



**COMMUNITY BOARD 7/MANHATTAN**  
**Minutes of Full Board Meeting**

Community Board 7/Manhattan's Full Board met on Tuesday, June 2, 2015, at Fordham University in the District. Chair Elizabeth R. Caputo called the meeting to order at 6:42 pm after the Secretary had confirmed the existence of a quorum.

Minutes from previous full board meeting were **approved:** 26-0-3-0

Chair's Report: Elizabeth R. Caputo

- There will be a meeting on June 9<sup>th</sup> focused on safety and infrastructure. The public can provide comments at office@cb7.org and a report will be provided at that meeting.
- The West End Avenue Safety study results have been posted on the CB7 website.
- On Wednesday, June 3, there will be a walk in honor of Cooper Stock hosted by Councilmember Helen Rosenthal to coincide with the secondary street re-naming in his honor.
- Welcomed Christopher Riano as a new member of the Board.

Community Session

Olive Freud

- Representative of CFESD.
- Noted that CB 5 passed a resolution requesting a moratorium on tall buildings around Central Park.
- Stated that there should be no more height as of right and that an environmental impact study should be required for buildings of a certain height.

Justin Peck

- Announced a unanimous decision by the NY State Senate to allow dogs in outdoor cafés.
- Suggested that CB7 inform property owners of this development.

Kaitlin Peterson

- Announced the opening of the Manhattan Community Boathouse this upcoming weekend.

Suzanne Urich

- Spoke to her opinion that the sidewalks on the UWS are unfriendly to seniors, people with mobility issues.
- Cited bike parking and sidewalk cafes as problematic.

Bruce Vatnetsky

- Requested CB7 representation at 20<sup>th</sup> precinct Community Council so that we can align our goals.

Bob Wyman

- Spoke to developments related to "clean" heat.
- June 2015 is the last month during which number 6 fuel oil may be used.
- The movement away from this fuel oil has resulted in cleanest air in NYC in 50 years.
- Still have some scofflaws in CB7 (unnamed) who will not stop using number 6 fuel oil.



- Advocated for the removal of number 4 fuel oil, which, under current law, is allowed until 2030.

#### Philip Stein

- Shareholder and resident of 101 w. 81<sup>st</sup> St. apt. 203.
- Raised three safety issues regarding the proposed Citi Bike site at W. 81<sup>st</sup> Street.
  - o The street is the access road to get to the 79<sup>th</sup> street transverse, which causes a high volume of traffic on a narrow street.
  - o M79 bus has to weave through that road.
  - o There is a hill over which traffic has to travel, traveling east, to get through that roadway.

#### Jill Erlichman

- Spoke regarding the proposed Citi Bike site at Riverside Dr. between 67/68 St.
- Concerned that the site would be in front of an active pre-school.
- Crossing the street is already difficult, and this would make it even more dangerous.
- The street is not yet a slow zone for the school.
- The proposed site would fill area currently used by emergency vehicles.

#### Nancy Hament

- Resident and shareholder of 101 W. 81<sup>st</sup> Street.
- Opposed to siting of Citi bike right in front of building.
- 2/3 of building signed a petition in opposition.
- The Endicott will have scaffolding for next two years.

#### Diane Glass

- Resident of 101 W. 81<sup>st</sup> Street.
- Opposed to Citi Bike site at 81<sup>st</sup> Street and Columbus.
- Narrow street and sidewalk.
- Only one entrance for 130 families who live in the building.
- School buses stop in front of building now; will be impeded by Citi Bike's presence.

#### Naomi Sladkus

- 6<sup>th</sup> grade student.
- Spoke to need for CB7 to do more to address street safety.
- Worried about commuting alone to school next year.
- Asked us to think of Cooper Stock and fix our streets.

#### Lisa Sladkus

- Reminded community of vigil to honor Alexander Sheer and Cooper Stock.
- Many people demanded answers and actions from the CB.
- This CB has discriminated against good street safety ideas.
- CB7 has refused to act.
- Vision Zero Task Force has nothing to show for the work that has been done.
- Tired of inaction and unsafe conditions; wants leadership that believes in Vision Zero.

**Mark Gorton**

- Members of community have tried for over a decade to engage with CB7 regarding transportation safety.
- Asserted that meaningfully talking and thinking about street safety is a taboo issue on CB7.
- Asserted that CB7's Safety Committee failed and then CB7 "lied" about it; asked for a constructive process regarding street safety.

**Willow Stelzer**

- Resident of 35 W. 90<sup>th</sup> Street.
- CB7 has a unique opportunity to lead on street safety.
- No need to go to Albany; most things can happen here at the City level.
- Appoint knowledgeable and passionate people to Vision Zero Committee

**Mary Beth Kelly**

- Representing Families for Safe Streets.
  - o The group formed last year after traffic deaths on the UWS.
- As a member of the community, disappointed in CB7 that it has not made the changes that are needed. CB7 does not have people of vision leading its Transportation Committee.
- Requested that CB7 stop dragging its heels and adopt traffic safety proposals.

**Emmair Gelman**

- Member, PS 75 PTA.
- Concerned about proposed construction at 711 West End Avenue.
- Construction methods are controversial.
- DOB is not doing anything they are not supposed to do; but they do not have remit to look at the school; asking us to ask the mayor and the AG to look at this as a school equity issue.

**Jodie Abbytangelo Gray**

- Member, PS 75 PTA.
- PS 75 is one of the few schools that is an integrated school; having issue with enrollment now (under-enrolled) and there will be more drop off with the construction.

**Tyesha Tuck**

- Member, PS 75 PTA.
- Worried that the proposed construction will negatively affect the security of the students, especially in light of recent traffic death at 95<sup>th</sup> street.

**Peter Arndsten**

- Columbus/Amsterdam BID
- Announced events calendar pamphlet and examples of events listed therein.

**Deborah Travis**

- Trauma Program Director, St. Luke's.
- Spoke to issue of pedestrian safety.
- She stated that they wish that they were seeing more of a difference as a result of a commitment to Vision Zero; need to come together and find a way to make it a livable city.



Manhattan Borough President's Report, Diana Howard

- The June leadership development series for community board members has begun.
- Thanked those who attended the opening of the BP's store front office on 125<sup>th</sup> street.
- Announced June 15 reception for CB members from 6-9 pm.
- Day of action June 12 to spread word about BOE's summer meals program.

Reports by Elected Officials:

Helen Rosenthal, City Council Member, 6<sup>th</sup> District

- Thanked CB7 for considering a resolution to support her bill to slow down the Landmark Preservation Commission review process and provide the Community Boards with a more meaningful look.
- PS 75 block not included in proposed expanded historic district; some buildings on Broadway also were excluded; CM not happy with the map; has since raised the issue to the City Hall level; highlighted critical nature of PS 75 block. City Hall noticed that this was a soft site.
- City Council is engaged with the renewal of the rent laws.
- Senior food bag program will be starting again; flyers available.
- Housing clinic and usual update flyers also available.
- Response to letter re: cuts to Beacon program; Council went nuts because there was a reallocation of funds from our district; the administration back tracked; we lost even more after school programming because of a loss of a contractor.

Reports by Elected Officials' Representatives:

Sabine Franklin, C-M Mark Levine's Office

- Council passed bill to create the "People's Law Firm" to provide pro bono civil services for low-income individuals.

Max Weiss, A-M Linda Rosenthal's Office

- Assembly Member-sponsored CURE Act pact passed by Assembly.
- Encouraged people to travel to Albany June 9<sup>th</sup> to advocate for affordable housing.
- Wants to ban use of e-cigs indoors.
- Senior Day will be held June 12<sup>th</sup> at the Museum of Natural History event.

Justin Simmons, A-M Daniel O'Donnell's Office

- Concerned about changes to 421(a), related to rent regulation.
- Also working on correctional and education issues.

Brice Peyre, A-M Richard Gottfried's Office

- Agreed with A. Albert that it is an issue that the MTA's capital budget is unfunded.
- GENDA passed Assembly for 8<sup>th</sup> year in a row.
- NY Health Act, which would establish single payer in NY State, passed the Assembly.



Tara Klein, State Senator Brad Hoylman's Office

- Working on ethics and campaign finance reform.
- Released report on LGBT veterans on Memorial Day; treatment of LGBT service members and denial of benefits.
- Oil Spill on the Hudson event this Thursday; information available in the handout.

David Baily, State Senator Adriano Espaillat's Office

- Rent laws set to expire in 12 days—the Senator is focused on this issue.
- Busses going from Washington Heights to Albany next week to discuss housing issues.
- Hosting track meet, information available in the handout provided at the table in the room.

George Damalas, State Senator Jose Serrano's Office

- Provided an update on rent regulation legislation.
- Senator passed two bills recently, both related to parks.

Jackie Blank, Congressman Jerrold Nadler's Office

- USA Freedom Act; passed the senate today; will be signed by President shortly.

