Appellants’ function-based argument that accessory off-street parking can support a determination that loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices.

WHEREAS, DOB notes that the Appellants’ stated need to accommodate the drop-off and pick-up of patients is not a purpose for which loading berths are customarily used and argues that the Appellants’ argument - that off-street parking spaces are the functional equivalent of loading berths for the purpose of establishing that a loading berths are customarily found in connection with medical offices - is erroneous in that loading berths are used for goods, not people, and that, as such, a loading berth cannot be accessory to a medical office in order to facilitate the discharge of patients thereat; and

WHEREAS, DOB states that by listing “off-street parking” and “off-street loading berths” as separate categories, Zoning Resolution §12-10 (accessory use) indicates that “off-street parking spaces” function differently than “off-street loading berths,” and argues that the Appellants rely on an out-context phrase from *New York Botanical Garden* to suggest the Board ignore these functional distinctions...

WHEREAS, DOB argues that the distinction between loading berths and off-street parking spaces is significant and is evidenced by reports issued by the New York City Planning Commission and the Zoning Resolution itself; and

WHEREAS, specifically, DOB cites various reports issued by the City Planning Commission which the agency purports to demonstrate that “the Zoning Resolution permits accessory off-street loading berths where the proposed primary use needs to load and unload goods, but not ‘load’ and ‘unload’ people”; and

WHEREAS, in further support of its argument that loading berths contemplate a transfer of goods, rather than people, DOB notes that ZR §§ 25-72 and 36-62, which require accessory off-street loading berths for hospitals and related facilities with more than 10,000 square feet of floor area but, in the attendant tables entitled Required Off-Street Loading Berths for New Construction or Enlargements, state that “[r]equirements in this table are in addition to area utilized for ambulance parking,” thereby suggesting a distinction in the Zoning Resolution between loading berths and ambulance parking; and

WHEREAS, DOB further notes that ZR §12-10 (street) clarifies that “vehicles ... take on or discharge passengers” in support of its argument that loading is

MINUTES

distinct from parking; and

WHEREAS, DOB concludes that the Zoning Resolution “states that ambulances use parking, not loading”; and

WHEREAS, DOB further argues that the Appellants have failed to provide sufficient evidence of the functional equivalency of loading berths and off-street parking spaces, i.e., that loading berths are customarily used for loading or unloading people; and

WHEREAS, DOB notes that the Ambulette Service Letters belie the Appellants contention that loading berths and off-street parking spaces are functionally equivalent, nothing that the use described in the Ambulette Service Letters is more akin to temporary parking than to using a loading berth to facilitate the drop-off and pick-up of patients; and

C. DOB offers a framework for determining whether a loading berth constitutes an accessory use.

WHEREAS, DOB offers the following thirteen-factor analysis to determine whether an off-street loading berth is an accessory use to a medical office; and

WHEREAS, specifically, DOB contends that the following factors should be used to determine whether such use is “clearly incidental”: (1) Frequency of deliveries; (2) Size and amount of goods typically delivered; (3) Hours of operation; (4) Size and volume (i.e., proportionality) of loading berth in relation to primary use’s loading needs; and

WHEREAS, DOB contends that the following factors should be used to determine whether an off-street loading berth addresses the needs of a small medical office: (5) Route for goods to travel from loading berth to primary use; (6) Access to the loading berth as service entrance; (7) Ingress and egress; (8) Effects on traffic, parking, pedestrians, and safety; (9) Site-specific characteristics (such as geography and building layout); (10) Inadequacy of alternatives to address the primary use’s loading needs; and

WHEREAS, DOB contends that the following factors should be used to determine whether an off-street loading berth is customarily found in connection with a small medical office: (11) Character of the particular area; (12) Specific examples of loading berths found in connection with the primary use; (13) Details about how those examples use the loading berth; and

WHEREAS, the Appellants reject DOB’s proposed framework on the basis that it is premised on the assumption that loading berths function solely to accommodate the delivery of goods, a position which the Appellants dispute; and

4. DOB maintains that *New York Botanical Garden* is inapplicable to the instant appeal, but also maintains that the case supports the distinction between parking and loading.

WHEREAS, DOB notes that in *New York Botanical Garden*, all parties agreed that radio towers were accessory to universities, and that the issue before the Court was “whether the *proposed* tower [was] ‘incidental to’ and ‘customarily found’ in connection with the University,” and not, as is the case in the instant appeal, whether, the

proposed accessory use at issue, generally, could be accessory to its purported principal use; and

WHEREAS, DOB argues that the decision in *New York Botanical Garden* does not support the Appellants’ argument that evidence of the customary character of off-street parking spaces evidences the customary character of loading berths, based on their purported functional equivalency, and contends that the language from that case on which the Appellants rely, that “the Zoning Resolution classification of accessory uses is based upon functional rather than structural specifics,” *New York Botanical Garden*, 91 NY2d at 421-22, is taken out of context; and

