



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

Community Board 7/Manhattan's Full Board met on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, at the Museum of Natural History, in the District. Chair Elizabeth R. Caputo called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. after the Secretary confirmed the existence of a quorum.

Minutes from July 7, 2015 full board meeting were **approved: 25-0-0-0**

Chair's Report: Elizabeth R. Caputo

- Citi bike locations on UWS listed on CB7 website.
- D. Zweig addressed quote in Post and the Paper's failure to address the proper position of the Board.
- September is national emergency preparedness month; S. Fine provided a short update on the UWS CERT team and its successes over the last year; offered presentations to local community groups on emergency preparedness.
- BCI committee will be hosting a B2B in October; Thursday, October 22, 6-8 pm at the New York Historical Society. Hoping to have a speaker from the Borough's President Office on its report, "Small Business, Big Impact". Inviting leaders from other community boards to learn how we put together these meetings. Additional information will be on the CB7 website.
- DOT will evaluate the implemented changes on West End Ave., CB will provide the results of our SurveyMonkey hosted survey at that time.
- There will be spraying for west Nile virus in the neighborhood soon; details on website of HHS.
- City Planning and Zoning Issues—will come through the Land Use committee this fall.

Presentation on OneNYC

- "The Plan for a Strong and Just City".
- Adding equity to the values addressed by Plan NYC.
- Further presentations will be done at the Committee level and focus on specific issues pertinent to those committees.
- Feedback can be given at [www.nyc.gov/oneNYC](http://www.nyc.gov/oneNYC).
- Core challenges and opportunities expanded to include "growing inequality", "importance of the Region" and "New York Voices".
- Four visions: "Our growing, thriving city"; "our just and equitable city"; "our sustainable city"; "our resilient city."

Elections Committee Update

- Four individuals on the committee.
- Will take nominations at this meeting for election at the October meeting.
- Nominations (moved and seconded)
  - o Chair: Elizabeth Caputo;
  - o Vice-Chair: Audrey Isaacs; Matt Holtzmann; DeNora Getachew
  - o Secretary: Christopher Riano; Christian Cordova;

Community Session

Libby Evans

- Bike Rack W. 78<sup>th</sup> and Columbus; the bike rack is currently on hold, which obviates concerns.

Peter Arndtsen

- Columbus/Amsterdam BID event calendars available at back of the room.

Richard Barr

- Spoke regarding the 86<sup>th</sup> Street Crosstown bus
- Because the bus no longer has its layover on the East side of 86<sup>th</sup> between Broadway and West End, there are two problems: Layover now on North side of 86<sup>th</sup> between Broadway and Amsterdam, and when there is a third bus in line, it blocks an active driveway; problem 2, the last stop has been eliminated, which was 87<sup>th</sup> and West End, which must be difficult for people with disabilities.

Joseph Guanos

- Comments on Shake Shack.
- Asked that the proposed café be rejected or held over.

Manhattan Borough President's Report, Diana Howard

- Newsletter update available in the back of the room.
- Community award grants due September 10.
- Public Hearing on traffic congestions, 9/17/15 at 10 a.m. at 199 Chambers Street

Reports by Elected Officials:Helen Rosenthal, City Council Member, 6<sup>th</sup> District

- Introduced new constituent services representative and scheduler.
- Newsletter available at the back of the room with updates.
- Emailed earlier today re: west Nile virus spraying; will be done by a van, spraying will be done low.
- City screwed up PS191/199 wait list situation. Anxious for new school to open at Riverside Center. PS 191 has been labeled a persistently dangerous school, but it's the result of inaccurate reporting and inaccurate classification of events.
- Introduced bill to increase participation of people with disabilities in civic life; more agencies would be required to have an ADA coordinator; meeting agendas will have to include notices of relevant accommodations.
- Co-Chair of BCI offered to assist on training of delivery people who work for establishments that do not otherwise have to appear before the board for liquor licenses or side-walk cafes.
- Participatory budgeting to begin with neighborhood assemblies in October.
- Last month, Mayor signed on CM's bill that would require sprinklers at establishments that house animals.

A-M Linda Rosenthal

- Have been shutting down illegal hotels in the district; working to see that they are shutdown.



- Has a bill that would require landlords of rent-regulated tenants to inform them of the SCREE protections.
- P.S. 191—City and DOE has never adequately planned for the number of students who will need to go to school here.
- New issue with landlords is the denial of natural gas to tenants, sometime for as long as a year.
- Introduced new staffer, Gus Gibson.

State Senator Brad Hoylman

- Unveiled legislation with A-M Glick that would require any company wishing to do business with the state of New York to disclose its pay gender gap.
- Thanked C-M Rosenthal for her efforts for supporting PS 191; joined A-M Rosenthal in sending a letter to the DOE discussing frustration with notification process related to the labeling of the school as persistently dangerous.
- Announced local events that will be occurring in the district; discussion on monarch butterfly disappearance, Wednesday, September 30 6:30-8 p.m. at NYU; office will be offering flu shots; mammogram van will also be at Lincoln Towers on September 24, 2015.

Reports by Elected Officials' Representatives:

Cherica DuBois, C-M Corey Johnson's Office

- Participatory budgeting kick-off on 9/28 at the Highline; funded 7 projects last year.
- IDNYC pop up at GMHC between 9/1-9/18.

Liznel Aybar-Ventura, A-M Daniel O'Donnell's Office

- Monthly update provided in the back of the room.
- Office is looking for a Fall intern and fellow.

Brice Peyre, A-M Richard Gottfried's Office

- Named to task force formed by mayor to examine conditions of Time Square; firmly opposed to closing pedestrian areas.

Jackie Blank, Congressman Jerrold Nadler's Office

- Iran deal
- Congressman Nadler came out in favor of the deal; concluded that approval would be best chance to keep Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon.
- Congressman's full statement is available in the back.

Laura Atlas, Public Advocate Letitia James' Office

- Discussed press coverage of Public Advocate, specifically regarding her legal activity.

Dan Campanelli, NYC Comptroller's Office

- Report available in the back of the room.
- Hispanic Heritage celebration on September 30.

Business Session

**Steering Committee**

**Elizabeth Caputo, Chairperson**

1. Community-driven Design of Inclusive Playgrounds.



- Resolution introduced by C. DeLazzero.
- Resolution outlines the proposed design framework for the playground; unanimously adopted by Steering in July.
- A community member discussed her experience with her son who has a physical disability; only 16% of playgrounds in NYC are accessible.
- There is a difference between universal design and ADA accessibility; universal design considers a goal of social inclusion, not only access. Concerned with segregation according to ability.
- There was an inquiry into “culturally appropriate aesthetics”—design should reflect local culture and history.
- This resolution specifically requests continued engagement in the scoping process.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 40-0-0-0

#### **Business & Consumer Issues Committee**

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

#### **2. Applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses.**

- **286 Columbus Avenue (West 73<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Wine and Roses Bar and Cafes LLC, d/b/a To be Determined.**
- **428 Amsterdam Avenue (West 80<sup>th</sup> Street.) Upper West Hospitality LLC, d/b/a Crave FishBar.**
- **450 Amsterdam Avenue (West 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Gumbull LLC, d/b/a The Dead Poet.**

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 39-0-0-0

#### **3. 225 Columbus Avenue (West 70<sup>th</sup> Street.) FM70 Inc., d/b/a To be Determined.**

The resolution to *disapprove* without prejudice was adopted: 40-0-0-0

#### ***New Unclosed Café Application:***

4. **274 Columbus Avenue (West 73<sup>rd</sup> Street.)** New application #7383-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Birdbath Ventures, LLC, d/b/a Birdbath Duvet, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 4 tables and 8 seats.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 39-0-0-0

#### ***Enclosed Café Renewal Application:***

5. **366 Columbus Avenue (West 77<sup>th</sup> Street.)** Renewal application ULURP# N120250ECM/ DCA# 1282506 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Shake Shack 366 Columbus, LLC, d/b/a Shake Shack, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 12 tables and 34 seats.

The resolution to *disapprove* without prejudice was adopted: 38-0-1-0

#### **Land Use Committee**

#### **Richard Asche and Page Cowley, Co-Chairpersons**

6. **70 West 93<sup>rd</sup> Street, Columbus Manor (Columbus Avenue.)** The proposed action is a modification of the West Side Large Scale Residential Development pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3) to permit the construction of approximately 14,730 square feet of retail floor area at the ground floor of the building located at 70 West 93<sup>rd</sup> Street (between 92<sup>nd</sup> and 93<sup>rd</sup>), and the construction of a new rooftop open area at the level of the second story (above the retail area) for use by the building’s tenants.