Laura Atlas, Public Advocate Letitia James' Office

- NY Times wrote a long series on nail salons; reminded CB7 of their report on the issue.
- DOH has recognized this is a problem; reforms are already taking place.
- There have been postings of employee bills of rights in nail salons.
- Recognized that it was PRIDE month and announced the event at Hyacinth Heaven; 125<sup>th</sup> Street and ACP; honoring local LGBT leaders.

**Business Session**

**Housing Committee**

**Nick Prigo, Chairperson**

**1. Resolution Re:** Preserving and improving New York State Rent Regulation Laws applicable to New York City [Emergency Tenant Protection Act (1974)] due to expire on June 15, 2015.

- The Chair introduced the resolution.
- Public Comment
  - o Richard Barr
    - Urged CB to consider supporting return to home rule for rent regulations.
- Board Discussion
  - o This resolution is about rent regulation and should not be considered preclusive of efforts to encourage the creation of new affordable housing.
  - o A member of the Board requested that there be a request to add money to investigate fraud in rent regulation; not added to the resolution. A number of individuals spoke to the fact that the current rent regulation paradigm is a broken system that sometimes subsidizes wealthy individuals.
  - o The Committee Chair indicated that he would only be supporting the resolution as written.
  - o Apartments are rent regulated, not the people who live in the apartments.
  - o This is an emergency situation with rent regulation set to expire and we should focus on alternative proposals at a later date.



- Friendly amendment to remove “strengthen” from both whereas clauses accepted.
- There was a request for there to be separate votes on the two parts of the resolution. The Committee Chair wanted to keep it together as one resolution.
- S. Fine noted that he lives in a rent stabilized apartment.

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **34-3-2-1**

### **Preservation Committee**

**Jay Adolf and Gabrielle Palitz, Co-Chairpersons**

#### **Resolutions Re:**

2. **555 West End Avenue** (West 87<sup>th</sup> Street.) Application # 17-0198 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to create a new entrance, install a canopy, create new window openings, replace special windows construct a rooftop and rear yard additions, and modify the rear facades.
  - The Co-Chairs introduced the resolution.
  - Developer proposes to turn the site into housing; not going to fill out the whole site.
  - Public façade restoration; rear yard modification.
  - Creation of a new entrance to the main part of the building.
  - Also has a proposed rooftop addition and AC unit.
  - For (A), Committee believed reasonably appropriate with recommendations.
  - For (B), the rooftop addition, Committee believed reasonably appropriate, but recommended that the developer soften how the building meets the sky.
  - For (C), Committee voted to disapprove, noting that the enclosure and bulkhead were too bulky and asking that the developer should look at other alternatives. Landmarks took no action. Board member commented that selected unit was bigger than it needed to be. Co-Chair does not recommend changing the resolution to reflect the Board member’s observation regarding size and instead should continue to focus generically on the added bulk.

After deliberation, the resolution to approve (A, façade restoration, etc.) was adopted: **40-0-0-0**

After deliberation, the resolution to approve (B, rooftop addition) was adopted: **40-0-0-0**

After deliberation, the resolution to disapprove (C, mechanical enclosure and the elevator bulkhead) was adopted: **39-0-0-0**

3. **118 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street** (Columbus – Amsterdam Avenues.) Application #17-0584 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to construct rooftop and rear yard additions.
  - Co-Chair explained that the rear yard addition runs between school yard (on one side of 118 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street) and another row house (on the other side of 118 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street); that the current proposal for the rear yard addition, with large glass panels, looks too much like a store front; committee wants applicant to introduce some small scale glass panels in the rear yard addition.

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-2-0-0**

4. **2195 Broadway, d/b/a AT&T** (West 77<sup>th</sup> – 78<sup>th</sup> Streets.) Application #16-9149 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to install storefront infill and signage.

- The Co-Chair introduced the resolution.

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **36-1-0-1**



**5. 38 West 83<sup>rd</sup> Street** (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application #16-4475 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to legalize window replacement and facade and areaway work performed without Landmarks Preservation Commission permits.

- The Co-Chair explained that the applicant is requesting legalization of numbers 1-5 (1. multi-part transom; 2. fanlight transom; 3. one-over-one double hung window; 4. brick chimney extension; 5. location of light fixture over basement window)
- At its meeting, Committee approved legalization of numbers 1-4
- One Board Member indicated does not like incompatible elements; opposes legalization; owner should have gotten permit prior to making these changes; other applicants seeking legalization of lesser violations have been disapproved

After deliberation, the resolution to approve legalization of items 1, 2, 3 & 4, and to disapprove legalization of item 5, was adopted: **25-9-2-0**

**6. 55 West 90<sup>th</sup> Street** (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application #16-8466 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for 2-story rear addition, a rooftop addition, façade restoration and replacement of windows.

- Co-Chair explained that there is an existing rear yard addition; the proposal for the rear yard addition evens out the pieces of the rear yard addition

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **33-2-2-0**

**7. Resolution in support of Helen Rosenthal’s bill (Intro 791-2015) for a “second look” at applications to Landmarks Preservation Commission (“LPC”) under certain circumstances:**

- Preservation Committee Co-Chair Jay Adolf wrote an initial draft of the bill; the City Council Drafting Unit then revised it.
- The Co-Chair presented the following scenario:
  - o The appropriate Community Board reviews and comments upon an application to LPC
  - o LPC holds a public hearing on the application at which LPC gives recommendations to an applicant to make substantial changes to its application
  - o After the hearing, LPC takes no action
  - o The applicant then makes substantial changes to its application in accordance with LPC’s recommendations
  - o Without going to the Community Board for review of the substantially changed application, the applicant resubmits its substantially changed application to LPC
  - o LPC can then vote in favor of the substantially changed application
- Under this law, where the application has been substantially changed after the initial LPC hearing, LPC would refer the revised application to the pertinent Community Board and City Council Member for comment prior to LPC’s vote
- This law would codify that every application for certification of appropriateness would be referred to the appropriate Community Board. (Currently, it is customary for applications for certification of appropriateness of individual landmarked properties to be referred to the appropriate Community Board; however it is not required under current law.)
- Board comment: LPC should be required to have a 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing at which the Community Board can give its comments to LPC.
- Co-Chair: We can lobby to strengthen the intro.
- Board comment: CCM Rosenthal’s bill is a move in the right direction.
- Board comment: LPC often follows directives of politically powerful personages; but if this intro is adopted, the Community Boards will at least have updated knowledge about applications, and



can bring their (the Community Boards') concerns to appropriate personages as well, hopefully leading to decisions satisfactory to the Community Boards.

- Board comment: The deadlines (e.g., "...no less than 45 days and no more than 75 days...") give the Community Boards the opportunity to bring resolutions regarding these applications to full board meetings before the matter returns for consideration to LPC.
- Board comment: The Real Estate Board of NY is trying to eliminate LPC; Board member fears that the delays caused by the deadlines in the intro will be used as the basis of an argument by REBNY that LPC delays cause an undue burden on owners of landmarked properties.
- Co-Chair: This intro does not diminish LPC; it strengthens LPC; Co-Chair believes LPC Commissioners do listen when we testify; after the hearing, there is a delay before the applicant submits its proposed changes; LPC staff then takes time to review those proposed changes; then LPC schedules a meeting to review the changed application; the Community Board 2<sup>nd</sup> look might not delay resolution of the application at all; the minimum delay of 45 days relates to Community Board process, not LPC's process (which might be longer than 45 days); even if there is no 2<sup>nd</sup> Community Board comment re the changed application, the Community Board will get information re applicant's substantial changes.

After deliberation, the resolution in support of Intro 791-2015 was adopted: **34-0-1-0**

**8. Greenfield/ Koo bill (Intro 775) re: de-calendaring.**

- The Chair indicated that
  - o If this intro were enacted, if LPC does not act within the deadline, the application is decalendared; LPC cannot reconsider the application for 5 years;
  - o This law would motivate LPC to act; however he fears LPC would stall on certain applications so they would be off LPC's calendar for 5 years; the Chair supports this intro except for the provision prohibiting recalendaring for a 5-year period.
- Board comment: During the 5-year limbo, the building would be stripped or demolished, in the hopes that its status as a candidate for landmarking would be forgotten; this Board member opposes the 5-year limbo period.

After deliberation, the resolution to endorse those portions of Intro 775 which impose deadlines for LPC's consideration of applications and to oppose that portion of Intro 775 which prohibits reconsideration of decalendared applications for 5-year period was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**9. Proposed changes in the boundaries of the pending WEA Historic District.**

- The Chair indicated that:
  - o the originally proposed boundaries for expansion of the WEA Historic District were subject to a study and a public hearing; that both the study and the public hearing supported the originally proposed boundaries; that the proposed boundaries of the expansion should be restored to its original configuration; even if individual buildings are not special, the areas in which they are located should not be excised from the district
  - o No rationale for excising sections of the originally proposed boundaries has been provided
  - o We have been informed that the basis for the excision is not that redevelopment is in the offing

After deliberation, the resolution calling upon LPC to designate the entirety of the proposed Riverside-West End Historic District II, as calendared, was adopted: **32-1-0-0**



**Parks & Environment Committee**

**Klari Neuwelt, Chairperson**

**Resolutions Re:**

10. **Riverside Park.** Department of Parks & Recreation on the reconstruction of the sidewalks on Riverside Drive between West 91<sup>st</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> Streets, including the removal of the existing deteriorated asphalt pavement and the installation of new hexagonal asphalt block pavers, new benches, granite block tree pits and new covered garbage cans.