WHEREAS, DOB further argues that the Court’s reasoning, that “the Zoning Resolution classification of accessory uses is based upon functional rather than structural specifics,” supports the agency’s position that “parking” and “loading” are distinct uses, and notes that by listing them as separate categories, Zoning Resolution § 12-10 (accessory use) indicates that “off-street parking spaces” function differently than “off-street loading berths”; and

WHEREAS, DOB also argues that the record presented to the Board and Court in *New York Botanical Garden* was significantly more developed with respect to the number of accessory radio towers than the instant record, which, DOB argues, is devoid of evidence that loading berths are customarily used in connection with small medical offices; and

WHEREAS, DOB urges the Board to infer from this lack of evidence that loading berths are not customarily found in connection with small medical offices, and cites *Toys R Us v. Silva*, 89 NY2d 411 (1996) for the proposition that the Board can consider lack of standard evidence in reaching a determination as to whether loading berths are customarily found in connection with small medical offices; and

WHEREAS, accordingly, DOB requests that the Board uphold the Final Determination; and

CONCLUSION

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the Loading Berth is not an accessory to the Medical Office because it does not satisfy subsection (b) of the ZR § 12-10 definition of “accessory use”; as such, the Final Determination is upheld and the appeal is denied; and

A. The Loading Berth is not “clearly incidental” to the Medical Office.

WHEREAS, the Board acknowledges *Gray v. Ward*, 74 Misc2d 50, 55-56 (Sup. Ct., Nassau Co. 1973), *aff’d* 44 Ad2d 597 (2d Dept 1974) for the principle that incidental, in the context of accessory uses, means (1) that the contemplated use is not the principal use of the property and is, to the contrary, a use which is subordinate to and minor in significance when compared to the principal use; and (2) that the relationship of the of the proposed accessory use to the alleged principal use is attendant or concomitant; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds further support for this principle in *Matter of 7-11 Tours Inc. v. Board of Zoning Appeals of the Town of Smithtown*, 90 AD2d 486 (2d Dept

MINUTES

1982) (citing *Lawrence v. Zoning Bd. of Appeals of Town of North Branford*, 158 Conn. 509, 512-513 (1969)); and

WHEREAS, the Board credits the Appellants' argument that there is no strict limitation on the amount of square footage an accessory use may occupy relative to its principal use, but notes, as DOB has argued and as the Board has recognized in the past, that DOB may take into consideration, with respect to a purported accessory use, the relative size of such use to its stated principal use where the size of the purported accessory use is indicative of its status as subordinate and minor in significance to said principal use; and

WHEREAS, the Board reiterates that the issue of whether a purported accessory use is minor in significance relative to its stated principal use requires a fact-specific analysis, thus the range of relative sizes acknowledged by the Board in prior appeals to be incidental is varied and of insignificant precedential weight; and

WHEREAS, the Board does not accept the Appellants' reading of *New York Botanical Garden* as applicable to whether the Medical Office is incidental to the Loading Berth because, as noted by the Court in that case, there was no dispute that the accessory use at issue – radio stations and their related towers – were clearly incidental to and customarily found in connection with college campuses; and

WHEREAS, based on the foregoing, and accepting the Appellants' calculus regarding the size of the Loading Berth, the Board finds that the former is not 'clearly incidental' to the latter, as is required under subsection (b) of the ZR § 12-10 definition of "accessory use" because it is not minor in significance relative to the small Medical Office; and

B. Loading berths are not "customarily found in connection with" small medical offices.

WHEREAS, the Board notes that in order to qualify as a use which is customarily found in connection with its principal use, a purported accessory use must, as a general rule, be commonly, habitually and by long practice established as associated with such principal use (*see e.g., Gray v Ward*, 74 Misc2d 50 (Sup. Ct., Nassau Co. 1973), *aff'd* 44 Ad2d 597 (2d Dept 1974)); and

WHEREAS, the Board further notes that a purported accessory use need not be common where the principal use to which it is accessory is uncommon, but maintains that in order to meet the "customarily found in connection with" requirement, a purported accessory use must have a well-established and relatively frequent association with the principal use; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that it is the Appellants' burden to demonstrate that a purported accessory use is "customarily found in connection" with its stated principal use; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that the Appellants have failed to establish that loading berths are customarily found in connection with small medical offices; and

WHEREAS, the Board makes the foregoing finding without regard to the geographic denominator of the inquiry, and does not advance any position as to whether an analysis of

a purported accessory use is customarily found in connection with its stated principal use must be performed on a neighborhood, borough or city-wide basis; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that, for the purposes of this discussion, it accepts the findings advanced by the Appellants in the UC Report and finds that relatively insignificant number of loading berths presented as accessory uses to small medical offices (a single "loading space"), in light of the significant number of such medical offices, is an insufficient basis on which to determine that loading berths are customarily found in connection with small medical offices, and the Board notes further that it infers from such lack of evidence that indeed loading berths are not customarily found in connection with small medical offices; and