Richard Metsky of Beyer Blinder Belle, architects: continuous street frontage along Columbus Avenue; unused plaza transformed into retail and improved lobby; visual connection between streetscape and interior; undulating roof; more gracious and friendly lobby; vibrant active streetscape compatible with existing tower

Dierdre Carson of Greenberg Traurig, attorney for applicant: application/design met legal standards; worked with electeds, City agencies, and tenant association; committee negative nevertheless

Adam Roman, Stellar Management with owner/development: electeds and tenants association positive about the design; no MCI charges for improvements; upgrading security; lobby larger than ADA guidelines; upgrading basement so laundry room not dingy; improving community room; reducing rents during construction

Sharon Canns President of 50 W 93<sup>rd</sup> Tenants Assn; lives in sister building to 70 W 93<sup>rd</sup> Street; plaza is NOT underutilized; will change way block functions because share walkways and facilities; grew from 10,000 sq feet to 16,000 sq. feet; 2 trees dead; will they be replanted; please take that into consideration

#### Board Comments:

- Although building is not a NORC, many residents are seniors and concerned about accessibility issues; CB7 must keep these issues in mind when changes are considered; design does not meet tenants concerns notwithstanding that it is an interesting design; impact on passersby is of concern; security of play area is insufficient because easy access from street
- Committee has a list of things that can be done to address needs of tenants
- Committee disagrees on whether design is good, particularly whether sloped roof over 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension is positive
- Design would add vibrancy to Columbus Avenue
- Committee opposes maximization of retail at expense of tenants' needs
- Trash collection is being moving from Columbus Ave to W 92 Street, requiring greater care on narrower street (Co-Chair: applicant reconsidering placement of trash bins and pickup areas)
- If project on border line between approval and disapproval, give it the benefit of the doubt and approve it
- Alcoves prevent sidewalk cafes; notwithstanding the asserted reasons (protecting trees), this is not good enough reason
- Applicant should continue to work with Committee
- Design issue is separate from issue of impacts
- Should not base conclusion re whether plans enhance street scape based upon our subjective aesthetic tastes
- Rationale for text amendment was to change large scale developments so can now have retail; now reverting to underlying zoning in area permitting a C zone of commercial development at street level; CB7 IS permitted to use its sense of aesthetics in making the findings re whether design enhances street scape and promotes a harmonious relationship
- Even if we like the design aesthetically, found it had negative impact on seniors, and therefore is voting no on both A and B

#### Comm Co-Chair:

- Moving laundry room to basement is problematic; less security; cannot watch children while doing laundry if move laundry room to basement



- Committee reviewed this repeatedly and asked questions; but did not get the answers they were asking
- Tenants did not indicate they liked the plans
- All but one committee member did not like design
- Usually work with designers and eventually approve design; did not happen here
- Did not reject design because Committee likes current plaza
- Zoning law assumes retail enhances street scape
- Elderly will not be able to walk on sloped roof of 2<sup>nd</sup> story
- Every element of design is meant to improve/maximize retail space

Re Part A: resolution not to make a finding, that the enlargement enhances the street scape and that the design promotes a harmonious relationship with neighboring buildings, was adopted: 24-12-4-0

Re Part B: resolution not to make a finding, that adverse impacts resulting from the development would be avoided or minimized, was adopted: 33-6-1-0

Therefore, resolution to *disapprove* was adopted.

#### **Preservation Committee**

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

7. **Landmarks Celebration.** Resolution recognizing the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the NYC Landmarks Law and Value of Preservation

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 39-0-0-0

8. **305 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street** (Riverside Drive - West End Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a master plan for replacement windows on the south façade.

The resolution to *approve* on numbers 8 – 11 bundled was adopted: 38-0-1-0

9. **470 West End Avenue** (82<sup>nd</sup> – 83<sup>rd</sup> Street.) Application #17-3153 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to establish a master plan governing the future installation of windows.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted.

10. **645 West End Avenue** (West 92<sup>nd</sup> – 91<sup>st</sup> Streets.) Application #16-8885 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to replace windows.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted.

11. **309 West 92<sup>nd</sup> Street, West Side Montessori Nursery School** (West End Avenue – Riverside Drive.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a window replacement.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted.

12. **32 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street** (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application #17-3088 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to alter the rear facade, and excavate the cellar and rear yard.



Joseph Bolanos, Pres W 76 Block Association: Community does not have 2<sup>nd</sup> chance to speak after LPC hearing; excavation 13 feet below brownstone; stream goes from CPW onto W 76 to midblock (toward Columbus); as a result have sinkholes due to stream; 7 events in last 5 years all due to stream; excavation dangerous to other residents of the block

Committee Co-Chair: not unusual issue; does NOT have impact on what have to vote on.

CB7 Chair: submit something for the record

The resolution to *do whatever committee recommended on 12 – 14* was adopted: 37-0-2-0; Page Cowley on 12 only 36-0-3-0.

13. **270 West 77<sup>th</sup> Street** (West End Avenue – Broadway.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a rear yard addition and facade renovations, including window replacement.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted.

14. **328 West 108<sup>st</sup> Street** (Riverside – West End Avenue.) Application #17-4022 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to construct rooftop and rear yard additions.

The resolution to *approve* was adopted.

15. **320 West 101<sup>st</sup> Street** (Riverside – West End Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for front facade restoration work, window replacement, new 4-story rear yard addition and cellar expansion, and new stair bulkhead.

The resolution to *disapprove* unless...was adopted: 38-0-0-0

16. **324-326 West 108<sup>th</sup> Street** (Riverside Drive – West End Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a front facade restoration, window replacement, rear yard alteration and 6th floor addition.

Barbara Shore lives across street: Glad redoing building; opposes 32 foot extension; would like that reduced in size so does not obliterate light in her apartment and in those of fellow tenants

Paula Denaldi on Board of landmarked building next to proposed development: This project too massive on top; more intrusive than original plan; reduce size of balconies so less intrusive; structure on top oppressive and blocks views from all sides of her landmarked building; blocks sun; overwhelming; concern about noise from numerous balconies

Comm Co-Chair: That's why we said disapprove unless....

A, The resolution to *approve* re front façade was adopted: 37-0-1-0

B. The resolution to disapprove unless.... re rear façade and rooftop addition was adopted: 36-0-0-0

**Parks & Environment Committee****Klari Neuwelt, Chairperson**

17. **Central Park.** Design for the reconstruction of West 84th Street/Mariner's Playground, Central Park at West 84<sup>th</sup>-85<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Committee: will take 9 months to do the renovation

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 35-0-0-0

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

18. **Newsstand.** N/W/C Columbus Avenue & West 92<sup>nd</sup> Street (IFO, 100 West 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.) New application #8504-2015-ANWS to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Mohammed F. Uddin to construct and operate a newsstand on the northwest corner of Columbus Avenue and West 92<sup>nd</sup> Street, in front of 100 West 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The resolution to *disapprove* was adopted: 33-1-0-0

**Steering Committee****Elizabeth Caputo, Chairperson****19. Requests for leaves of absence:**

- A. Lillian Moore for three months beginning in June 2015.
- B. Marc Glazer for three months beginning in June 2015.

Board Comment:

- This means 6 months of leave, ¼ of tenure.
- Discretionary
- Will discuss this at another meeting as general policy

The resolution to *approve* was adopted: 31-2-0-0

Alan Flacks: Not complying with NYS law that must mail written agendas in advance if requested  
Adjourned at 10:21 pm.

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



**Special Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes  
Richard Asche and Page Cowley, Co-Chairpersons  
September 3, 2015**

The following issues were discussed and actions taken.

1. **70 West 93rd Street, Columbus Manor** (Columbus Avenue.) The proposed action is a modification of the West Side Large Scale Residential Development pursuant to ZR Section 78-06(b)(3) to permit the construction of approximately 14,730 square feet of retail floor area at the ground floor of the building located at 70 West 93rd Street (between 92nd and 93rd), and the construction of a new rooftop open area at the level of the second story (above the retail area) for use by the building's tenants.

A. This is the third full committee review of the project, CB7 having had an update of the project informally in August with two members of the Land Use Committee.

A summary of progress since the last full Committee meeting in July was made by the applicant's attorney, Diedre Carson Esq. of Greenberg Traurig, Richard Metsky, representing the architect, Beyer Blinder Belle, for the proposed modification and Special Permit, and assisted by a representative from the landscape architect, M. Paul Friedberg and Partner.

Richard Metsky summarized the design concept as follows:

1. Concept:
  - Build out to the lot lines to increase retail.
  - Build a green roof with amenities over the new retail infill.
  - Make the infill more visually interesting, a granite base has been added to the storefronts. (Columbus Avenue frontage slopes north to south with a grade change of approximately 3'-0")
  - New facade has mini setbacks to preserve existing mature trees on the sidewalk.
  - Relocate the building entrance (where the current rear plaza exists) to 93rd Street to NE corner of the site.
  - The lifted corners for the retail units will be approximately 19'-11" with the lowest storefront at a height of approximately 15'-6" are intended to add light to the commercial spaces.
2. Landscape at ground level:
  - Preserve the double row of trees on Columbus Avenue.
  - Create a new playground at 92nd Street that is gated at the street.
  - A new residential entrance with a tilted canopy that is part of the upper roof deck (with a central open area to the sky).
  - The landscape at the eastern property line has been revised with the previous pathway removed.
3. Second level terrace above new retail infill
  - Second floor units do not have balconies, in lieu they will have small private patios at the same level as the terrace
  - Private patios will be screened by hedges.
  - The roof terrace will have a series of sloped areas, with the highest peaks at the corner of the lot and at the middle of the Columbus Avenue elevation.
  - There will be a common lobby for tenant access to the roof terrace.