- The Chair indicated that:
  - o Sidewalks on west side of Riverside Drive are deteriorated between W 91st & 95<sup>th</sup> Streets
  - o Other sections of the sidewalks on the west side of Riverside Drive have already been renovated
  - o The design proposed by the Dep't of Parks & Recreation
    - will include the usual benches, lighting, etc.,
    - plus traffic calming devices on West 95<sup>th</sup> Street & Riverside Drive

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **33-0-0-0**

11. **Central Park.** Department of Parks & Recreation on the restoration of the Ramble and the Ravine.

- The Chair indicated that:
  - Central Park Conservancy's plan to renovate the waterway known as the Gill (in the West 70s by the gondola) in the Ramble
    - o Sediment and vegetation that does not belong there will be cleaned from Gill
    - o 4 rustic structures reconstructed
  - Central Park Conservancy's plan to renovate the Loch (a collection of streams) in the Ravine (a wilderness area) at 102 St
    - o Sediment and vegetation that does not belong there will be cleaned out

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**Business & Consumer Issues Committee**

**Michele Parker and George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Co-Chairpersons**

**Resolutions Re:**

12. **New applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses (bundled):**

- **180 Columbus Avenue** (West 68<sup>th</sup> Street.) COBP Corp., d/b/a Il Violino.
- **568 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 87<sup>th</sup> Street.) 568 Amsterdam LLC, d/b/a To be Determined.
- **570 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 87<sup>th</sup> Street.) Mermaid Grill LLC, d/b/a The Mermaid Inn.
- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **31-0-0-0**

13. **410 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 79<sup>th</sup> Street.) New application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by ThandaNYC LLC, d/b/a Thanda.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **34-0-0-0**



**14. 1991 Broadway** (West 67<sup>th</sup> Street.) New application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by Sugar Factory Broadway LLC, d/b/a Sugar Factory.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to disapprove without prejudice was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**15. Unenclosed Café Renewal Applications:**

- **302 Columbus Avenue** (West 74<sup>th</sup> –75<sup>th</sup> Streets.) **Renewal application #1339241-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Lenny’s 74<sup>th</sup> Street, LLC, d/b/a Lenny’s, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 9 tables and 18 seats.**
- **201 West 79<sup>th</sup> Street** (Amsterdam Avenue.) Renewal application #1125981-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Renolta, LLC, d/b/a Nice Matin, for four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 24 tables and 68 seats.
- **435 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 81<sup>st</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1387587-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 357 Hospitality, Inc., d/b/a Spice, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 17 tables and 34 seats.
- **450 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 82<sup>nd</sup> Street). Renewal application #1204137-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by EKD Tavern, Inc., d/b/a The Dead Poet, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 5 tables and 11 seats.
- **485 Columbus Avenue** (West 83<sup>rd</sup> – 84<sup>th</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1249725-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Cilantro West, LLC, d/b/a Cilantro NYC, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 9 tables and 18 seats.
- **522 Columbus Avenue** (West 85<sup>th</sup> Street.) Renewal application #0895505-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Barjer, Corp., d/b/a Firehouse Restaurant, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 11 tables and 29 seats.
- **2799 Broadway** (West 108<sup>th</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1394145-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 2799 Broadway Grocery, LLC, d/b/a Cascabel Taqueria, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 20 tables and 41 seats.
- The Co-Introduced the Resolutions

After deliberation, the resolution (regarding the above seven bundled applications) to approve was adopted: **31-0-1-0**

- **474 Columbus Avenue** (West 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1415817-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Spring Natural Corp., d/b/a Spring Natural Kitchen, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 10 tables and 20 seats.

After deliberation, the resolution to approve the above application was adopted: **30-0-2-0**

**16. 370 Columbus Avenue** (West 77<sup>th</sup> – 78<sup>th</sup> Streets.) Renewal application #1337067-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Gari International, Inc., d/b/a Gari, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 11 tables and 22 seats.

- The Co-Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **31-0-1-0**



**17. 722 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 95<sup>th</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1458675-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Opai Thai, Inc., d/b/a Opai Thai Restaurant, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 8 tables and 17 seats.

- The Co-Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **26-4-2-0**

**18. Enclosed Café Renewal Applications:**

- **2020 Broadway** (West 69<sup>th</sup> Street.) Renewal application #0769760-DCA/ ULURP# N110004ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by First 69th Street Realty Corp., d/b/a Westside Restaurant, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 17 tables and 34 seats.
- **247 West 72nd Street** (Broadway – West End Avenue.) Renewal application #1379700-DCA/ ULURP# N150029ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by My Most Favorite 72nd St. Corp., d/b/a My Most Favorite Food, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 10 tables and 27 seats.
- **2290 Broadway** (West 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Renewal application #1350796DCA/ ULURP #N140425ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Corned Beef Express, LLC, d/b/a Artie’s Delicatessen, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 26 tables and 54 seats.
- **502 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 84<sup>th</sup> -85<sup>th</sup> Streets.) Renewal application #1146560-DCA/ ULURP# N120361ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Romagica, Corp., d/b/a Celeste, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 4 tables and 10 seat
- **2483 Broadway** (West 92<sup>nd</sup> -93<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Renewal application #0916146-DCA/ ULURP #N150028ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Hussien Environment, Inc., d/b/a Cleopatra’s Needle, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 9 tables and 16 seats.
- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**New Unenclosed Café Applications:**

**19. 483 Columbus Avenue** (West 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.) New application #3872-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by LVSS, Inc., d/b/a Bellini, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 3 tables and 6 seats.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**20. 570 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 87<sup>th</sup> – 88<sup>th</sup> Streets.) New application #4150-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Mermaid 88, LLC, d/b/a The Mermaid Inn, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 15 tables and 34 seats.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**



**21. 210 West 94<sup>th</sup> Street** (Broadway – Amsterdam Avenue.) New application #5245-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Levantino, LLC, d/b/a Vino Levantino, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 6 tables and 14 seats.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

**22. 2580 Broadway** (West 97<sup>th</sup> – 98<sup>th</sup> Streets.) New application #4241-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 2580 Broadway, Inc., d/b/a Earth Cafe, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 14 tables and 28 seats.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **32-0-0-0**

***New/Change of Ownership Enclosed Café Application:***

**23. 2672 Broadway** (West 102<sup>nd</sup> Street.) New (*pre-existing*) application #CA1472635 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Mexican Festival NYC, LLC, d/b/a Mexican Festival, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 19 tables and 56 seats.

- The Co-chair Introduced the Resolution

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted: **27-5-0-0**

**Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Elizabeth Caputo, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Tina Branham, Steven Brown, Christian Cordova, Kenneth Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Catherine DeLazzerro, Mark N. Diller, Robert Espier, Sheldon J. Fine, Paul Fischer, DeNora Getachew, Rita Genn, Matthew Holtzman, Benjamin Howard-Cooper, Meisha Hunter Burkett, Madelyn Innocent, Audrey Isaacs, Brian Jenks, Genora Johnson, Klari Neuwelt, Gabrielle Palitz, Michele Parker, Nick Prigo, Anne Raphael, Christopher Riano, Richard Robbins, Suzanne Robotti, David Sasscer, Roberta Semer, Eric Shuffler, Polly Spain, Mel Wymore, Howard Yaruss, George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero and Dan Zweig. **On-Leave:** Marc Glazer and Lillian Moore. **Absent:** Richard Asche, Isaac Booker, Miki Fiegel, Blanche E. Lawton, Jeannette Rausch, Madge Rosenberg, Peter Samton and Ethel Sheffer.



**Transportation Committee**  
**Andrew Albert and Dan Zweig, Co-Chairpersons**  
**June 9, 2015**

Enforcement – NYPD Sgt Felicia Montgomery (out of order to accommodate Sgt Montgomery's schedule)

Answered questions about electronic bikes, bikes going the wrong way, dooring of bikes, and the pedestrian injured last week. Note: City Council is considering legalizing electronic bikes.