WHEREAS, the Board rejects the Appellants' function-based argument that for the purpose of determining whether loading berths are customarily found in connection with small medical offices the Board should accept off-street parking spaces as the functional equivalent of loading berths in support of the position that loading berths are commonly, habitually and by long practice established as associated with small medical offices; and

WHEREAS, indeed, the Board finds that the Appellants' argument would divest "loading berth," a defined term, of any meaning and declines to conflate loading berths, parking spaces and any other "pick-up and drop-off" points (all of which, the Appellants argue, are "customarily associated with medical offices") in favor of an analysis which would vitiate the plain meaning of the Zoning Resolution; and

WHEREAS, contrastingly, the Board credits DOB's argument that by listing them as separate categories, Zoning Resolution §12-10 (accessory use) indicates that "off-street parking spaces" function differently than "off-street loading berths"; and

WHEREAS, the Board credits DOB's clarification of *231 East 11th Street*, BSA Cal. No. 151-12-A (Nov. 20, 2012) and notes that in that case, the Board reasoned that ham-radio towers, while not commonly found throughout the city, *are* well-established uses with a long history of association with principal residential uses, such that, to the extent that they exist, they are customarily found in connection with residential buildings; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that its reasoning in *231 East 11th Street* applies to the instant case to the extent that Appellants' failure to establish that loading berths and small medical offices, neither of which are uncommon, have no such history of association with each other; and

WHEREAS, likewise, the Board rejects the Appellants' reading of *New York Botanical Garden* as supporting an analysis that would permit off-street parking, which the Appellants contend is the functional equivalent of a loading berth, to evidence the customary association of accessory loading berths to small medical offices; and

C. The Board declines to recognize a new category of accessory use to small medical offices

MINUTES

WHEREAS, the Board accepts that, in certain instances, it is appropriate to recognize novel accessory uses, even where such use is not customarily found in connection with its stated principal use, but declines the Appellants' request that the Board do so in this instance; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that it need not consider the instant purportedly novel accessory use in lieu of finding that such use is customarily found in connection with its stated principal use where, as here, the Board finds that the subject purported accessory use is not clearly incidental to its stated principal use; and

WHEREAS, for the reasons set forth above, the Board finds that the Loading Beth is not accessory to the Medical Office; and

Therefore it is Resolved, that the subject appeal, seeking a reversal of the Final Determination dated May 9, 2014, is hereby *denied*.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, May 12, 2015.

245-12-A

APPLICANT – Law Offices of Marvin B. Mitzner LLC, for 515 East 5th Street, LLC, owner.

SUBJECT – Application August 9, 2012 – Appeal pursuant to Section 310(2) of the Multiple Dwelling Law, requesting that the Board vary several requirements of the MDL. R7B Zoning District

PREMISES AFFECTED – 515 East 5th Street, north side of East 5th Street, between Avenue A and Avenue B, Block 401, Lot 56, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to August 8, 2015, at 10 A.M., for continued hearing.

95-14-A

APPLICANT – Bernard Marson, for BBD & D Ink., owner.

SUBJECT – Application May 5, 2014 – MDL 171 & 4.35 to allow for a partial one-story vertical enlargement (*Penthouse*) of the existing 3 story and basement building located on the site. Pursuant to the 310 MDL. R8 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 237 East 72nd Street, north Side of East 72nd Street 192.6' West of 2nd Avenue, Block 1427, Lot 116, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #8M

THE VOTE TO CLOSE HEARING –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter; Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez ...4
Negative:.....0

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to May 19, 2015, at 10 A.M., for decision, hearing closed.

167-14-A

APPLICANT – Eric Palatnik, P.C., for 250 Manhattan LLC, owner.

SUBJECT – Application July 11, 2014 – Appeal seeking a determination that the owner has obtained a vested right to complete construction commenced under the prior C4-3(R6) zoning district. R6B zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 250 Manhattan Avenue, between Powers Avenue and Grand Street, Block 2782, Lot 1, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1M

THE VOTE TO CLOSE HEARING –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter; Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez ...4
Negative:.....0

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 2, 2015, at 10 A.M., for decision, hearing closed.

250-14-A thru 257-14-A

APPLICANT – Sheldon Lobel, P.C., for Villanova Heights, Inc., owner.

SUBJECT – Application October 15, 2014 – Extension of time to complete construction of eight (8) homes and obtain a Certificate of Occupancy under the common law and Vested Rights. (R1-2) zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 5401, 5031, 5021, 5310, 5300, 5041, 5030, 5040 Grosvenor Avenue, Goodridge Avenue to the East of Iselin Avenue and West 250th Street, Borough of Bronx.