- Tables, chairs and reclining chairs will be provided.
  - The change in height between the lowest point to the highest is 4'-5" not including the parapet/railing (ADA compliance for the slopes were not provided).
  - The parapet has been revised to be in glass that will be code compliant at an additional 3'-6".
  - The sloped corners will be landscaped with grasses.
  - The greenery has been revised to be visible from the street level behind the glass guard panel.
  - Other areas will be paved or covered with wood decking (Ipe).
  - Flowering shrubs and trees (example: crepe myrtle) will also be planted on the terrace.
4. Materials and Signage
- Base of the storefronts will be black/dark granite increasing in height as the building slopes south on Columbus.
  - Storefront glass will be clear throughout.
  - Storefront mullions and framing will be dark grey metal (coated aluminum).
  - The Fascia at the terrace above the retail will be a lighter grey metal profiled panel.
  - A place-card for the location of signage will be profiled lettering /logo mounted on top of the bay entrance doors.  
(Signage is not part of this application)
5. Interior tenant amenity revisions at the ground floor
- The Trash Room remains at the entrance level and the disposal path to the street has been changed to avoid crossing the playground area. Trash collection for the tenants and the commercial pick-up will both be on 92nd Street (presently pick up is from Columbus Avenue)..
  - The Laundry Room has been moved to the basement and replaced by a Mechanical Room overlooking and discharging at the playground side.
  - The Mail Room has been enlarged, but no change to the corridor with that extends to the elevator bank. The Elevator Bank area remains without visibility from the front desk.
- B. Land Use Committee / CB7 Board Member Questions  
These have been organized in sequence of the question/comment.

Brian Jenks:

- Can you explain the following revised areas: Trash area, Stair Access to Roof Terrace and Lobby changes: Reply: The change for routing the trash to the street has been improved, the exterior stair from the roof deck has been moved adjacent to the play area, and the vestibule moved to be nearer the lobby.

Page Cowley:

- Has the playground been made smaller? Reply: Only the winding path has been removed. So the playground is narrower? Reply: Effectively yes, but it is all now play area.

Sheldon Fine:



- Can you explain the security measures for playground area? Is the present gate to remain? What is the supervision? Reply: there is a gate at the street now. Point taken and a further review will be made regarding security and surveillance.

Peter Samton:

- The storefront street wall is recessed to keep the existing trees, however the tree pits are in alignment with the lot-line? Reply: An arborist confirmed that the tree pits were adequate and the trees can remain.
- Are you aware that at least one, if not two trees are dead? Reply: at the outset of the project, an arborist checked the health of the trees and all were alive. This will be re-checked.

Page Cowley:

- The bayed entrances to the retail units will have a flat roof area behind the lettering that is lower and protected as well by the cantilevered roof terrace. What is the depth of the recess beyond the entrance bay? Reply: Yes and the recess are approximately six feet.
- There is a growing concern with safety and surveillance of un-lit areas; how will these areas be lighted, supervised and maintained to discourage loitering, defecation and urination? Reply: This occurs now with flat street walls. The sides of the alcoves will be the same as the glass storefronts.

Louisa Craddock:

- The revised interior area, especially the corridors leading to the elevators has not be widened. This was discussed at previous meetings as desirable for tenants in wheelchairs, walkers and those using strollers-- two elderly with walkers could not pass one another as shown.
- A bump-out in the corridor off the mechanical room gives a restrictive feeling. The space would be more comfortable if it were wider. Have you and can you consider widening these areas, perhaps reducing the retail areas? Reply: The build out can only be used for retail and not for increasing or enhancing the existing residential space.
- But how is the lobby reconfigured and moved to the north east corner? Reply: The area tabulations must be the same as previously constructed.

Jeanette Rausch:

- There is a real concern that the potentially large retail spaces will remain vacant. Is all commercial space within the C1-9 limit area? Reply: Yes.
- How are the retail tenants' mechanical systems to be vented? Reply: These units will be designed and installed by the tenants. They will be vented within the transom areas of the storefront.
- If the retailer is an eatery, how will the cooking areas be vented? It would be good to see how a restaurant fits your retail model now, rather than face a further revision in the future. Reply: A restaurant would not affect roof deck or tenants and it will also vent over/through the storefront of the building.



- There is a loss of self-service and service laundry facilities in the neighborhood. Why is the Laundry Room moved to the basement? Reply: This is to accommodate additional washers and dryers.
- Regarding the trash collection and travel route, can't this be better managed via the basement using the parking ramp to provide direct access to the 92nd street pick up area? Reply: This is the best route and location for trash collection. Wouldn't it be better to keep the commercial private pick up on Columbus to prevent additional garbage pick up and reduce traffic on the side street? Reply: It would not be a problem to move the commercial trash pick up back to the avenue.
- Lastly, while I have not read the EAS, were there any significant single impacts regardless of meeting the "significant" threshold? I am concerned about the type of retailer that was used as an example and that the type of retailer could possibly be a destination retailer but this cannot be predicted. A worst-case scenario should be described, that should include noise factors of a restaurant/ bar retailer, and any increased traffic and deliveries. Was this considered? Reply: The EAS considered all of these as accumulative. No single impact exceeded the threshold resulting in "no significant impacts."

Page Cowley:

- With the relocation of the laundry, how will the venting of both the Laundry and the Trash Rooms work? And will either venting or air intake affect the playground? Reply: No answer. Wouldn't it be better to have the Laundry on the ground floor and also provide surveillance to the play area?

Ethel Sheffer:

- Some of the comments raised in these discussion never predicted the impact to the residential tenants. The text amendment sought to increase street-life and the retail with the notion that it would be smaller retailers, not the larger stores.
- How does the new retail insertion program work with the text and findings, and without the comment and experience of those who live in the building and use this area? Reply: We cannot change the residential portion interior, as the tenant space is not included in the text amendment. Yes, but this is a significant issue (attention now directed to DCP staff present).

[It was agreed that a separate letter should be drafted and sent to the Department of City Planning to recommend that this project, and others to follow, consider needs and priority of amenities for residential tenants equally. The addition of new / increased retail should not be the only consideration and at a potential diminution of service, convenience and accessibility (aging in place included here.)

- Is there sufficient space for walking and use of pedestrians between the Columbus Avenue trees? Is there room for a sidewalk cafe? And what will be the new sidewalk dimension? Reply: Yes, and it is approximately 19'-0".
- The retail space along 93rd Street contains two retail units, a large one and a small one extending at about 80'-0". Can the lobby area be reconfigured to create more generous interior corridors? Reply: No.
- Regarding the "look-at-me architecture" of the roof terrace, especially the slanted corners, perhaps this can be reviewed to conform to the context of Columbus



Avenue, especially sight lines to the roof terrace, while it is nice to see the greenery above, the terrace is for the residents, not the pedestrians.

- A suggested clarification here is to be made while the project keeps describing the roof terrace as a "plaza" it is not. It is a private terrace/ space.
- Lastly, although the text amendment does not require lighting, we should say something in our resolution about lighting. Reply: The store retailers will keep their lighting on.

Page Cowley:

- Regarding lighting, the street lamps are at the curb, with trees in leaf and with the density of the canopy as projected in the new design, very little night time lighting will be available to amply light the sidewalk and also reach the storefronts. Other projects that we have seen incorporate lighting within the base of the storefront or add exterior wall lighting appropriate to the design style of the infill. It is unlikely that the recessed areas can benefit on the street lamping alone.

Peter Samton:

- Is the rear plaza used? I have not seen much activity there, but the replacement design is lacking.
- There is a chance here to do some remarkable things without the "wings," as it makes portions of the terrace unusable. Greenery could overhang the perimeter. While the proposed terrace is quite unusual, it creates shadows at the ground level with the deep overhangs and sloped corners, lastly, whatever greenery there is will be difficult to maintain or grow. The hole in the middle of the sloped corner at the entrance makes no sense.
- Basically, there are many contradictions in this design that need attention and the renderings and building section do not consider the orientation and natural day light.

Richard Asche:

- If you leave the lobby where is presently is, the only consequence is smaller retail.
- The alcoves are an attractive nuisance.
- Most importantly agree that the entire retail proposal has been designed to create retail space without concern for pedestrians and very little concern for residents.
- So I believe the key concern here, in the compilation of our resolution, can address the following requirement / finding under the 78-06 Special Regulations Applying to Large-Scale Residential Development and in particular:

**"(vii) the enlargement enhances the streetscape and the design promotes a harmonious relationship with the existing development and contiguous blocks within the large-scale residential development".**

**In addition, any significant adverse impacts resulting from a development or enlargement pursuant to such modifications, considered in combination with developments or enlargements within the same former urban renewal area listed in paragraph (b)(2), previously the subject of modifications under this paragraph, (b)(3), shall have been avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable by incorporating as conditions to the modification those mitigative measures that have been identified as practicable.**



[This last statement is not very clear as drafted, but it was agreed that the intention not to create an adverse impact whatsoever does apply to this particular proposal, as their appears to be a diminution of amenity and convenience for the residential tenants.