Review of proposed Citi Bike sites:

- a. Roberta and Su: all sites from 72<sup>nd</sup> St (1 – 9) and south were fine. Site #3 was in the end of the cul de sac and near a pre-school. Not a traffic street, the children would only be affected 3 times a day. School starts at 8:30 and a shuttle runs throughout the day between the schools. Comment, no stop signs or light. Comm member: When getting or dropping a bike off one is walking or riding slowly. If bike stands are not to be allowed by schools or playgrounds we won't have any banks.
- b. Howard – #10 – 11- 12 - quiet areas, 14 near Apthorp but also an appropriate area
- c. Andrew - #15 west side of R'side Drive not a good location because of DoT's new configuration. Move to W side of RSide drive to 77 & 76. #16 N side of 81<sup>st</sup>, many things wrong with this location. When you have a bike and pull it out from the stand how far out from the stand. Move to South side of 81<sup>st</sup> street east of Columbus in front of the museum. #17 would impede deliveries to store. Move to North side of 81<sup>st</sup> Street when construction on South side is finished. Why would a bike stand impede deliveries when parked cars don't impede? Cars are stuck. Why put a bike stand where people would get stuck? HighLife was enthusiastic about bike stands and would be glad to have in front of his establishment. #18 was fine. #19 problematic. Move to in S side of 84<sup>th</sup>, E side of B'way, north side of theater. #20 fine location.
- d. Linda - #21 fine place.
- e. Ken - #22 fine. #23 fine. #24 fine. #28 map claims roadbed but would be in the floating parking lane. The wide sidewalk there would be better. #29 fine. #30 fine. #32 scaffolding right now. Would be fine after scaffolding. Police Officer does not like that location – sidewalk is narrower than a block away, Whole Foods loading dock is near, many accidents, poor visibility, fire department is there too. One block east, in the street, north side-just west of Manhattan Avenue would be much better. Need to daylight the corner for southbound traffic.
- f. Andrew - #25, not sure. #26 move to south side of 94<sup>th</sup> just east of WEA. #27 fine.
- g. Dan & Rich - #32 fine. #33 fine. #34 fine. #35 move one block south. #36 fine. #37 move to 109<sup>th</sup> street east of Amsterdam either north or south side of street. #39 fine. #38 by Straus Park- Dan on a bus route and a narrow part of WEA, move to B'way. Rich against putting it on B'way, traffic is too fast. The spot is fine or look between 107/108.

Jan Levy – 72<sup>nd</sup> and entrance to CP. Suggest park side north of 73<sup>rd</sup>, on CPW 71<sup>st</sup>/72<sup>nd</sup> Columbus Avenue West side 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup>.

Joanne Adalla - #13 78<sup>th</sup> St + Colo. The street and sidewalk are narrow. We have a school and strollers, tourists, art fair, farmers market. #16 at 81<sup>st</sup> is so close, please take #13 off map

Tom Valenzuela – betw 67 & 68<sup>th</sup> 2 major play grounds that are configured for toddlers and older children. Have witnessed many near misses in that neighborhood. Too many children, carriages, mothers.

Richard Fine – Citibike is really for short local trips, not just commuters. Shoppers use it in the neighborhood, it will help businesses in the community.



Deborah Bottle – Object to moving site from 81<sup>st</sup> & Columbus outside the Endicot. We have a huge congestion on that block.

David W81st St block association- agrees with above

Avrah Petritus – object to location at #13. 101 W 78<sup>th</sup> St. It will interfere with the renovation of exterior and interior of the building. The work will take at least 2 years.

David Menzano – north side of 81<sup>st</sup> B’way and WEA. In agreement to move it across B’way. Better visibility, safer.

Christie P - Mayfair Towers on W 72<sup>nd</sup>. Agree to move #8 CPW and 72<sup>nd</sup>. Not safe. Please move it north or south a block.

Susan Rutner – Wants the sites looked at over the weekend. There is a food vendor and a t-shirt vendor Site #8.

John Simpson - Initial roll out had stands every 1,000 feet. That is what we need so that we can use it the way it was meant to be for short trips. We need a Vision Zero Task Force.

Willa Stosser – roll out of Citibike in the West Village improved traffic. Thanks to CB7 for getting so much feedback from community. We need a north bound protected bike route.

Elizabeth Caputo - with 2 active subway lines and buses means we have tremendous transportation up here so there are fewer bike stations.

Penny Schwartz - W81st street location is a disaster, thank you for agreeing. Age Friendly NYC – we have a high percentage of seasoned citizens who will not using bikes. What happened to CitiTrikes?

Batya Lewton - Who insures the bikes? Helmets should be mandated.

**Present:** Andrew Albert, Dan Zweig, Linda Alexander, Ken Coughlin, Anne Raphael, Richard Robbins, Suzanne Robotti, Roberta Semer and Howard Yaruss. **CB7 Chair:** Elizabeth Caputo. **Board Member:** Mel Wymore. **On-Leave:** Lillian Moore. **Absent:** Isaac Booker.



**Business & Consumer Issues Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Michele Parker and George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Co-Chairpersons**  
**June 10, 2015**

The meeting began at 7:00pm and Co-Chair George Zeppenfeldt asked the public to bring any non-agenda items to the committee's attention.

No one responded so the agenda was called.

SLA applications:

1. James Wang, [Wjagencyinc@gmail.com](mailto:Wjagencyinc@gmail.com) told us that Fusha restaurant at 311 Amsterdam Avenue at 75<sup>th</sup> Street has closed and they were moving into this location, the former Ditch Plains. He told us the new location would have the same menu as Fusha (which is Japanese) with the addition of 5 habachi tables that are individually ventilated. He said Fusha has no affiliation with Brother Jimmy's to put to rest the rumor that Brother Jimmy's, currently at Amsterdam Avenue between 80-81sts, was moving into this space. There are, however, several other Fusha restaurants in Manhattan. Mr. Wang told us there would be no live music and no delivery at present. We noted there is no space for an enclosed café as the sidewalk is narrow and there is also a handicapped ramp taking up what little space there may have been for a café. He told us the restaurant planned to be open in 3-4 months and they had no plans for an outdoor café.

The application was **approved 5-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** with the provision Mr. Wang would fax the addresses of the locations where the CB notice was posted as soon as possible but by July 6, 2015.

(Mr. Wang faxed this information and a correction by June 12, 2015)

2. Randy Adams, [info@amityhallnyc.com](mailto:info@amityhallnyc.com), David McCarthy, Victoria Delany, [torydelany@aol.com](mailto:torydelany@aol.com) 917-406-9681, and Chris O'Neal for applicant. This is the site of the former Pourhouse. The owner of Amity Hall also owns several restaurants in Manhattan, to wit, 20 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and 33 W 33<sup>rd</sup> Street, and others. They submitted a notebook to the committee which, among other documents, showed us the architectural plans for the interior of the restaurant as well as their insurance policies, the menu, and photos and information about their other restaurants. Victoria Delany told us they have a full kitchen with an executive chef. She told us their Long Island offices are moving to the basement of this space and therefore a manager or owner would be on premises to resolve any issues with the neighbors, should they arise. William Porto, 201 W 108<sup>th</sup> Street, who has lived on the UWS for 50 years was concerned about the noise that may travel up the exposed brick walls that will be in the restaurant. He was told by McCarthy there is a way to drill holes into the brick and insert a foam spray behind the brick that acts as insulation against noise. They will use whatever soundproofing necessary to guard against this type of noise. Hugh Smyser 200 West 109<sup>th</sup> Street Apt. A5, above the restaurant, bought this apartment 18 months ago, when it was operated by Pourhouse, and gave Pourhouse an "A" for the sound system installed. He said if there was a problem, he could send a text and the noise volume was lowered. Delany told him that she and the management choose the music and that employees have no authority or ability to change the music or the volume of the music. She assured Mr. Smyser Amity Hall will be a better neighbor than Pourhouse.

Finally, Delany disclosed that they plan to make an application for an unenclosed café. When asked by GZ if they plan to put up awnings to prevent cigarette smoke from rising up to the apartments, Delany said no one is permitted to smoke outside the restaurant.

The application was **approved 5-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** with the provision that they amend the hours of operation in their method of operation to Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday 11am to 2am and Thursday, Friday, and Saturday 11am to 3am and submit that amended method of operation as soon as possible but by July 6, 2015. We also agreed they could come back to the committee at the end of 2015 for reconsideration of the hours of operation.

(They complied by 6-12-15)



SLA alteration application:

3. This alteration application, for 509 Amsterdam Avenue, Jacob's Pickles, was made for the use of the basement. They were represented by Arsham Kamali, general manager, and Joseph Subro. Genrory Brown is the executive chef. The space would be used on a reservation only basis with 15 tables and 30 seats. They would not use the space as an overflow space for Jacob's Pickles upstairs. The last seating would be at midnight and the music level would be only to facilitate conversation, not drown it out. The back door to the area in the back of the building was for emergency use only. Laura Peres, who lives on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, but used to live on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, says that although the restaurant invested in the sound proofing of her apartment, when she lived on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, it was never enough and although the circumstances of her move to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor were unclear, she says she is still bothered by noise. Martha Duke, who moved to that 2<sup>nd</sup> floor apartment said it was very noisy. She said she was aware of the noise before she moved in. There is a bar/restaurant next door so it is unclear to the committee how the noises can be separated from each other. Duke said Jacob's Pickles was using an apartment on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor as an office and said this use, day and night and by several employees, made her feel unsafe. We thereafter, **denied the application without prejudice, 4-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** until we could resolve these several issues with the restaurant owner.

Unenclosed café renewal applications:

4. The renewal application of Bistro Cassis was **disapproved without prejudice 4-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** because they did not appear at the meeting.

5. Columbus Gourmet Food. Represented by Manjeet Singh, [Singhcolumbus@aol.com](mailto:Singhcolumbus@aol.com). The renewal application of Columbus Gourmet Food was **approved 4-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** with no additional stipulations.