250-14-A thru 252-14-A, Block 05831, Lot(s) 50, 60, 70
253-14-A and 254-14-A, Block 05839, Lot, 4025, 4018
255-14-A, Block 05830, Lot 3940
256-14-A and 257-14-A, Block 05829, Lot 3630, 3635

COMMUNITY BOARD #8BX

THE VOTE TO CLOSE HEARING –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter; Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez ...4
Negative:.....0

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 2, 2015, at 10 A.M., for decision, hearing closed.

ZONING CALENDAR

248-13-BZ

APPLICANT – Sheldon Lobel, P.C., for Moshe Benefeld, owner.

SUBJECT – Application August 23, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-622) for the enlargement of an existing single-family home, contrary to floor area and open space (23-141a); side yards (23-461). R2 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 1179 East 28th Street, east side of East 28th Street, approximately 127' north of Avenue L, Block 7628, Lot 13, Borough of Brooklyn.

COMMUNITY BOARD #14BK

MINUTES

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Application granted on condition.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez ...4

Negative:.....0

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the decision of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated July 26, 2013, acting on DOB Application No. 301411363, reads in pertinent part:

1. Proposed plans are contrary to ZR 23-141(a) in that the proposed floor area ratio exceeds the permitted 50 percent;
2. Proposed plans are contrary to ZR 23-141(a) in that the proposed open space ratio is less than the required 150 percent;
3. Plans are contrary to ZR 23-461(a) in that the existing minimum side yards is less than the required minimum 5’-0”;
4. Proposed plans are contrary to ZR 23-47 in that the proposed rear yard is less than 30’-0” and

WHEREAS, this is an application under ZR § 73-622, to permit, on a site within an R2 zoning district, the proposed enlargement of a single-family home, which does not comply with the zoning requirements for floor area ratio (“FAR”), open space ratio, and side and rear yards, contrary to ZR §§ 23-141, 23-461, and 23-47; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this application on January 6, 2015, after due notice by publication in *The City Record*, with continued hearings on February 10, 2015, March 10, 2015, and April 14, 2015 and then to decision on May 12, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Montanez, and Commissioner Ottley-Brown performed inspections of the site and premises, as well as the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, Community Board 14, Brooklyn, recommends approval of the application; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located on the east side of East 28th Street, between Avenue K and Avenue L, within an R2 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the site has 26.67 feet of frontage along East 28th Street and approximately 2,667 sq. ft. of lot area; and

WHEREAS, the site is occupied by a two-story, single-family home with approximately 2,306 sq. ft. of floor area (0.86 FAR); and

WHEREAS, the applicant notes that the existing home was constructed pursuant to a BSA special permit (ZR § 73-622) issued under BSA Cal. No. 29-03-BZ; and

WHEREAS, the site is within the boundaries of a designated area in which the subject special permit is available; and

WHEREAS, the applicant now seeks to enlarge the building, resulting in an increase in the floor area from 2,306

sq. ft. (0.86 FAR) to 2,686 sq. ft. (1.01 FAR); the maximum permitted floor area is 1,333 sq. ft. (0.5 FAR); and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks to reduce the non-complying open space ratio of the site from 65 percent to 58 percent; the minimum open space ratio is 150 percent; and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks to maintain and extend its non-complying side yards, which have widths of 3’-11” and 4’-5”;

the requirement is two side yards with a minimum total width of 13’-0” and a minimum width of 5’-0” each; and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks to increase its non-complying rear yard from 19’-6” to 20’-0”;

the requirement is a minimum depth of 30’-0”;

the applicant notes that the prior special permit authorized a 20’-0” rear yard but a construction error resulted in a 0’-6” deficiency in the rear yard; and

WHEREAS, the applicant represents that the proposed building will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not impair the future use or development of the surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, the applicant contends that the proposed FAR is entirely consistent with the neighborhood and submitted a land use study in support of that contention; and

WHEREAS, at hearing, the Board expressed concerns regarding the compatibility of the proposed home’s massing with the prevailing character of the streetscape; the Board also directed the applicant to amend its plans to include complete and accurate floor area calculations and proposed plantings; and

WHEREAS, in response, the applicant made changes to the roofline to reduce the apparent mass of the streetwall and roof; the applicant also amended its plans, as directed; and

WHEREAS, based upon its review of the record, the Board finds that the proposed enlargement will neither alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood, nor impair the future use and development of the surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Board has determined that the evidence in the record supports the findings required to be made under ZR § 73-622.