Mark Diller:

- Does the sloped terrace meet the ADA ramping requirements? As I cannot calculate the grade proportion based on the length of the slope it may not be compliant. In this instance alone, the design could fail to meet the requirement not to create an adverse impact.
- I would agree that number (vii) also applies here. Does the proposal enhance and promote a harmonious relationship with the existing development? Perhaps not.

C. The meeting was opened to hear comments from the Community.

Serafin Mariel:

- There were tenant meetings, but most of the discussion revolved around the jobs created and the overall living conditions.
- It should be noted that most of the residents are retired.
- Moving the Laundry Room to the basement is a problem for many reasons, the primary one is that there is no way to take and bring laundry from the basement without the elevators and they are in frequent disrepair.
- The only reason for moving the Laundry Room is maximizing retail.
- There was no discussion of delivery/pick-up for the new stores.

Sharon Canns, President of the 50 West 93rd Tenants Association:

- Concerned with the drop of areas between both buildings.
- Also the number of school children use the plaza as a short-cut, as do the residents, and it will be sorely missed. It is a very active area, which has not been considered. This area will now be closed off by the relocated lobby proposal.
- The condition of the existing trees are also a concern as they are dying out all over the area. How will the new trees at the terrace level be maintained? Good Luck there.

Phyllis Harvin:

- Regarding the Laundry Room, there is a strong consensus to keep laundry room where it is. Reply: The current proposal is to move it.
- Has any assessment of the building as to whether the building's condition could support the changes (e.g. Local Law 11, drainage, structural impacts, etc.). Reply: none.
- Equally important is the duration and the hours when construction is permitted. WE have no information about this.

Susie Lugare:

- The capacity and impact on the existing parking garage is not clear. Right now the garage more than 100% overfilled.



Patricia Martin:

- Generally concerned with all of the issues raised.
- Is the infrastructure capable of handling the new retail units? There are presently three small retail units: a dry cleaner, a rental office and two apartments used for property management. How can the additional much larger retail spaces be accommodated and fit into existing building services [electric, gas, water drainage] including egress.
- If Stellar Management is not taking care of the building, as evidenced by the elevators are frequently out of service, no new commercial units should be permitted until the building is properly repaired and maintained.
- Given the current tenant population, the new management should be focusing on age-friendly neighborhoods, not commercial friendly neighborhoods. These commercial spaces are intended for large retailers, not neighborhood stores.

Hector Cardona, President of Columbus Manor Tenants Association:

- There have been meetings with Stellar Management and the Laundry Room was discussed. But there was a problem. We have been working with Council Member Helen Rosenthal. She told those present to have straw vote that it was non-binding. It is not clear how many voted for or against the relocation of the Laundry Room as other votes from those who did not attend were added later. So the issue is if the signatories at the actual meeting were legitimate or not.

Louis Reinhardt:

- The presentation did not speak to impact on residents on the side streets.
- The focus on pedestrians is on the Columbus frontage, not the side streets. Columbus Avenue pavement will be made narrower than it is now for all frontages. These streets are used by hundreds of school children as there are four schools whose students cross our block and the new proposal has inadequate space and setback on the side streets.
- In addition to the high pedestrian traffic are deliveries and the impact on the side streets, already congested with pick up and drop off during the school weekdays and other sanitation and maintenance trucks. The increase of more deliveries to service the new retail has not been adequately thought through as the side streets already have heavy use.

Fred Fishkin:

- There is no evidence to suggest viability of the additional commercial space. The business model does not take into account the empty stores in the area. We do not need mall type stores.
- There is currently little or no on street parking, due to bike lanes and the off set lane for turning vehicles, and no opportunity to increase the existing capacity of the garage(s). Our garage is limited to 88 cars, but there are often 192 cars parked there.
- I am also concerned about the duration of construction.

Judy Davies:

- West 93rd traffic has been significant because of the schools: Columbia Grammar, and on West 92nd, PS 84. In addition to school busses are SUVs



dropping off/picking up.

The sidewalks are too narrow and the addition of the entrances with doors from commercial door openings will impact pedestrians (kids going to/from school).

Sean Donovan:

- Why does the proposal include construction to the east of the C1-9 line. Reply: none given.

Rebecca Trip, past president of 70 West 93rd Tenants' Association (for 25 years):

- There are many elderly issues, which are not being considered in this proposal. We are a "NORC." [The group assembled learned that this acronym stands for *Naturally Occurring Retirement Community*.]
- The Laundry Room is heavily used and this should be on the ground level where more people can have access and assistance if needed, especially the handicapped.
- There are disagreements with the new Tenants Association, which makes discussions difficult and argumentative.

Richard Davies:

- Generally concerned with the subjective nature of the presentation by the architects: Will retail actually be local? It is also not a fair statement using words like "friendly" when the design shown is not. Claims of "friendly" appearance not borne out by experience of the infill across the street. And steel and glass is not inviting.
- The narrower sidewalks are not in keeping with what is happening in the neighborhood.

John Wehba:

- Generally disappointed by the trash solution presented, as the route to the street does not make sense with the pick-up of all trash on 92nd Street.
- There is presently not enough room in between the existing gate and the rear yard or west of the garage and the garage entrance to store the trash on the sidewalk on pick up days. This poses a real health and safety risk too. The garbage of 139 apartments should be taken out through the basement and not combined in the same area as the commercial trash and not combined. The trash should all be taken to Columbus Avenue.

Lorraine Johnson:

- While understanding the changes that Stellar would like to make, there is no consideration of the tenants requirements in the building. The design should be both family friendly and elderly friendly, which it is not, so the proposal is unfair to all.
- Corridors on the entry level are inadequately sized.
- Not convinced that the increase in retail will require more garage spaces for retail users.

Steve Abrams:



- Agrees with many of the comments made thus far, that traffic already on block is difficult and will be exacerbated once this proposal is built.
- Trucks making deliveries will clog traffic on Columbus Avenue.

Jill Hamberg:

- Concerned with the number of estimated deliveries as stated in the EAS as two (2) deliveries a week per retail unit. If the EAS assumes that the two larger retail spaces will be restaurants, these users will certainly have more frequent deliveries.

D. Committee Discussion and Vote:

The discussion that followed allowed each committee member and board member final thoughts.

Mark Diller:

- Doubts that the sloped roof areas are ADA accessible.
- The proposal does not adequately consider the vitality of the street life possible with outdoor cafes. The built-out entrances appear restrictive and render the thoroughfare insufficient.

Page Cowley:

- Reported that CB7 had comments from Council Member Helen Rosenthal's office and noted that she shared concerns about the Laundry Room, age-friendliness, and mix of retail.
- No written communication was received from the BP Gale Brewer's Office, but we know of her concern for lively an interesting streetscape.

Richard Asche:

- The new design features maximize retail and there is nothing wrong with this, but we must not permit this, if it reduces and cramps the residential space to accomplish this. We need "shops" not mall stores
- The uplifted "wings" exist only to increase light and air to the stores and a different approach to this needs to be considered.
- The example across the street is what can go wrong even though the text amendment calls for more glass. CB7 argued for more transparency when ZR text was amended, but this may have too much glass, and as presented does not look inviting and does not enhance the streetscape.
- The landscape and plantings are agreeable, but not enough to salvage the proposal.
- As to the interior modifications and relocations, agrees that the Laundry Room should remain on the ground floor as at present - another sacrifice to the retail.
- Another design features that is objectionable are the alcoves. These should be removed in favor of a straight street wall and all pushed back.
- While the build-out is warranted, there is not enough in the design to make this compelling.
- It never occurred to us that by introducing new commercial space it would be at the expense of the residential tenants. The purpose of text amendment was to enhance the street - not to turn amenity into encroachment on tenants.

Sheldon Fine:



- Agreed with the residents' consensus that the corridor to elevator should be reconfigured.  
Not enough width realistically.
- There needs to be further considerations regarding general site safety and the safety, access and surveillance of the playground area. Not convinced that this has been adequately addressed.

Roberta Semer:

- Has reservations about the 2nd floor roof and would like to see more of the deck and planting areas accessible [concerned about the sloped areas].
- The Laundry Room relocation is of concern too and not sure that moving it to the basement is a sound idea, especially regarding the only access is by elevator.
- Prefers the storefront treatment to be straight and without alcoves.

Page Cowley:

- The project team made strides to address many of the previous design concerns and the proposal has improved in certain areas. On a 200' long block, the best place for the building entrance is the middle of the block, as demonstrated on many new residential building projects in our district. This placement provides 24/7 surveillance over residents and tenants, especially when stores are closed.
- Given the varying height of the proposed street wall, there is a scale problem particularly at the uplifted corners.
- While not a text amendment requirement, other past projects have incorporated lighting at the perimeter of the building to light the pavement and or architectural features at the entrances. This would be beneficial, particularly at the residential entrance.
- Agreed with other committee members that clause (vii) applies and that this proposal over-accommodates the retail and under-appreciates the resident and pedestrian experience.

Louisa Craddock:

- Agrees that the retail should not be enhances to the detriment of the tenants.
- NORCs should be accommodated, as aging populations have not been taken into consideration in this proposal.
- The narrow corridors and moving the laundry to the basement are examples of not considering the changing neighborhood and tenant needs.
- The building should be setback, not all the way to the street line, to accommodate and generate street activity, cafes etc.
- Also agreed that shops and neighborhood services - -tailors, shoe repairers - - are needed not large retailers.