New unenclosed café applications:

6. The application of Seven Turkish Grill was **approved 4-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0** with the stipulations that they will submit their café checklist as soon as possible, they review the café guidelines, and they post the CB7 notice until July 7<sup>th</sup> and provide a more comprehensive list of these postings, including the addresses, because the photos they showed us were not clear enough. They were also advised to appear at the Full Board Meeting on July 7, 2015. They were represented by Patrick Agard [Patrick@parliamentadvisers.com](mailto:Patrick@parliamentadvisers.com) and Tony Seven, the owner.

7. The application of Manchester Diner, 2800 Broadway at the corner of 108<sup>th</sup> Street, was **disapproved 1-3-0-0; 1-1-0-0**. We asked for the café checklist, photos of at least one delivery person on the bicycle with the required helmet and signage on the bike and the vest of the delivery person (they said they would have 2-3 delivery bikes), and a list of the addresses they posted the CB7 notices as soon as possible but by July 6, 2015. They told us the café would close at 10pm and that the diner closes at midnight. This application was for a "wrap around café" and although the café comes out 8 feet from the front of the diner (although we allow 9 feet) and there are no other cafes between 108 and 109<sup>th</sup> streets, and there is a permanent grating on 108<sup>th</sup> street (not connected to Manchester Diner) that already impedes pedestrian traffic walking down that street, there would be some pedestrian obstructions on Broadway because the café would jut out from the building line. The architect would not consider amending the plans. He was advised to come to the Full Board meeting on July 7<sup>th</sup> with the owner of the diner.

New Owner in previously constructed enclosed café:

8. Mezzogiorno is moving into the space formerly occupied for thirty years by an Indian restaurant. This space was vacant for one year and with city planning and landmarks approval, the interior and the café were renovated. There is no change to the number of tables and chairs from the prior restaurant. In addition, the restaurant received approval from the Board of the Building in the form of a landlord consent form. The food will be Tuscan and the owner wants to hire locals.

The application was **approved 4-0-0-0; 2-0-0-0**.

9. New business. There were several members of the committee missing but we discussed the new directions to take the committee which include: an update of the unenclosed café guidelines, a discussion



of enclosed cafes and an update of those guidelines, foregoing committee discussions of café renewal applications, but keeping the posting requirement and continuing site inspections of those cafes. All new SLA and café applications would continue to be heard by the committee. All committee members are asked to read Gale Brewer's Impact Report for the July committee meeting.

**Present:** Michele Parker, George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Paul Fischer, Brian Jenks and Anne Raphael.

**Board Member:** Christian Cordova and Christopher Riano. **On-Leave:** Marc Glazer. **Absent:** Linda Alexander, Matthew Holtzman and Suzanne Robotti.



**Preservation Committee Meeting Minutes  
Jay Adolf and Gabrielle Palitz, Co-Chairpersons  
June 11, 2015**

*The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm*

The following matters were considered and actions taken.

**132 West 75 Street (Columbus/Amsterdam). Application to LPC to construct a rooftop and a rear yard addition, alter the rear façade, and excavate the rear yard.**

*Presentation by Greg Rothstein, architect.*

- Proposed changes include removal of an existing rear yard L extension and building a full-width addition, plus a greenhouse at the garden level, and a rooftop addition.
- Returning to a single-family residence.
- Unsure if other tenants are still in possession.

Front façade

- No restoration work is being proposed for the front façade
- Areaway floor will be lowered; flooring will be replaced with blue stone.

Rear Extension:

- Existing L extension is appx 25' from the lot line.
- Full width addition would be 30' from the lot line, so would extend 8'2" from the existing rear façade.
- Greenhouse would extend 6' into the rear yard as proposed.
- Proposed full-width addition is one story taller than the existing L extension.
- Proposing enclosing the rear yard with a brick wall.  
Total rear yard would be 18' (6' greenhouse plus 6' areaway).  
Extension will be brick.

- Fenestration:

- Cellar (onto excavated garden – small areaway to be excavated) – three wide picture windows-sized sliding doors.
- Basement (greenhouse) – three groups of paired sliding doors with transom above.
- Parlor – three sets of paired French doors. The doors to the west swing in (opening inward); the middle and east doors slide (plans read that the doors are fixed, but will be changed). The grouping will have a brick surround and transom above.
- Second floor – three pairs of French doors (with transom above) with a single Juliette balcony spanning all three.
- Third floor – two pairs of French doors separated by brick spacing. Each with an individual Juliette balcony.
- Top floor – three punched openings, on the west a door, to the middle and east are proposed to be tilt-and-turn.

“Greenhouse”:

- Greenhouse will have a glass roof that will serve as a terrace for the parlor floor.



- Roof of the greenhouse will have a railing.
- Cellar will extend to be co-planar with the north edge of the greenhouse.
- Framing of the greenhouse will be glass and aluminum, with steel supports for the roof.

#### Rooftop Addition

- Not visible from the street.
- Dropping the roof level and the ceiling height of the third floor, so the roof terrace to the north and south of the proposed rooftop addition would be well behind the cornice.
- Proposed top of addition would be appx level with the top of the cornice; only the stair bulkhead would extend above – still not visible.
- Railing on the roof of the penthouse – also not visible.
- Chimney will be extended 4' above the highest floor level at the roof; unclear whether the chimney would need to be extended.
  - has not done mock-up of the chimney extension
  - likely at least a small extension will be required.
- Materials – stucco (light brown) with casement door system with 4 panels centered (east panel is fixed, the middle are sliding, and the west window would swing outward).
- Railing on the roof – black metal.

#### Railings:

- Juliettes are vertical.
- Terraces below roof are vertical.
- Roof terrace and terrace above rooftop addition are horizontal.

#### ***Public Comment***

David Sokol (also an architect) – 130 West 75<sup>th</sup>

- Extension is in his kitchen.
- Questions about mock-up procedure.
- Concern that the removal of a portion of the L extension will affect the party wall – it is unfinished rough brick.
- Brick is ancient and unpointed.
- Concern for damage within his apartment during demolition and construction, especially since party wall will not be enclosed as previously.
- A: Will need to resurface and repaint brick that is exposed on the current L extension party wall
- Meisha: Code and LPC requirements (Technical Policy and Procedure) are strict about protection of surrounding structures.

Elaine Paris – 129 West 74<sup>th</sup> Street (opposite side in the donut)

- Concern for amount of noise from construction and from entertaining once building.
- Concern for disruption and noise.

Mark Rosen – 136 West 75<sup>th</sup> (adjacent building)

- Surprised to see mock-up.
- Less light in the light well between the buildings.



- Presenting photos of the rooftop addition mock-up, which would reduce light to the entire line of apartments on that light well.
- While not visible from the street, the additions would be visible from the neighboring buildings.
- Also concerns about privacy.

Tim Balboni – 136 West 75<sup>th</sup>

- Other opportunities to be heard?

Committee Discussion:

- Concerned about a lot going on re the rear façade – no cohesive overall concept.
- Understands the narrowing effect of fenestration.
- No justification for eliminating double-hung windows at the top floor.  
Two different directions for railings.
- Some sliders without providing egress.
- Different planes – fixed, swinging and sliders.
- Should be consistent.  
Huge problem with a walkable greenhouse.
- Load will be huge, especially in the winter.  
Stucco is not appropriate as a material for the rooftop addition.
- Greenhouse isn't really temporary from a zoning perspective, since it is constructed on an excavated and extended cellar, and is intended to serve as the platform for a terrace from the set-back façade above.
- Excavating cellar level to expose cellar windows flaunts the rule that cellars are not subject to lot invasion. Also inconsistent with the character of the rear yards, especially since it leaves only 18' for a rear yard.
- The brick surrounds to window units on the proposed extension are appropriate and a welcome change from alternatives using more steel and glass.  
Concern about integrity of the rest of the row – the rest of the row was not presented.
- Excavating the rear yard varies from the row.
- LPC needs to see photos of the existing rooftop structures, and then be able to differentiate which were approved and which were grandfathered.
- So critical information is not available for the required assessments.
- Not bothered by the stucco on the rooftop.
- Confused about the chimney extensions – need clarity.
- No mention of mechanical equipment.  
A: 2 condensers on the roof, sitting on isolators.  
A: 4.5 feet
- Concern about articulation of the rear yard.
- Committee has approved full-width additions.
- OK with overall configuration and proportion of brick.
- Shares concern on double-hung at the top floor.
- Shares concern re rationale for doors.
- As for greenhouse, views as more of a DoB concern.
- Full width here is mitigated somewhat because dies into paired L extension.



- Overall concern – so much of the details such as materials, dimensions, details – seems a little preliminary. Need to be sure our decisions are being made on the same project that LPC will be considering. Would have been more comfortable if questions raised could have been answered directly.
- We often approve or disapprove with comments that can direct the project, but hard to do so here given the number of open issues/details.
- Dismayed by intrusions into the rear yard.
- Greenhouse, if the same space enveloped by brick, would clearly be impermissible.
- Staircase to reach the cellar 13’ below the rear yard – amounts to a further intrusion to the rear yard, resulting in 18’ of rear yard rather than 30’.
- This is obviously a permanent structure – playing games with the rules.  
A: “Temporary” is not part of the rules at DoB.
- Staircase leading to the excavated cellar exposure is inappropriate.