Therefore it is resolved, that the Board of Standards and Appeals issues a Type II determination under 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617.5 and 617.3 and §§ 5-02(a), 5-02(b)(2) and 6-15 of the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review and makes the required findings under ZR § 73-622, to permit, on a site within an R2 zoning district, the proposed enlargement of a single-family home, which does not comply with the zoning requirements for FAR, open space ratio, and side and rear yards, contrary to ZR §§ 23-141, 23-461, and 23-47; *on condition* that all work will substantially conform to drawings as they apply to the objections above-noted, filed with this application and marked “Received April 30, 2015”–(11) sheets; and *on further condition:*

THAT the following shall be the bulk parameters of the building: a maximum floor area of 2,686 sq. ft. (1.01 FAR), a minimum open space ratio of 58 percent, side yards

MINUTES

with minimum widths of 3'-11" and 4'-5", and a rear yard with a minimum depth of 20'-0", as illustrated on the BSA-approved plans;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to specifically cited DOB/other jurisdiction objections(s);

THAT the approved plans shall be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted;

THAT all DOB and related agency application(s) filed in connection with the authorized use and/or bulk will be signed off by DOB and all other relevant agencies by May 12, 2019; and

THAT DOB must ensure compliance with all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of the plan(s)/configuration(s) not related to the relief granted.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, May 12, 2015.

284-14-BZ

CEQR #15-BSA-098K

APPLICANT – Jay Goldstein, Esq., for 257-267 Pacific Street, LLC, owner; 718 Bar LLC d/b/a The Bar Method, lessee.

SUBJECT – Application November 6, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to allow for the operation of a physical culture establishment (*The Bar Method*) on the first floor of the existing building. R6-2 with an C2-4 Overlay zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 267 Pacific Street, between Smith Street and Boerum Place on the north side of Pacific Street, Block 181, Lot 31, Borough of Brooklyn.

COMMUNITY BOARD #2BK

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Application granted on condition.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez ...4
Negative:.....0

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the decision of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated October 24, 2014, acting on DOB Application No. 320627032, reads, in pertinent part:

Proposed use as a physical culture established is not permitted in R6A (C2-4) district, per ZR 22-10 and ZR 33-10; and

WHEREAS, this is an application under ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03, to legalize, on a site within a R6A (C2-4) zoning district, a physical culture establishment (“PCE”) operating in a portion of the first story of a seven-story mixed residential and commercial building, contrary to ZR §§ 22-10 and 32-10; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this application on April 28, 2015, after due notice by publication

in the *City Record*, and then to decision on May 12, 2015; and
WHEREAS, Vice-Chair Hinkson and Commissioner Montanez performed inspections of the subject site and neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, Community Board 2, Brooklyn, recommends approval of this application; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located on the north side of Pacific Street, between Boerum Place and Smith Street, within an R6A (C2-4) zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the site has approximately 125 feet of frontage along Pacific Street and approximately 22,680 sq. ft. of lot area; and

WHEREAS, the site is occupied by a seven-story mixed residential and commercial building with approximately 49,997 sq. ft. of floor area (2.20 FAR); and

WHEREAS, the PCE occupies 2, 728 sq. ft. of floor space on the first floor of the building; and

WHEREAS, the PCE operates as The Bar Method; it is a dance studio specializing in ballet; and

WHEREAS, the applicant represents that the hours of operation for the PCE are daily, from 5:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Investigation has performed a background check on the corporate owner and operator of the establishment and the principals thereof, and issued a report which the Board has determined to be satisfactory; and

WHEREAS, the Fire Department states that it has no objection to the proposal; and

WHEREAS, the PCE will not interfere with any pending public improvement project; and

WHEREAS, accordingly, the Board finds that this action will neither (1) alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood; (2) impair the use or development of adjacent properties; nor (3) be detrimental to the public welfare; and

WHEREAS, at hearing, the Board directed the applicant to provide proof that the fire alarm and sprinkler systems have been installed and tested; and

WHEREAS, in response, the applicant provided proof that the systems have been installed and tested, and are fully operational; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that, under the conditions and safeguards imposed, any hazard or disadvantage to the community at large due to the proposed special permit use is outweighed by the advantages to be derived by the community; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that the term of this grant has been reduced to reflect the period of time that the PCE operated without the special permit; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Board has determined that the evidence in the record supports the requisite findings pursuant to ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03; and

WHEREAS, the project is classified as a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.5; and

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted a review of the proposed Checklist action discussed in the CEQR Checklist

MINUTES

No. 15-BSA-098K, dated October 28, 2014; and

Therefore it is Resolved, that the Board of Standards and Appeals issues a Type II determination prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617 and § 6-07(b) of the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review and Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, as amended, and makes each and every one of the required findings under ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03, to legalize, on a site within a R6A (C2-4) zoning district, a PCE operating in a portion of the first story of a seven-story mixed residential and commercial building, contrary to ZR §§ 22-10 and 32-10; *on condition* that all work shall substantially conform to 1. drawings filed with this application marked “May 1, 2015,” Four (4) sheets; and *on further condition*:

THAT the term of the PCE grant shall expire on December 1, 2024; 2.

THAT the hours of operation shall be limited to daily, from 5:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.;

THAT any massages at the PCE shall be performed by New York State licensed massage therapists; 3.