Peter Samton:

- Surprised at the way that the retail spaces and entrances were designed.
- Overall, the retail base needs to be redone and simplified. The raised corners create shadows and the alcoves uninviting spaces, and above the sloped areas at the terrace are unusable. At this site a straight street facade would provide more flexibility and retail options.
- The material palette is too much like a shopping mall, and the use of metal seems foreign to this part of our neighborhood.



- Retail in itself is great.

Ethel Sheffer:

- Use of metal panels at the terrace level and at the entire perimeter lack texture and are not an Upper West Side feature.
- Agrees that materials are reminiscent of shopping mall.
- Respect tenants' concerns regarding relocating the Laundry Room to the basement and other interior corridor changes.
- Respects the desire to create a roof deck structure and garden, but this proposal has too many unanswered questions regarding how it will work for the tenants and how it looks from the street.
- Recommends modification, as has been discussed by the committee.
- The street level could be made more workable and more harmonious for pedestrians and it would be easier to accomplish if we knew who the tenants would be and the type of store /service provider.
- Having witnessed changes in the exterior environment after 40+ years of Urban Renewal, this is the time to now respect needs of former anchor pioneers who now have needs associated with aging.
- Compliance with requirement Text Amendment no. (vii) is the driver for our comments and concerns.
- Would rather not vote against the proposal but believe it needs significant, substantive changes.
- As a follow up to the observations and comments, we should review the Text Amendment text itself and recommend clarification with the intent of balancing any proposed retail with needs and requirements of existing residential populations.

Brian Jenks:

- Generally agree with interior concerns.
- Moving the lobby westward, closer to Columbus, would solve some of the problems and provide surveillance of the elevators too.
- Would like to understand better why the Laundry Room calculation cannot be accommodated in the floor area when there are other increases to mail room areas and corridors.
- Would like to see the Laundry Room on the ground floor area, although it would diminish other residential areas.
- The Mechanical Room should be located elsewhere and not take up significant ground floor space.
- Not on board with other committee members critique of the facade and quite likes the exterior design for the following reasons:
  - While not consistent or contextual, does provides something different and interesting the in neighborhood.
  - There should be some flexibility in the retail options that have a new and stimulating design.
  - The proposed profile of the terrace could be interesting to pedestrians and likes the "wings" which do change the streetscape.

Jeannette Rausch:



- The introduction of retail space should be maximized in a way that does not constrain commercial growth and activity in our neighborhood.
- However, the applicant and the resulting design have failed to find right balance between retail interests and the residents as well as the cumulative and resulting impact at the street.
- Consideration for 92nd street, that already has a garage, and the addition of a trash deposit area as well, will significantly impact the streetscape and traffic congestion. The location of an existing garage is not sufficient reason to use that street for trash. The applicant should demonstrate the highest constriction of sidewalk before this goes forward. Further study /evaluation is recommended here.

Richard Asche: Summary Remarks

- While we want the applicant to take advantage of the opportunity to infill and activate the block, there are some substantial issues. Everyone, except Brian, is uncomfortable with the exterior, while we seem to have universal consensus of the issues regarding the interior spaces.
- Therefore, a two part vote was suggested as follows:
  - **Part A: The exterior design proposal** following the requirements of the Text Amendment requirement (vii).
  - **Part B: The interior of the project** wherein safeguarding tenant amenities and tenant protection will be listed.
  - The entire resolution can encourage the applicant to make further revisions as the project cannot reach the correct result if the only driver is to maximize the retail.

The following vote was taken with the understanding that the draft resolution will be circulated to all committee members and board members present prior to Tuesday morning.

Vote on Part A (finding not met):

Committee: 7-1-0-0. *Non-Committee Board Members:* 1-0-0-0.

Vote on Part B (finding not met): 1-0-0-0

Committee: 8-0-0-0. *Non-Committee Board Members:* 1-0-0-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Page Cowley, Co-Chair Land Use

**Present:** Richard Asche, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Sheldon J. Fine, Brian Jenks, Peter Samton, Roberta Semer, Ethel Sheffer and Jeanette Rausch. **Chair:** Elizabeth Caputo. **Board Members:** Mark Diller and Michele Parker. **Absent:** DeNora Getachew and Howard Yaruss.



**Business & Consumer Issues Committee Meeting Minutes  
Michele Parker and George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Co-Chairpersons  
September 9, 2015**

**Applications to the SLA for two year liquor licenses:**

1. **998 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 109th Street) Tannadice LLC, d/b/a To Be Determined. Presenting: James Dipasquali, atty; Michael Ferrie, [Michaeltferrie@gmail.com](mailto:Michaeltferrie@gmail.com). Applicant is opening a whiskey bar and currently owns a Scottish restaurant on UES. Committee member Brian Jenks did not see postings, but applicant brought a list. Hours of operation are consistent with the previous tenant's operation, i.e., 4p-4a weekdays; Sat/Sun. 11a-4p. Board requests modification of hours to Sun. 11a-2a; Mon-Wed, 4p-2a; Thurs 4a-3a; Fri. 4p-4a; Sat. 11a-4a. Applicants will re-post at least one week before meeting. **Committee Approves with change of hours and re-posting: 7-0-0-0**
2. **427 Amsterdam Avenue**, (80/81<sup>st</sup> Streets), Tai Kai Inc., d/b/a/ Momoya Upper West. Same operation for nine years, but applicant is adding new partners and is required to apply for a new license. **Committee Approves: 7-0-0-0**
3. **2636 Broadway** (West 100<sup>th</sup> Street), Spectrum Restaurants d/b/a Manhattan Valley. Applicant is a new owner acquiring the 20+-year restaurant. It will have a new menu and six delivery bicycles with in-restaurant storage. Applicant has agreed to vests with prominent signage. Hours of operation: 11a-3p; 5p-11p. **Committee Approves: 8-0-0-0**
4. **80 Riverside Drive** (West 80th Street) Cosmopolitan Broadcasting Corporation d/b/a Riverside Tower Hotel.56. Hotel currently has eight permanent residents and 120 guest rooms. It was renovated in 2013. Applicant wants to re-open an existing cafe space with 40 seats and 10 tables at grade level and additionally expand the café to the basement level space with 40 more chairs and 10 more tables. Presenting on behalf of the hotel owner: Martin Mehler, Attorney and restaurant manager Frances (Suzy) Wong, [suemeiwong@hotmail.com](mailto:suemeiwong@hotmail.com).  
**Public Speakers:** Neighbor Mason Haupt lives across from the hotel at 326 W. 80<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that he first found out about the application on Labor Day because the signage was inadequate and only posted on side of the building. He feels the restaurant will be noisy. Bill Deseta, 323 West 80<sup>th</sup> Street, has owned his brownstone for 45 years and said the current residents are SRO tenants, contradicting the Applicant's representation of the resident population. In addition, Mr. Deseta questioned the safety of the basement level café section because he maintained there are only two means of egress and both are at grade level. He also pointed out that the hotel caters to school age populations, which the staff has not been able to effectively manage and is disruptive to the neighborhood. His last point alleges that the hotel owner, who was not present at presentation, has a history of violating regulations. Another neighbor, Alex Bagley, 306 West 81<sup>st</sup> Street, asked if there would be an additional bar. His brother, David Bagley, also only saw the notice posted on Monday. Mitch Frank, 425 WEA, confirms the notice was posted in his building on Monday. His concerns focus on additional noise. They are on the first floor of the building and are concerned about additional noise. The Applicant said there would not be a sidewalk café nor open windows but did not present blueprints or a certified floorplan. George Z feels the committee needs additional information including architectural plans, copy of C of O and list of re-posted notices. The Committee will also find out distance from Calhoun School. **Committee Disapproves** application until Applicant returns to committee with requested information. **7-0-0-0**
5. **483 Columbus Avenue** (West 83rd Street) LVSS Inc., d/b/a Bellini. (Existing W/B, upgrade to full On-Premises.) Presenting: Virgo Lee; owner Steven Veksler. Applicant currently has a wine/beer license and is asking for change to full bar. Applicant submitted school proximity report. **Committee Approves. 9-0-0-0**
6. **229 Columbus Avenue (70/71)** Applicant did not show. **Committee Disapproves without Prejudice, 8-0-0-0.**

**Unenclosed Sidewalk Café Applications**

7. **359 Columbus Avenue** (77<sup>th</sup> Street) Renewal application #0954373-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs, d/b/a/ Isabella's, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 28 tables and 74 seats. Owned by Starwood and applying to change awning color to B&W, working with LPC. **Committee Approves: 9-0-0-0.**

8. **467 Columbus Avenue** (82/83<sup>rd</sup> Streets), Renewal application #1384273-DCA by Canteen 82, Inc. for a four year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 9 tables and 18 seats. Presenting Corinna Lee, [CorinnaKing@gmail.com](mailto:CorinnaKing@gmail.com). **Committee Approves: 9-0-0-0**