Agreed-to Changes:

- Fourth floor windows will be double-hung instead of tilt-and-turn.
- Sliding doors on the parlor floor will be fixed panels rather than sliders.

Rooftop Addition – resolution to Approve rooftop with strong recommendations to use brick cladding instead of stucco.

*VOTE: 4-0-0-0; non-committee 1-0-0-0.*

Rear yard addition – resolution to Disapprove unless:

- Fenestration changes noted above are implemented (agreed-to);
- One vocabulary for all the railings is used throughout (agreed-to);
- the greenhouse and stairs and excavation of the cellar level are eliminated from the proposal (not agreed-to).

*VOTE: 4-0-0-0; non-committee 1-0-0-0.*

Calendared 6/16/15

**188 Columbus Avenue (West 68-69). Application to LPC to legalize the installation of storefront infill by prior owner without LPC permits.**

*Presentation by Guy Cohn – architect.*

- Storefront installed ca. 2000.
- Violation issued.
- Owner inherited the storefront and violation.
- Store currently vacant.
- Existing condition includes 3 glass panels with aluminum dividers.
- Sign band above also clad in aluminum.
- Color is anodized black/bronze aluminum.
- Aluminum infill between existing cast iron .
- Image from time of designation included an aluminum knee-high solid panel with windows behind.



- Consensus that the existing condition is an improvement above the prior condition (i.e. condition at the time of designation).
- Not currently asking for an awning or proposed new sign band, as no tenant in the pipeline.

Resolution to approve.

*VOTE: 3-0-1-0; non-committee 1-0-0-0.*

Calendared 6/16/15

**106 West 80<sup>th</sup> Street (Columbus Avenue). Application to the LPC to legalize work done around the entry door not included in the LPC permit for prior façade work.**

*Presentation by Chris Lukacs, property manager.*

- LPC has noted concerning the surround for the entry door at the basement level (which is the main entrance).
- No violation – just conforming as-built to permit.
- Brownstone townhouse.
- Stoop removed long prior to designation.
- Building constructed ca. 1893.
- Extensive façade restoration done ca 2012.
- Surround as built includes a pair of pilasters with fluting culminating in ionic capitals.
- Lintels have stepped detail with dental effects above the main lintel.
- Precedent photos of nearby entry doors with very similar surrounds.

Debra Bueno – tenant in the building

- Unclear what is being approved/sought.  
A: clarified.

Julie Meridy – tenant in the building

- Background – landlord has applied for an MCI for over \$100K including \$8K for the door.
- MCI application had no permits attached.
- Concern that MCI being sought for work that did not receive required permits.

Resolution to approve the design as appropriate (taking no position with respect to any MCI issue).

*VOTE: 4-0-0-0; non-committee 1-0-0-0.*

Calendared 7/7/15

**347 West 84<sup>th</sup> Street (WEA - Broadway). Application to the LPC for a window replacement, 2-story rear yard addition and penthouse.**

*Presentation by Devon O’Neill – architect.*

- Townhouse renovation.
- 4-story brownstone (with basement), flanked by rows of 5-story townhouses.

Front façade:

- Replacing aluminum windows with wood.
- Eliminating through-the-wall A/C opening.

Rooftop addition:



- Lowering the existing roof level.
- One-story proposed addition.
- Clad in stucco, mostly glass and steel.
- Sloped roof.
- Set back from the front 18'; from the rear 8'
- Visible only through an alleyway on West 85<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Condensers will be behind the proposed addition on the roof by the parapet.
- Decking will be stone paver on pedestals.
- Internal roof drains.

#### Rear Addition:

- Existing is brick with double-hung windows.
- Existing addition is full-width on the basement level, intrudes beyond 30' into the rear yard.
- Existing has a poured concrete slab; asphalt roofing – suggests was build at a later time.
- Fenestration in the addition is 12x12 divided light windows.
- Proposing a 3-story full-width addition.
- Brick addition surrounding fenestration.
- Fenestration on the addition would be steel and glass divided light (steel has thinner mullion) – different groupings:
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> floor – lintels remain wood double-hung, one with sill lowered as door.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> floor - fixed panels in the middle with operable casements on either side.
  - parlor floor – fixed panels flanking French doors in the middle (and a pass-through hamburger window).
  - basement level – two French doors in a group of three, with operable casement that is of the same dimension of the doors.
- Pulled back 18" to conform to 30' rear yard.
- Balcony extending off the parlor floor 6' from the extension.
- Balcony and terrace will be Epay.
- Existing rear yard is below the grade of the donut.
- Will be small pea stone (permeable) with ferns etc. – not much light; little will grow.
- Existing condition in the donut has lot line windows on the side of the extensions.
- Proposing windows on the side of the extension on the parlor and second floors.
- Ceiling heights appx 11' on the parlor floor.
- Windows appx 10' in height.
- Trellis extending 18" above the parlor floor – steel – intention is to have a vine climb on one side and then grow along and hang from the trellis.
- Building is occupied – 3 tenants, will change to a 2-family.

#### Public Comment:

Hollister North – tenant at 345 West 84<sup>th</sup> Street (adjacent to the east).

- Existing bathroom lot line window will be covered.
- Concern about lack of sunlight and ventilation into bathroom.
- Sole lot line window on that level.
- A: Window will be covered. No space to adjust.



- CB7: Familiar issue of lot line windows that were not permitted when added.
- Existing condition on 349 roof has cornice and infill behind for only

Karen Freeman – 349 West 84<sup>th</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floor (adjacent to the west).

- Has terrace – will now have terrace just above their level to the east.

Committee Discussion:

- Concern for east-facing lot line windows from the proposed addition – blocks natural light during the day and adds light during the day.
- LPC will want complete catalogue of additions on the block.
- Not clear what advantage will be gained by the lot line addition windows.
- Looking at a brick wall.
- Unsure if it is an appropriateness issue.
- Not clear why there is a more slender window is below and the double window is above.
- Not really a brick corner, and will look odd both inside and out.
- Distance from addition lot line window to neighbor's L extension  
A: appx 8-10 feet.

Resolution to approve as submitted.

*VOTE: 4-0-0-0; non-committee 1-0-0-0.*

Adjourn 9:20 pm

**Present:** Jay Adolf, Gabrielle Palitz, Mark Diller, Meisha Hunter Burkett and Peter Samton. **Board Member:** Louisa Craddock. **Absent:** Miki Fiegel.



**Land Use Committee Minutes**  
**Land Use Committees**  
**Wednesday, June 17th, 2015 at 6:30 PM**  
**CB7 Offices, 250 West 87<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Present:**

**Land Use:** Richard Asche, co-chair, Page Cowley, co-chair, Tina Branham, Louisa Craddock, Sheldon J. Fine, DeNora Getachew, Brian Jencks, Jeannette Rausch, Peter Samton, Roberta Semer, Howard Yaruss  
**Absent:** Ethel Sheffer, and David Sasscer,

**CB7 Board Members:** Elizabeth Caputo, CB7 Chair, Mark Diller and Paul Fischer

The following issues were discussed and actions taken.

**1. Central Park Sunshine Task Force prepared by CB5**

Discussion of the impact of high towers on Central Park South and potential in CB7. Manhattan Community Board 5's report is available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bx8AWyfKvtQdVfVHRWhuSzdPUEE/view>.

To generate discussion, the CB5 Report was projected so the Land use Committee and members of the public in attendance could refer to certain slides and projects in construction or in planning. There were many different opinions about the merit and factual interpretation of how the shadow studies were generated, the accuracy of the heights of the completed buildings and those under construction or recently permitted were determined, compared to the already tall buildings south of 59<sup>th</sup> Street. The following is a summary of the comments made by Committee members:

Peter Samton: The length and angle of the shadows can be generated by architectural drafting tools that can calculate the extent, duration and movement of the sun at any given time day or season. This study demonstrates more than just the absence of light but other factors that will impact the sustainability and use of the park.

Jeannette Rausch: ~~Was a "moratorium" on tall building application review and permitting, more of a legal issue? Could this be implemented? Janette pointed out that the last time there was a moratorium in the city was in the 1970's and the circumstances need to be very explicit.~~

**Delete the above and in lieu substitute the following statement from Jeannette:**

Is the moratorium on the super tall buildings proposed in order for DCP & DOB to review safety issues or is it due to the impact of light & air, congestion, and neighborhood character at the street level? What are the legal tools available and how many of the planned buildings are already permitted?

Louise Craddock: The moratorium was aimed at building s over a certain height that would require a Special Permit.

Shelley Fine: should there be more information and comparative showing the shadows by the existing relatively tall buildings and the increase in the shadows from the newer and taller builds. To his way of thinking, he was reluctant to endorse the report.

Richard Asche: The key issue was the accuracy of the shadow determination and impact on the Central Park and the immediate building neighbors below 59<sup>th</sup> Street and if the shadows actually impacted our district boundary and the distance of how much of a shadow crated a negative impact to the park environment and use.