THAT there shall be no change in ownership or operating control of the PCE without prior application to and approval from the Board;

THAT fire safety measures shall be installed and/or maintained as shown on the Board-approved plans;

THAT the above conditions shall appear on the Certificate of Occupancy;

THAT all DOB and related agency application(s) filed in connection with the authorized use and/or bulk shall be signed off by DOB and all other relevant agencies by May 12, 2019;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to specifically cited DOB/other jurisdiction objection(s);

THAT the approved plans shall be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted; and

THAT DOB must ensure compliance with all of the applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code, and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of plan(s)/configuration(s) not related to the relief granted.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, May 12, 2015.

124-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Sheldon Lobel, P.C., for Yuriy Teyf, owner.
SUBJECT – Application June 2, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-622) for the enlargement of a single-family detached residence to be converted into a two-family home contrary to floor area, lot coverage and open space (ZR §23-141); side yards (ZR §23-461) and less than the required rear yard (ZR §23-47). R4 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 1112 Gilmore Court, southern side of Gilmore Court between East 11th Street and East

12th Street, Block 7455, Lot 74, Borough of Brooklyn.

COMMUNITY BOARD #15BK

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Application granted on condition.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez...4

Negative:.....0

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the decision of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated May 2, 2014, acting on DOB Application No. 320819021, reads in pertinent part:

1. Proposed enlargement increases the degree of non-compliance of an existing building with respect to floor area ratio, which is contrary to ZR Section 23-141.
2. Proposed enlargement increases the degree of non-compliance of an existing building with respect to open space and coverage which is contrary to ZR Section 23-141.
3. Proposed enlargement results in two side yards less than 5 feet and the total of both side yards less than 13 feet, which is contrary to ZR Section 23-461; and

WHEREAS, this is an application under ZR § 73-622, to permit, on a site within an R4 zoning district, the proposed enlargement and conversion of a single-family home to a two-family home, which does not comply with the zoning requirements for floor area ratio (“FAR”), open space ratio, and side and rear yards, contrary to ZR §§ 23-141, 23-461; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this application on November 25, 2014, after due notice by publication in *The City Record*, with continued hearings on February 3, 2015, and March 3, 2015, and March 31, 2015 and then to decision on May 12, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Vice-Chair Hinkson and Commissioners Montanez and Ottley-Brown performed inspections of the subject site and neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, Community Board 15, Brooklyn, recommends approval of the application; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located on the south side of Gilmore Court, between East 11th Street and East 12th Street, within an R4 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the site has 20 feet of frontage along Gilmore Court and a depth of 117’-5” and approximately 2,350 sq. ft. of lot area; and

WHEREAS, the site is occupied by a one-story single-family home with approximately 876 sq. ft. of floor area (0.37 FAR); and

WHEREAS, the site is within the boundaries of a designated area in which the subject special permit is available; and

WHEREAS, the applicant now seeks to enlarge the building and convert it into a two-family residence, resulting in an increase in the floor area from 876 sq. ft. (0.37 FAR)

MINUTES

to 3,052 sq. ft. (1.29 FAR); the maximum permitted floor area is 2,115 sq. ft. (0.9 FAR); and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks to increase the lot coverage of the site from 37.32 percent to 54.13 percent; the maximum permitted lot coverage is 45 percent; and

WHEREAS, the applicant seeks to maintain and extend its non-complying side yards of 3'-0" and 0'-7"; the requirement is two side yards with a minimum total width of 13'-0" and a minimum width of 5'-0" each; and

WHEREAS, the applicant represents that the proposed building will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will not impair the future use or development of the surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, at hearing the Board directed the applicant to increase the size of its proposed rear yard to a complying 32'-11", reduce the proposed floor area of the building and amend its design for the proposed building to incorporate features from adjacent buildings so as to contextualize the proposed enlargement; and

WHEREAS, the applicant modified the proposal in accordance with the Board's direction; and

WHEREAS, the applicant notes that the building and cellar are being raised in accordance with applicable flood regulations; and

WHEREAS, the applicant notes that, pursuant to ZR § 25-211, one off-street parking space must be provided on the subject lot for each dwelling unit created by the subject enlargement, and states that the existing site does not contain any off-street parking; and

WHEREAS, as such, and as shown on the BSA-approved plans, the applicant has provided a single off-street parking space for the dwelling unit that is being created pursuant to the instant enlargement and conversion but the pre-existing non-compliance (i.e., the lack of off-street parking for the existing dwelling unit) shall be maintained; and

WHEREAS, based upon its review of the record, the Board finds that the proposed enlargement will neither alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood, nor impair the future use and development of the surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Board has determined that the evidence in the record supports the findings required to be made under ZR § 73-622.