**Enclosed Café Renewal Applications:**

9. **269 Columbus Avenue** (West 72nd – 73rd Streets) Renewal application #1392078DCA /ULURP #N150429ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 72nd & Columbus Restaurant, LLC d/b/a AG Kitchen for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 16 tables and 34 seats. Applicant did not attend. **Committee Disapproves without Prejudice. 8-0-0-0**

10. **366 Columbus Avenue** (West 77th Street.) Renewal application ULURP# N120250ECM/ DCA# 1282506 to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Shake Shack 366 Columbus, LLC, d/b/a Shake Shack, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 12 tables and 34 seats. Presenting on behalf of applicant: Area Director Amanda Kale; Jason Daniels, GM; Dustin Dykstra, GM UWS. Committee discussed existing problems and how to ameliorate them. Applicant says they are aware of the complaints. Regarding the garbage issues on 77<sup>th</sup> Street, they are adding two Big Belly Solar Waste cans to the park side of Columbus Avenue, which were previously approved by DEP and Friends of Museum Park. In addition, they will assign staff to pick up refuse along the corridor between 77<sup>th</sup> Street between Columbus & CPW and supplement Parks Dept. trash pick-up after 2 p.m., seven days/week. Regarding problems with the overflow of patrons and sidewalk congestion, the Applicant has requested the approval of stanchions with crowd control directed by on-site during its busiest periods, especially on weekends. **Committee requests quarterly updates for next 12 months** and applicant has agreed. Community member Joseph Volanos, President of 78<sup>th</sup> Street Block Association and a former security company executive who has worked with restaurants, presented, as well. He pointed out that although this may work in good weather, during the winter months the snow will impede the efforts of the Applicant. He feels the issue of congestion is exacerbated by Shake Shack's existing design. He added that the kitchen currently takes up 65% of the space. He suggests that Shake Shack close for a month and re-design the restaurant. Barbara Adler, Executive Director of the Columbus Avenue BID, says that Shake Shack is a generous member of the community that provides reasonably priced food and is "a meet-and-greet" destination. She says the biggest problem is on Sunday with the convergence of Green Market/Flea Market visitors, museum visitors and Shake Shack patrons. Michael Broomfield, co-founder of Friends of Roosevelt Park, confirmed that his organization approved the Big Belly waste cans and commended the Applicant's responsiveness. He added that Shake Shack has done more than what they were legally required to do. **Committee Approves** with the following stipulations: applicant will come to committee meeting quarterly for one year; applicant will use stanchions; applicant will have "ambassadors" monitoring traffic flow daily, but especially on weekends; applicant will remove exterior benches and flower pot: **8-0-0-0**

11. **2290 Broadway** (West 83rd 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. Barry Orenstein, Appears to already have been approved by the Full Board in June, however, in case, approved again by the committee. **Committee Approves: 8-0-0-0**

**New Unenclosed Sidewalk Café Application:**

464 Amsterdam Avenue (82/83 Streets) New application #11552-2015 ASWC to DCA by SEVA, LLC d/b/a Hampton Chutney Company, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 6 table and 22 seats. Presenting Isabel MacGurn, Owner. **Committee Approves with the stipulation that applicant submits stamped copy of DCA submission to Board office by September 16, 2015. 8-0-0-0**

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

12. **320 Columbus Avenue** (West 75th Street.) New/change of ownership application #5143-2015-ASWC /ULURP #N150414ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Shreeji Swami Restaurant, Inc. d/b/a Saffron Indian Cuisine for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 10 tables and 26 seats. George Z-C confirmed postings. **Committee Approves. 8-0-0-0.**

**13. 187 Columbus Avenue** (68/69 St) New application 11625-2015 ASWC to DCA to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 6 tables and 10 seats. Applicant did not attend. **Committee Disapproves without Prejudice. 8-0-0-0.**

**Present:** George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Michele Parker, Linda Alexander, Christian Cordova, Paul Fischer, Matthew Holtzman, Brian Jenks, Christopher Riano and Suzanne Robotti. **On-Leave:** Marc Glazer & Anne Raphael.



**Preservation Committee Meeting Minutes  
Jay Adolf and Gabrielle Palitz, Co-Chairpersons  
September 10, 2015**

The following topics were discussed and actions taken:

**44 West 77<sup>th</sup> Street, Apt 13D (Columbus-CPW).** Application to LPC to replace windows.

*Presentation by Alexander Neratoff, architect.*

- Original condition had replete Gothic detail; much has been lost.
- Project is for window replacement:
  - east-facing courtyard – visible only from the interior of the courtyard.
  - south-facing rear windows – visible from bus stop on Columbus Avenue.

Rear (South façade) windows:

- All windows replaced in the 1980s with cheap aluminum double-hung windows.
- Subsequently, many were replaced with single-pane windows, some of which retained the original separation between a wider main bay and narrower side panel windows.
- Windows on the south façade are currently a hodge-podge – no pattern of color, configuration or arrangement.
- Project proposes windows that are consistent with the dimensions of the existing conditions.
- Unlikely that any future restoration would replicate original double-hung windows (although there are no historic photos available to show the fenestration on the south façade).
- Proposal is to replace the existing condition with Skyline aluminum windows, light bronze (original) color.
- Casements tilt-and-turn or inward angling casements.
- Mullions a little thicker than those of the floor above.
- A/C through the wall sleeves being removed and replaced with new metal panels – color would be red brick (Benjamin Moore Garrison Red).
  - Too expensive and cumbersome to build a scaffold to infill with brick.

Courtyard windows:

- Existing condition consists of inoperable double-hung windows in poor condition (rotted frames, counterweights missing etc.).
- Dining room windows are double-hung with 9-square grid above and with diamond-patterned muntins below – group of 4.
- Den windows have ornate muntins reminiscent of leaded glass.
- Received offers from other residents to re-use the divided light glass windows proposed to be removed.
- Unclear whether these windows were original since at least the sashes were relatively new.
- Proposal is to replace with new windows in a 1:1 double-hung configuration; color to be painted black. The windows would have two narrow windows flanking a wider central window.
- Client choice not to re-use the existing glass and lead patterns.
- Existing condition on top floor (one level above) and two floors below retain the consistent arrangement with leaded glass and related detail.



- Difficult to assess the entire courtyard façade because it would only be visible from apartments within the courtyard, and the sightlines in the narrow courtyard make only a few floors’ windows visible at a time.
- Correction to drawing – west kitchen window depicted as casement will be 1:1 double-hung because of complications with interior walls.

Community Comment – [none]

Committee Comment:

Gabby:

- No issue with replacing the south-facing windows with the proposed arrangement.
- Believes strongly that the courtyard windows with their unusual details should be retained.
- No compelling argument to replace the configuration.
- These are special windows, referred to full LPC for a good reason.

Louisa:

- Courtyard: Should be possible to replicate or re-use.
- Removal of the special windows would create a gash in a consistent pattern from the exterior.
- South: appears that arrangement is emulating different portions of the floors below.

Mark and Jay:

- Agree with Gabby.
- Ordinarily would allow courtyard window replace, but these are special windows worthy of retention.

Resolution to approve the replacement of the south-facing windows and disapprove the courtyard windows unless the special windows are retained or replicated. **Vote: 4-0-0-0**

**41 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street (Columbus-CPW).** Application to refurbish the front façade, add a rooftop addition and change fenestration of the rear yard extension.

*Presentation by James Ramsey, designer; Space is architect of record.*

- One of a group of seven rowhouses built in a group in 1893 in neo-Grecian style.
- Most in the group have experienced renovations.
- Most in the grouping have very large L-extensions in the rear.
- Proposal includes:
  - Altering openings in rear
  - Adding a rooftop addition
  - Refurbishing the front façade with new paint colors.

Rooftop addition:

- Addition would match in height and setback the smaller of the rooftop additions on the two flanking neighbors.
- Materials: aluminum-framed glass and salvaged brick.
- Not visible from any public way.
- Mock-up in place when committee did site visits.
- A/C mechanicals on the roof of the addition – also not visible.

Rear Yard/Rear Façade:



- Proposal includes a new large opening in the west face of the L extension; a large single-pane window at the rear (north face) of the basement level and infill the small windows on the parlor and second floors of the L addition.
- L extension extends to about 8' from the rear lot line.
- Proposing very large picture windows in a column on the east side of the third and fourth floors of the main structure and in the rear of the rooftop addition (which is set back 2' per DoB – no balcony at that level).
- Picture windows are dark grey aluminum. Large square-ish single-pane window with a narrow single-pane to the east.
- Large three-panel window units on the west face of the L extension – all three slide. Infills replace a smattering of punched openings. Opens onto the west sliver of the lot (appx 6' between windows and west edge/wall). Also a small window on the floor above the large openings.
- The L extension to the building to the west includes east-facing windows.
- Roof of L extension includes a half-length skylight and a second bay with a skylight and a garden below.
- West punched windows will remain (with new aluminum windows within) – retaining the stone lintels.
- Tall narrow window at ground floor on the west in line – not an operable door.
- To the west of the large picture windows on the upper floors of the rear façade, the proposal is to retain the existing punched windows in a column, including retaining their existing stone lintels.