The discussion was then opened to the members of the public.

Clare Dana: Her concern was of the quality of life at the base of the taller buildings, creating canyon-like streets, and change the amount of light and air.

Sean Khorsandi: Representing Landmarks West! Sean pointed out that there were already numerous studies of the impact of development on soft sites, namely large scale developments on Central Park West, commissioned by Landmark West by consultant architects Weisz + Yoes



Studio. This study predicted the impact of as-of-right buildings that could be built along the Central Park West corridor. He also pointed out that there was a trend to build taller building on the base of a lower structure – “bleacher buildings” that would benefit from a base with a tower on top to enable higher priced residential units to have a view over already tall buildings lining Central Park West.

Olive Freud: Representing the Committee for Environmentally Sound Development called for a re-evaluation of the zoning and the use of air rights. Not only is there a problem with shadows cast on parks and existing buildings, but also of the increase in traffic and general street level congestion. She offered that a moratorium made a great deal of sense until the impact on many quality of life issues could be determined. She also stated that many larger cities, San Francisco being one, have ordinances that prevent development from casting shadows across parkland. Lastly, she was concerned that environmentally, the tall buildings appeared to have no operable windows, relying solely on mechanical systems, which is costly and drives energy costs higher.

Peter Samton: Replied that all residential buildings must have operable code compliant windows.

Richard Ashe: Did not believe this report or the one prepared by the Municipal Arts Society was factually reliable. One key element missing from this discussion of taller buildings was a lack of a requirement to incorporate affordable housing. This could be a windfall for affordable housing.

Jeannette Rausch: ~~The example where affordable housing that DCP often points to is the new development in the Lower East Side, which is not enough.~~

**Delete the above and in lieu substitute the following statement from Jeannette:**

When I asked DCP about mandatory affordable housing, it indicated they were looking at such in East NY. It seems to me that we do not need mandatory affordable housing in a neighborhood where housing is most affordable, but rather in communities like ours where housing is most expensive. These super tall building should include mandatory affordable housing at the very least.

Louisa Craddock: How tall was 600’-0” compared to the existing buildings below 59<sup>th</sup> Street? How tall is the Time Warner Center?

Roberta Semer: There were other environmental considerations as well for shadows in the park -- the drop in temperature with the result that kids in playground abandon the areas that get darker and older under shadows as they move across the parkland.

Mark Diller: Was curious about the tall buildings in our district and that it would be good to know the heights of our tallest structures: Time Warner, 15 CPW and the Ariel East & West, etc.

It was agreed that the Land Use Committee should support the report and Community Board 5’s recommendation for a moratorium but not the entirety of the CB5 resolution as presented. The Committee adopted the following resolution:

CB7 supports the application of CB5 for a moratorium on the construction of buildings in excess of six-hundred (600) feet in height to the extent that they will be located within one thousand feet (1,000) feet of the perimeter wall that encloses Central Park; and

CB7 requests that the City Planning Commission immediately review the zoning resolution in order to address issues presented by extra-tall buildings on the surrounding community; and,

CB7 requests that the Department of City Planning review includes a study of inclusionary housing, with a view to reducing the rate of additional “bonus” FAR and allocate this to affordable housing.



Motion to approve:

*Land Use Committee: 10-0-0-0*

*Non-Committee Board Members: 1-0-0-0*

2. Update on Collegiate School Funds

Page Cowley gave a status report of the few meetings that have taken place with the Chair of CB7, Elizabeth Caputo, and Chair of the Housing Committee, Nick Prigo, at discussion and fact finding sessions with Housing Preservation Department, the Borough President and representatives from other elected officials as well as representatives from the Department of City Planning.

There was a discussion of the potential sites available within our district and the desire to maintain distribution of affordable housing throughout the community not just settle on the northern portion and boundary. To that end, Page reported on a joint Housing and Land Use meeting that was designed to solicit information from the community as to potential sites, known city owned property on 108<sup>th</sup> street west of Manhattan Avenue, or existing buildings that might be suitable for conversion/ adaptability to affordable /senior housing so that HPD could take these suggestions and determine what will yield the greatest number of units. These suggestions would be submitted in the form of a letter to HPD. It is anticipated that there will be many follow up meetings, as HPD looks at their inventory, suggestions and timeframe for design and construction. One important fact was confirmed: the \$50 million will stay in our district and will be allocated for either new units or in the worst case, conversion of affordable housing units expiring under existing programs to permanent housing and that any housing built out the \$50 million would also be permanent housing. We have also made recommendations to work with housing partners already active in our district and to encourage hiring the workforce for construction from within our community.

3. Review of the Department of City Planning's schematics showing the impact of the proposed Zoning for Affordable & Quality Housing on Buildings in MCD7. CD7 profile is available at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/pdf/zoning-qa/profiles/mn07.pdf>.

This item is for reference and initial review only. The proposed changes outlined in this document are currently in a "Community Board Briefing and Information Session" period at this time. We have not seen any revisions or the text amendment that will accompany this document. Committee members are requested to familiarize themselves with this data, as it will become increasingly useful as we shape inclusionary and affordable housing opportunities in our district.

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Page Cowley, Co-Chair Land Use



**Youth, Education & Libraries Committee Meeting Minutes  
Blanche Lawton and Eric Shuffler, Co-Chairpersons  
June 18, 2015**

The Youth, Education & Libraries Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, June 18, 2015, at the District Office, 250 West 87<sup>th</sup> Street, in the District. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by co-chairs Blanche Lawton and Eric Shuffler. The following matters were considered and actions taken.

The following representatives were also present:

- Marisa Maack, chief of staff to Council Member Helen Rosenthal.
- Lauren Schuster, chief of staff to Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal.
- Nico Galvan, intern to Borough President Gale Brewer.

Also present:

- Noah Gotbaum and Kristen Berger, District 3 Community Education Council

Update from the School Construction Authority concerning PS 342 (planned school at Riverside Center, West 61<sup>st</sup> Street at West End Avenue).

Presentation by Mike Mirasola, School Construction Authority

- PS/IS 342 (proposed as a pre-K through 8 school, but subject to change based on community needs)
- Expect to receive the core and shell in Spring 2016; if delivered timely, plan for school to open in September 2018.
- Capacity appx 692
- First floor:
  - Cafeteria, library, and lobby/entrance and circulation
- Second floor:
  - Classrooms (expect pre-K, K, 1<sup>st</sup> grade), supervisor's office
  - Gym, health instructor's office, boys & girls' locker room
  - Rest rooms, offices in central core
- Third Floor:
  - Classrooms (4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>); speech room
  - Science lab and prep room, science classroom
  - Music room; art room, art storage
  - Parent room
  - Teachers' lounge
  - Gymnasium (separate from the dedicated gym)



- Fourth Floor:
- Classrooms (6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>)
- Storage
  
- All spaces are flexible.
- All spaces fully ADA accessible, and WiFi.
  
- Two play spaces on the roof. Appx 3,000 SF and 3,600 SF  
MND: appears that the play space is bigger than anticipated during ULURP.

Eric:

- Determination of a catchment zone for the school is a CEC matter. Cec3.org – zoning process has already begun relating to a variety of issues in the entire District.
  
- Entrance:  
A: On West 61<sup>st</sup> west of WEA.  
A: Notch in sidewalk to provide extra area for students to congregate during drop-off.

Noah Gotbaum:

- Originally planned for 2015 – why delay?
- A: Amtrak active tracks directly beneath the construction site requiring clearance; other issues.
- Contractual commitments?
- A: Contractual commitments in the 2010 Restrictive Declaration are being met – school is in the first building being built.

Kristen Berger (CEC)

- Timeline?
- A: Deliver core & shell Spring 2016, then open September 2018.

West End Secondary School (On West 61<sup>st</sup> Street in former Beacon HS building)

Presentation by Mike Mirasola

- SCA had planned to begin construction shortly.
- OMB requires at least 5 years of lease term after end of significant capital improvements.
- At present, lease is still in negotiation but currently will expire in less than 5 years.
- So SCA will do maintenance and sprucing up, but cannot do major improvements.
  
- Once permitted to do so, SCA will engage in capital improvements in the WESS building including:



- Layout includes classrooms on the outside of a central rectangle; windowless classrooms and science rooms inside the core.
- Basement, will be:
- Very few classrooms, mostly storage and offices.
- First floor, will include:
- Black box theater, offices, classrooms, science demo room.
- Cafeteria – appx same size as current.
- Temporary library (will be installed before school opens).

Community Q: space will remain as is on first floor

A: Correct – always planned for first floor to remain mostly as is, and concentrate capital improvements on the upper floors first.

- Second floor:
- Exercise space on the second floor
- Mostly labs and classrooms.
- Third Floor:
- Main library.
- Classrooms, science lab and science demonstration rooms.