Therefore it is resolved, that the Board of Standards and Appeals issues a Type II determination under 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617.5 and 617.3 and §§ 5-02(a), 5-02(b)(2) and 6-15 of the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review and makes the required findings under ZR § 73-622, to permit, on a site within an R4 zoning district, the proposed enlargement and conversion of a single-family home to a two-family home, which does not comply with the zoning requirements for FAR, lot coverage, and side yards, contrary to ZR §§ 23-141 and 23-461; *on condition* that all work will substantially conform to drawings as they apply to the objections above-noted, filed with this application and

marked "April 22, 2015"– (13) sheets; and *on further condition:*

THAT the following shall be the bulk parameters of the building: a maximum floor area of 3,052.95 sq. ft. (1.29 FAR), a maximum lot coverage of 54.13 percent, a front yard with a minimum depth of 10'-0", side yards with minimum widths of 3'-0" and 0'-7", and a rear yard with a minimum depth of 32'-11" as illustrated on the BSA-approved plans;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to specifically cited DOB/other jurisdiction objections(s);

THAT DOB shall review and ensure compliance with applicable flood regulations;

THAT the approved plans shall be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted;

THAT all DOB and related agency application(s) filed in connection with the authorized use and/or bulk will be signed off by DOB and all other relevant agencies by May 12, 2019; and

THAT DOB must ensure compliance with all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of the plan(s)/configuration(s) not related to the relief granted.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, May 12, 2015.

264-13-BZ

APPLICANT – Francis R. Angelino, Esq., for David Lowenfeld, owner; BB Fitness dba Brick Crossfit NYC, lessee.

SUBJECT – Application September 6, 2013 – Special Permit (§73-36) to legalize a physical culture establishment (*Brick CrossFit*) on the ground floor and cellar of an existing 10-story building. C6-2A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 257 West 17th Street, north side, West 17th Street, between 7th & 8th Avenues, Block 767, Lot 6, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #4M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Off-Calendar.

266-13-BZ

APPLICANT – Law Offices of Marvin B. Mitzner, LLC, for 515 East 5th Street LLC, owner.

SUBJECT – Application September 6, 2013 – Variance (§72-21) to legalize the enlargement of a six-story, multi-unit residential building, contrary to maximum floor area (§23-145). R7B zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 515 East 5th Street, north side of East 5th Street between Avenue A and B, Block 401, Lot 56, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #3M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to August

MINUTES

18, 2015, at 10 A.M., for deferred decision.

51-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Lewis E. Garfinkel, for David Freier, owner.
SUBJECT – Application April 2, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-622) for the enlargement of an existing single family residence contrary to floor area and open space ZR §23-141; side yards ZR §23-461 and rear yard ZR §23-47. R2 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 1369 East 28th Street, East side of East 28th Street, 220’ north from Avenue N, Block 7664, Lot 17, Borough of Brooklyn.

COMMUNITY BOARD #14BK

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Off-Calendar.

204-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Sheldon Lobel, P.C., for Wythe Berry LLC, owner.

SUBJECT – Application August 25, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-44) for reduction of required off-street parking spaces for proposed ambulatory diagnostic or treatment health care facilities (UG 4A) and commercial office use (UG 6B listed in Use Group 4 and PRC-B1. M1-2 Zoning District.

PREMISES AFFECTED –55 Wythe Avenue, between North 12th Street and North 13th Street, Block 2283, Lot 1, Borough of Brooklyn.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1BK

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 23, 2015, at 10 A.M., for adjourned hearing.

324-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Gerald J. Caliendo, RA, AIA, for Kulwenty Pittam, owner.

SUBJECT – Application December 15, 2014 – Reinstatement (§11-411) for an automotive repair facility (UG 16B) granted under Cal. No. 909-52-BZ, expiring January 29, 2000; Amendment to permit the sale of used cars; Waiver of the Rules. C2-2/R5 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 198-30 Jamaica Avenue, Southwest corner of Jamaica Avenue. Block 10829, Lot 56. Borough of Queens.

COMMUNITY BOARD #12Q

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 23, 2015, at 10 A.M., for adjourned hearing.

REGULAR MEETING TUESDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 12, 2015 1:00 P.M.

Present: Chair Perlmutter, Vice-Chair Hinkson,
Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez.

ZONING CALENDAR

233-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Law Office of Fredrick A. Becker, for TF Cornerstone, Inc., owner; LOC Kickboxing LLC dba ilovekickboxing LIC, lessee.

SUBJECT – Application September 29, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to allow for a physical culture establishment (“iLovekickboxing”) within a portion of an existing commercial building. M3-1 zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 4545 Center Boulevard, east side of Center Boulevard between north Basin Road and 46th Avenue, Block 00021, Lot 0020, Borough of Queens.

COMMUNITY BOARD #2Q

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over without date for postponed hearing.

260-14-BZ

APPLICANT – Goldman Harris LLC, for The Chapin School, Ltd., owner.

SUBJECT – Application October 17, 2014 – Variance (§72-21) to permit the construction of a three-story enlargement to the existing school, contrary to floor area, rear yard, height and setback requirements. (R8B/R10A) zoning districts.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 100 East End Avenue aka 106 East End Avenue, Block 1581, Lot 23, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #8M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Laid over to June 23, 2015, at 10 A.M., for continued hearing.