#### Front façade:

- Intention to spruce it up.
- Proposal to lighten the color of the front façade – painting it a bright white.
- New windows – wood, 1:1, painted white to match the proposed façade.
- Building to the east is a slightly greyer white; building to the west is a more traditional brownstone color that may be original.
- Proposal to replace grey concrete pavers in the areaway with dark staggered blue slate tile.
- Similar treatment to neighbor, but without the Japanese maple.
- Steps – replacing existing brownstone risers and steps with grey cement. Matching the neighbor across the way.

Community Discussion – [none]

Committee Discussion:

#### Front Façade:

Jay:

- Not crazy about the existing yellow color of the front façade, but would like to see a greyer color that blends closer to the neighbor to the east.
- Step color would be appropriate if the façade color matched the neighbor.

Peter:

- Original façade color was brownstone. Should bring back the original brownstone.  
-- original brownstone would be a better option both because paint wears quickly and would be easier to maintain and is appropriate to the row.
- Prefer windows have a darker finish.



- Proximity to New-York Historical Society suggests that if a color were used, better to approximate the limestone color.
- Should keep brownstone color on the steps.

Mark:

- Concern about the white paint on the windows, but more of a design choice than an appropriateness issue given precedents on the block.
- If façade color changed, can accept the grey steps.

Louisa:

- OK with the steps provided that they match the courtyard tile.

Gabby:

- Only reason to accept the white color is that the building next door uses it (the applicant's reference to a white façade across the street is irrelevant).
- Color must be integral to the façade, not just applied to the exterior.
- With the color change from bright white to a greyer white to match the neighbor to the east - can approve.

Resolution: Approve subject to color modification to approximate the color of the neighbor to the east (architect agreed). *Vote: 5-0-0-0.*

Rooftop Addition:

Gabby:

- Reasonably appropriate.

Mark:

- Front of rooftop is asymmetric, but acceptable given precedents and neighbors.

Peter:

- Relationship of rear fenestration on rooftop to the floor below - concern about the continuation of the large glass plates ignores any relationship with the buildings to the east and west.
- Need to discuss the roof and rear façade together.

Rear Façade:

Peter:

- If kept the individual punched windows at either the rooftop or fourth floors, would integrate better with the neighboring buildings.
- Setback of the rooftop argues for retaining punched windows at one level or another.
- Recommends planting that hangs over the top on the rear façade of the L extension, especially if it could hang over both to the north and the west sides of the L extension -- would help the relationship with the neighbors by breaking up what would otherwise be a monolithic brick wall with no fenestration (and which is much closer to the northern neighbors because of the grandfathered intrusion into the required rear yard).

Gabby:

- CB7 consistently maintains that the top floor should have punched windows to retain the relationship with neighbors in the row.



- The proposal includes a header line for the top of the proposed picture windows that has no relation to the top of the lintels of the retained existing punched windows to the west.
- Losing the consistent header line argues even stronger for punched windows at the fourth floor.
- Design in general disrespects the grouping.
- Need punched openings on the fourth floor.
- Rear of roof – need not have lintel on the newly created wall.
- Should have the top line of the large panes line up with the lintel above the existing punched openings on the west.
- Concern that there will be no fenestration on the upper floors of the rear face of the L extension. Neighbors in the donut will be looking at a monolithic blank wall.
- Need to work with the vocabulary of existing neighbors.
- East face of L extension is out of place.

Louisa:

- Interesting design.

Mark:

- Wondering if adherence to the punched windows is essential here.
- Concern about breaking the precedent that consistently seeks retention of punched windows.
- In this unique case, the proposal retains punched windows in a vertical column rather than a horizontal row. The usual concern for retaining existing punched windows is to create a relationship with the historic main façade of the buildings to either side; here that worthy design precept is honored by retaining the vertical column of punched windows rather than the more typical horizontal.
- If required punched windows at the fourth floor, it would disturb the entirety of a respectful and innovative design, and would require significant changes to the rooftop rear façade as well. Otherwise would be anomalous.
- Also should require a green wall on the north face of the L extension. Not just a good idea – should mandate it out of deference to the neighbors.

Jay:

- Punched windows would interrupt the integrity of a good design.

Gabby:

- Large window units should align with the top line of the lintels.
- Should make a big statement across the full width, not only on two-thirds of the rear façade.
- Design feels unresolved.
- If accept the rationale, then columns need to relate to one another.
- If headers on large windows aligned with the lintels, then could accept the rear façade as appropriate.

Resolution A: Disapprove rear façade unless third and fourth floor large window header heights are aligned with the existing punched windows to the west, and with a strong recommendation that there be hanging plantings or a green wall installed on the rear (north) and side (west) facades of the retained L façade. **Vote: 3-2-0-0.**

Resolution B: to approve the rooftop addition. **Vote: 5-0-0-0.**

Adjourn: 8:30 pm



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



**Parks and Environment Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Klari Neuwelt, Chairperson**  
**September 21, 2015**

Klari Neuwelt, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00.

**1. Discussion of DPR new request for proposals for the operation and maintenance of bike rental stations in Central Park, Riverside Park and other locations.**

Alex Han and Eric Weiss (Project Manager) of the DPR Revenue Division discussed the new RFP to be issued. Bike & Roll has had the current concession for six years, and it will be expiring. DPR seeks CB7 input on new RFP to be issued soon.

Discussion:

- Problem of illegal bicycle rental vendors, particularly near Columbus Circle. Aside from being illegal, they do not give customers adequate instruction, the signs that they carry to attract customers can be dangerous, and their customers ride on pedestrian paths in Central Park. Enforcement regarding the illegal vendors is by PEP officers within Central Park, and by local police precincts outside of the park. There has been an improvement in the last year.

- Bike & Roll provides helmets (optional for adults over age 14) and maps and instruction about riding in the park to its customers. Adults may take a helmet or sign a waiver.

- The current Loeb Boathouse Restaurant concession has included a bicycle rental component, but that will be eliminated in the new RFP for that concession that was just issued.

- Payment to NYC is based on a percentage of gross revenues, as against an annual minimum. In 2014-2015, the payment to NYC was \$194,000. It was \$145,000 in the prior year.

- Rentals under the current concession are at two locations (Columbus Circle and Tavern on the Green) in Central Park year-round except in January and February, and are at other locations, including Riverside Park (South), near West 70<sup>th</sup> Street, from May to September.

- The concessionaire is required to provide an "incident report" concerning injuries.

- It appears that the Citibike program, even with its current expansion to the Upper East and Upper West Sides, has little impact on the bicycle rental concession, because they serve different clienteles. DPR does not know which potential vendors may respond to the new RFP, but it does not anticipate that the Citibike program will have a substantial impact.

- Committee and community suggestions:

- A "GPS" app or similar to be provided by the concessionaire to customers that includes maps and other information, particularly about Central Park.

- A possible additional rental site at the north end of Central Park, if demand would support it.

**2. Presentation of preliminary design for Phase 2 of the restoration of the West 69<sup>th</sup> Street Transfer Bridge, in the Hudson River off of West 69<sup>th</sup> Street.**

Karen Bausner (architect), of Karen Bausman & Associates, consultant to DPR, presented, along with Adrienne Hamilton, DPR Capital, Manhattan.

Discussion:



- The Transfer Bridge (sometimes referred to as the “Gantry”) opened in 1911, when the area that is now Riverside South was an active freight railway yard. The Transfer Bridge permitted cargo, in box cars, to be transferred from barges that carried them across the Hudson River.

- Phase 1 of the restoration, completed in 2012, stabilized the structure and raised it on a concrete substructure by several feet. There was no significant damage in Superstorm Sandy.

- Phase 2 will involve primarily the restoration of north and south gantry towers, the control cabin and the machinery house, including new roofing, cladding, windows, etc. in historically appropriate colors and new LED lighting. It will also include interpretative signage at the onshore lookout area opposite the structure.

- The preliminary design will be presented to Public Design Commission on October 5. (That is prior to the CB7 October Full Board meeting, so DPR will use the P+E Committee “action” (resolution not yet voted on by the Full Board) at PDC pending the Full Board resolution.)

- The Transfer Station will not be connected to land in Phase 2. Phase 3 will involve connecting it to land, so that park users can access it for programs, etc. (It is not anticipated that the public will be able to access the towers.) As of now, DPR does not know the cost of Phase 3, nor have funds for it.

- Phase 2 cost, including professional fees, etc., is \$4,034,000, of which \$2.8M is from federal funds, \$786,000 from Mayoral funds and \$448,000 from the responsible Developer of Riverside South, Extell.

- Construction of Phase 2 will start in 2017-2018 at the earliest. Because the federal funds are administered through NYS DOT, there is a complicated and time-consuming process.

Committee and community suggestions:

- Want to see the final design at P+E Committee meeting in the future, including the proposed interpretative signage.

- Currently park users do not know what the Transfer Bridge is. Request temporary interpretative signage opposite the Transfer Station.

- Allusions to industrial history of Riverside Park South further to the south in the park are also without explanation. Request interpretative signage there.

- More than \$6M will have gone into Phase 1 and Phase 2 without ability of the public to access the Transfer Station. Urge DPR to obtain funds for, and construct, Phase 3, so that park users will have access.