Eric:

- Q: Furniture?
- A: No new furniture from SCA – would be capital expense that is not permitted.  
A: The school may receive what appears to be unused furniture, but SCA cannot purchase new furniture until the lease situation is resolved. School facilities division could provide new furniture without it being “new” to SCA.
- Q: Computer lab?
- A: Generally schools do not have single dedicated computer lab – use laptops and WiFi instead.
- Q: Capital budget was estimated at \$50MM
- A: No firm budget allocation at this point, nothing has been allocated.  
-- [NOTE – the Capital Plan has a dedicated allocation of appx \$48MM for this school, pending lease resolution]
- Q: Who negotiates lease?
- A: Kenrick Oh – SCA property division.
- Concern: parents inclined to advocate for lease to be signed – urgency without having that urgency drive up the price of the lease.  
A: Already threatened eminent domain – could not be more aggressive.



Steve:

- Q: What are the large budget items?  
A: Science labs, technology, kitchens.

Community Questions:

- Q: Asbestos?  
A: No more than any existing school – likely already dealt with some of it in this building as SCA remediates when work is done in this building.  
A:
- Q: (Noah) – New Beacon building  
A: SCA is “blitzing” – expect to deliver the building on time on promised date August 3<sup>rd</sup>(?).  
A: Note that the entrance is the last part of any project – so upstairs is looking much better than the entrance.  
A: On schedule.  
A: TCofO; punch list usually lasts for a year or more.

PS 75 facing construction on all sides.

Concerns voiced by PS 75 parents including Emmaia Gelman.

Eric:

- Many schools facing construction throughout the district.

Emmaia:

- Project proposed at 711 WEA – very tall, complex project (involves building on top of an existing building).
- Concern that it will affect enrollment of choice families.
- Parents feel that they are fighting for the school on their own.

Mike Mirasola:

- SCA faces this situation in many location.
- E.g. 22<sup>nd</sup> and Lex – School of the Future – towers being constructed on both sides of their building.
- DoB cannot stop construction.
- But DoB can assist parents.
- “Best Squad” – safety team that reaches out to parents.
- Also coordinates with DEP – noise abate.
- PS 199 organized a construction committee, met regularly with the developer, scheduled certain construction activities after school hours (re new building at WEA at SE corner of West 70<sup>th</sup> Street).
- Start Dialogue early, involve elected early.



- SCA cannot stop construction, but can assist.
- SCA can assist on engineering viability, cost of A/C to avoid noise, other remediation options.

Eric:

- How can parents organize to access expertise needed to approach and negotiate effectively with developer?

Mike Mirasola

- First request is to seek noise monitoring, and then develop proposals to mitigate.
- First outreach is to DoE Division of School Facilities – will help with engineering expertise.

Emmaia Gelman – PS 75 parent organizer:

- What should we be asking for re mitigation? Engineering expertise?
- What is reasonable to ask for in terms of expense?

Lauren Schuster:

- Outside A-M Rosenthal's district.
- Analogy to PS 51 – can ask developer to provide
- SCA should provide expertise.

Marisa Maack:

- Already working closely with the school and the resident of 711.
- Also useful for parents at schools that have already faced these challenges to share best practices and successful experiences.

Emmaia:

- Asking City agencies to set standards to be met.

Mike:

- DEP has set standards.  
SCA serves as technical advisors, but not advocates.
- Catherine:
- Penny Ryan is an expert at construction management.

Emmaia:

- Intro 420 – C-M Levine's bill on noise from construction proximate to schools.
- Mike: not sure if SCA is taking a position.

Eric:

- Does SCA know in advance of construction near schools?  
A: No advance notice.



A: SCA does keep in touch with DoB, HPD, DCP to stay ahead of enrollment projections.

Noah:

- Community and Community Board has better information on planned construction than SCA.
- SCA projections are done on a 5-year basis.

• Kristen:

- When does SCA make projections?

A: Every year – constantly reassessing.

Additional projects:

- 165 – brick replacement
- JoA – brick replacement
- MLK library work – will start over the summer.
- LaGuardia – exterior modernization – removing and replacing granite panels.

PS 75 Postcard Campaign:

Eric:

- Potential resolution to support effort to
- Emmaia:
- Concerns re expertise and absence of latitude given as-of-right
- Need to give DoB something to respond to:
  - protest
  - expressions of concern from other agencies.
- Approach – WEA and Vision Zero
- 6 City agencies work together for street safety.
- Construction should be subject to input from various agencies as it crosses disciplines.
- Asking the Mayor to give DoB standards – have agencies prioritize and express concern.
- Seeking a community protection plan akin to a tenant protection plan.
  - ask the Mayor to compel agencies to respond re
- June 25<sup>th</sup> protest (before parents).
- DEP is not one of the agencies on the postcard – will add.

Marisa:

- Legislation pending to inform agencies – not necessarily engaging, but a start.
- Community Protection Plan is a good answer – will be immediately understood.

Eric:

- Propose a letter from CB7 to Deputy Mayor Alicia Glen and Commissioners of various agencies, calling for engagement on the PS 75 issue.



- Based on the Core Principles.
- CB7 to facilitate a discussion.

Marisa:

- Use Proposed Rezoning for Quality and Affordable Housing – include in the ULURP response to include language re near schools.

Playground Task Force Update:

- Waiting to hear about funding – next meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup>.
- Task Force already has done work on principles of universal design.
- Now focusing on facilitation of play among children with differing abilities and needs.
- Also looking to help educate families on principles of inclusive play, including a theater program that brings together children with a wide variety of special needs. Pairs the special needs children with children closer to the typical development spectrum.
- Also looking at Writopia – inclusiveness.
- These are well-developed programs - just new to New York.
- Mission is to be involved in design early on, so we are not given just another accessible playground that is not designed to be inclusive.

Adjourn: 8:35 pm

**Present:** Blanche Lawton, Eric Shuffler, Isaac Booker, Tina Branham, Steven Brown, Catherine DeLazzerro, Mark Diller, Rita Genn and Polly Spain. **Chair:** Elizabeth Caputo. **Absent:** Paul Fischer.



**Health & Human Services Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Madge Rosenberg, Chairperson**  
**June 23, 2015**

▪ Resolution on K2.

Audrey Isaacs drafted a resolution and presented at the meeting and reviewed as a group. The resolution identified manufacturing and transitioning of K2 as a felony and the sale as a misdemeanor. We discussed focusing on education and if there should be notification about the risks of using synthetic cannabinoids versus the legality of usage. Our committee decided that the resolution should focus on the education component and with less emphasis on the law enforcement. We are requesting that the DOE do an informative campaign. Buyer be aware! The resolution will also add “K-2” to synthetic cannabinoids and a long list of other similar drugs.

Audrey will call CSD 18 and CSD 3 to learn of different DOE programs available to educate students on the dangers of drug usage.

Audrey will revise resolution to include input from the committee and recirculate to everyone.

▪ District Needs

- Hunger – one of our primary needs. Genora Johnson said there is a real need for more food and pantries. Shared some of the statistics from the West Side Campaign Against Hunger. Seniors don’t wish to cook (Meals on Wheels, local Senior Centers offer cooked meals.) Goddard Riverside offers cooked breakfast. Red Oak Center – 106 Columbus Avenue, is a senior center offering a meal and social program.
- SNAP has been substantially cut back. Madge to investigate.
- Senior Services: case managers at senior centers.
- Homelessness/Supportive and Affordable Housing
- Accessibility for people with disabilities to sidewalks. Enforcement of ADA compliance. Access-a-ride evaluation.
- Mental Health Services and Supports for Children and their Families
- Domestic Violence Counseling and Prevention. Back up with statistics from police.
- Accessible/Inclusive Playgrounds

Increase in crime discussed: increase in assaults, domestic violence, Columbia University reporting. 24<sup>th</sup> Precinct reporting an increase in violence, gangs. We need more information from 20<sup>th</sup> Precinct.

Is there a Domestic Violence Programs cutback? Fern Fleckman, of the Ryan Center, shared the following related knowledge about DV: DOHMH funds a piece of it. “Road Map to Mental Health” run by Chirlane McCray looks at the youth part of it. What other related services are available to lessen DV? St. Lukes had a funded program for a number of years, but it is no longer funded. There is a real need for DV services. Is there a DV coordinator at the 20<sup>th</sup> Precinct? Rita to investigate. Is there one at the 24<sup>th</sup> Precinct? Christian to check.

Should we add “Children” to our District Needs?

- Mental health counseling services (parent must approve)
- After school programming for teens (Quality of Life)
- Insufficient number of mental health providers for children



Fern mentioned that the Ryan Center has a program called “Mental Health First”, an 8 hour training program which is evidence-based, program to de-stigmatize mental health. The program will be open to all.

3. GOING FORWARD:

Get more information from Fern on Mental Health First and learn how community can use and benefit from this program

- . Check with police on increase in crime and see how more police scheduled for the city can combat violence in the district.
- . Get domestic violence information from police
- . Bring together committee input into district needs statement.
- . Finalize synthetic cannabinoid resolution
- . Check changes in SNAP

**Present:** Madge Rosenberg, Christian Cordova, Catherine DeLazzero, Rita Genn, Audrey Isaacs and Genora Johnson. **Absent:** Robert Espier, Miki Fiegel and Sheldon J. Fine.