Ryan Singer, Executive Director

MINUTES

CORRECTION

This resolution adopted on February 3, 2015, under Calendar No. 217-14-BZ and printed in Volume 100, Bulletin No. 7, is hereby corrected to read as follows:

217-14-BZ

CEQR #15-BSA-061M

APPLICANT – Law Office of Stuart Klein, for NY REIT, Inc., owner; Flywheel Sports Inc., lessee.

SUBJECT – Application September 4, 2014 – Special Permit (§73-36) to allow for the legalization of a physical culture establishment (*Flywheel*) on a portion of the first floor of the building. C6-2A zoning district.

PREMISES AFFECTED – 245 West 17th Street, north side of W. 17th Street, 325' east of 8th Avenue, between 7th and 8th Avenue, Block 767, Lot 15, Borough of Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #4M

ACTION OF THE BOARD – Application granted on condition.

THE VOTE TO GRANT –

Affirmative: Vice-Chair Hinkson, Commissioner Ottley-Brown and Commissioner Montanez3

Negative:.....0

Absent: Chair Perlmutter.....1

THE RESOLUTION –

WHEREAS, the decision of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated August 14, 2014, acting on DOB Application No. 122062230, reads, in pertinent part:

The proposed Physical Culture Establishment in zoning district C6-2A is not a permitted use as of right...; and

WHEREAS, this is an application under ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03, to legalize the operation, on a site within a C6-2A zoning district, of a physical culture establishment (“PCE”) on the first floor of a 12-story commercial building, contrary to ZR § 32-10; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on this application on January 30, 2015, after due notice by publication in the *City Record*, and then to decision on February 3, 2015; and

WHEREAS, Community Board 4, Manhattan, recommends approval of this application; and

WHEREAS, the subject site is located on a through lot with approximately 50 feet of frontage along West 18th Street and 50 feet of frontage along West 17th Street, between Eighth Avenue, to the west, and Seventh Avenue, to the east, in Manhattan, within a C6-2A zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the site has approximately 9,200 sq. ft. of lot area and is occupied by a 12-story commercial building; and

WHEREAS, the PCE operates as Flywheel Sports Inc. d/b/a Flywheel, and occupies 3,395 sq. ft. of floor area on the first floor of the subject building; and

WHEREAS, the PCE’s hours of operation are 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., seven days a week; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Investigation has performed a background check on the corporate owner and operator of the establishment and the principals thereof, and issued a report which the Board has determined to be satisfactory; and

WHEREAS, the Fire Department states that it has no objection to the proposal; and

WHEREAS, the PCE does not interfere with any pending public improvement project; and

WHEREAS, accordingly, the Board finds that this action will neither: (1) alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood; (2) impair the use or development of adjacent properties; nor (3) be detrimental to the public welfare; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that the term of this grant has been reduced to reflect the period of time that the PCE operated without the special permit; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that, under the conditions and safeguards imposed, any hazard or disadvantage to the community at large due to the proposed special permit use is outweighed by the advantages to be derived by the community; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Board has determined that the evidence in the record supports the requisite findings pursuant to ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03; and

WHEREAS, the project is classified as a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.5; and

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted a review of the proposed Type II action discussed in the CEQR Checklist No. 15-BSA061M, dated August 28, 2015; and

Therefore it is Resolved, that the Board of Standards and Appeals issues a Type II determination prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617 and § 6-07(b) of the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review and Executive Order No. 91 of 1977, as amended, and makes each and every one of the required findings under ZR §§ 73-36 and 73-03, to permit, on a site within a C6-2A zoning district, the operation of a PCE on the first floor a 12-story commercial building, contrary to ZR §32-10; *on condition* that all work will substantially conform to drawings filed with this application marked “January 7, 2015”- Three (3) sheets; *on further condition*:

THAT the term of the PCE grant will expire on August 1, 2024;

THAT there will be no change in ownership or operating control of the PCE without prior application to and approval from the Board;

THAT all signage displayed at the site by the applicant shall conform to applicable regulations;

THAT the above conditions will appear on the Certificate of Occupancy;

THAT accessibility compliance will be as reviewed and approved by DOB;

THAT fire safety measures will be installed and/or maintained as shown on the Board-approved plans;

THAT all DOB and related agency application(s) filed

MINUTES

in connection with the authorized use and/or bulk will be signed off by DOB and all other relevant agencies by February 3, 2019;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to specifically cited objection(s);

THAT the approved plans will be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted; and

THAT DOB must ensure compliance with all of the applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code, and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of plan(s)/configuration(s) not related to the relief granted.

Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, February 3, 2015.

The resolution has been amended to correct the SUBJECT. Corrected in Bulletin Nos. 20-21, Vol. 100, dated May 20, 2015.