Resolution to approve preliminary design:

Committee members; 5-0-0-0

Non-Committee Board Members: 0-0-0-0

### 3. **Brief Discussion With Tawanda Harmon, Manager at Gertrude Ederle Recreation Center.**

Discussion of new programs at Rec Center, as well as general operations and schedule for construction of park area at exterior.

### 4. **CB7 Budget Priorities.**

The Committee discussed the CB7 budget priority process, including scheduling issues with regard to the CB7 FY1017 budget priorities.

The meeting was adjourned at about 9:30 p.m.

**Present:** Klari Neuwelt, Steven Brown, Ken Coughlin, Meisha Hunter Burkett and Christopher Riano.

**Absent:** David Sasscer.



**Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Andrew Albert and Dan Zweig, Co-Chairpersons**  
**September 24, 2015**  
**Fordham University, South Lounge**

**West 95<sup>th</sup> - 96<sup>th</sup>** (Broadway.) Request by Symphony Space to extend the parking time limit on the east and west sides of Broadway from West 94<sup>th</sup> to 96<sup>th</sup> Streets from 1 hour to 2 or 3 hours.

Presenting: Edward Budz, Director of Theater Operations. Committee and Community offered suggestions. Committee chairs suggested that Symphony Space arrange for spaces with the eight surrounding parking garages. Mark Diller suggested a “pilot” program. Su Robotti suggested a graduated rate meter that changes over at 6 p.m. or 7 p.m. It was unclear with what success Symphony would benefit from several possible choices of meter regulation change. There were also questions for DOT regarding what was possible to do in making changes to meter regulations at this location.

Committee will review the request, contact DOT for answers to questions, and invite applicant back in November to review possible meter changes for the local area.

**Newsstand, N/W/C Columbus Avenue & West 92<sup>nd</sup> Street** (IFO 660 Columbus Avenue.) Application #10682-2015-ANWS to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Kanwarjit Gyani to construct and operate a newsstand on the northwest corner of Columbus Avenue and West 92<sup>nd</sup> Street, in front of 660 Columbus Avenue. Applicant not present for third time. **Committee Disapproves Application:** 8-0-0-0; Non Committee members: 2-0-0-0.

**159-161 West 85<sup>th</sup> Street** (Amsterdam Avenue – Columbus Avenue.) Application EIN #46-3662556 to the Department of Transportation by IUC 159 West 85<sup>th</sup> Street, LLC for a new revocable consent to construct, maintain and use steps and planted areas on the north sidewalk of West 85<sup>th</sup> Street, east of Amsterdam Avenue. Presented by owners’ representatives, Dan Cohen and Eric Lang, Grand Projects Architects.

**Committee Approves Application:** 8-0-0-0; **Committee Approves Application:** 2-0-0-0

**130 West 87<sup>th</sup> Street** (Columbus Avenue – Amsterdam Avenue.) Application EIN # 54-2070479 to the Department of Transportation by Y&A Realty, LLC for a new revocable consent to construct, maintain and use a stoop, steps, and fenced-in area. Applicant not present. **Committee Disapproves Application:** 8-0-0-0; **Non-Committee Members Disapprove application:** 2-0-0-0

CitiBike and Vehicular Enforcement. With the advent of Citibike on the West Side and the expected increase in

cycling traffic, there had been two primary areas of concern noted at earlier meetings; infrastructure and enforcement. Lacking prior time for discussion, a draft proposal was distributed to the committee at the prior meeting. Dan Zweig thanked those on the committee who had responded with comments. As Howard had noted in comments, the draft proposal was vague in expressing what actions were being requested. Howard had also expressed that the police were professionals and that we should ask for what we want and let them figure out the best way to do their job. Dan presented a list of traffic violations of laws related to safety in three target groups: Motorists, Bicyclists, and Pedestrians. The goal for this meeting was to complete a list of safety and quality of life related laws. How to ask for enforcement of these items would be left for a later discussion. Suggested items to be added to the list were: honking, idling, feeding the meter and prohibition of motorized bicycles. **Discussion was held over for a subsequent meeting. It was agreed that NYPD and D.O.T. be invited. The items on the committee list are shown following:**



**Request to NYPD for Increased enforcement -**

**Motor Vehicles**

**Moving -**

- Failure to yield
- Speeding
- Disobey red signal
- Using a cell phone – not hands free -
- Texting
- Driving wrong way on street
- Driving on sidewalk
- Backing around corner
- Honking

**Parking –**

- Double parking – NYPD and DOT
- Parking in No Standing Zones
- Meter time limits – no feeding the meter
- Idling

**Bicycles**

**Moving -**

- Failure to yield
- Speeding
- Disobey red signal
- Using a cell phone – not hands free – or with two ear buds in place
- Texting
- Driving wrong way on street
- Driving on sidewalk
- Driving without a warning device - horn or bell
- Driving at night without lights
- Driving outside the bicycle lane where a bicycle lane is available
- Prohibition of motorized bicycles

**Pedestrians**

**Moving -**

- Failure to obey red signal
- Failure to cross in available crosswalk

MTA Capital Program. Co-Chair Andrew Albert presented an overview of the program and outlined the current \$2.5 billion gap and \$11.5 billion gap over the next five years. Eighty percent of the MTA’s assets are in NYC. He suggested that New Yorkers should be on the record to ask our elected officials to request the money. He emphasized the urgency. Mark Diller suggested there be a tax increase to help fund the Capita Plan. **Committee Approves a Resolution: 8-0-0-0; 1-0-0-0**

**Resolution - MTA Capital Program**

Whereas the MTA Capital Program is vital to the City & Region and provides important resources to keep our transit & commuter rail system in good shape & able to expand and meet the needs of over 12 million riders a year, and  
 Whereas at this point, there is still no agreement between the State, City, & MTA over the exact amount



that will comprise the next five-year Capital Plan, representing the longest the MTA has gone without a verified Capital Program, and

Whereas this lack of agreement presents the MTA with many dilemmas, including where cuts will have to be made in the Capital Program, which could include Phase 2 of the Second Avenue subway, Countdown clocks for the "B" division, new car purchases, the East Side access plan, station renovations, Communications-based-train-control to relieve overcrowding, & more,

Therefore be it resolved that Manhattan Community Board #7 demands that the City & the State of New York move quickly to make the MTA's entire Capital Program fully-funded, so that all of the aforementioned programs and the vital upkeep of our transit system may proceed without further delay.

New Hudson Rail Tunnel. **Committee Approves a Resolution:** 8-0-0-0; 1-0-0-0  
**Resolution - New Hudson River Tunnels**

Whereas the existing rail tunnels under the Hudson River that serve both New Jersey Transit & Amtrak trains are over 105 years old, and in dire need of repair, and

Whereas one breakdown of a train causes backups and massive delays all up and down the Northeast Corridor, and even affects the Long Island Rail Road, and

Whereas the first plan to address a new tunnel (Access to the Region's Core) had many problems leading to its demise, and

Whereas Hurricane Sandy did additional damage to the tunnels, making repairs even more imperative, and

Whereas Governors Christie and Cuomo agree on the necessity of new rail tunnels under the Hudson River,

Therefore be it resolved that Manhattan Community Board #7 calls on officials of both States, as well as the Federal Government, to immediately come up with a viable plan to fund the construction of new Hudson River Rail Tunnels to serve the all-important Northeast Corridor rail line. Failure to do so will likely result in a devastating blow to the economies of not only the two states, but the entire U.S. economy.

R179 contract delay (C line cars). Discussion about a possible three-year delay on new cars. Andrew Albert suggested a resolution to look to the second highest bidder capable of replacing R32 cars. Dan Zweig suggested we ask our Assembly members get information from MTA to expedite the process and find out the reasons behind the delay. **Committee Approves Resolution:** 7-0-0-0; 1-0-0-0

**Resolution - R179 contract**

Whereas Bombardier was the winning bidder of the R-179 contract, which will replace the R-32 (oldest cars in the entire MTA system) & R-42 cars, and

Whereas C train riders (R-32) in Manhattan and Brooklyn have long been suffering with numerous breakdowns, poor service, poor air conditioning, and jerky starts for many years, and

Whereas it has been reported that there will be a delay in delivery of the new R-179 cars, resulting in delays of at least two extra years in delivery of the new cars, and

Whereas new R-160 cars are placed on the C line during the summers due to the older car's lack of reliable air conditioning on an all-underground line such as the C,

Therefore be it resolved that Manhattan Community Board #7 asks the MTA to demand a better delivery schedule from Bombardier regarding the R-179 car, and if not feasible, to review the offer of the second-highest bidder, Kawasaki, to ascertain when they would be able to deliver the R-179 subway cars.



Jason Whittet, [Jason.whittet@ge.com](mailto:Jason.whittet@ge.com) community member, presented options for streetlight improvements available from G.E. which will offer cost savings and offer opportunities to improve pedestrian-safety. Mr. Whittet works at General Electric. Recommended LED lights with refractor, sensors and computers with “image stitching” capacity that will be capable of recording events (such as accidents). They will also be capable of making counts of various kinds of activity on the street. He demonstrated camera technology. The products are energy efficient and will save the city approximately 75% to operate. There are approximately 50K street lights in Manhattan. GE is proposing a pilot program to D.O.T.

Pedal-assist and e-bicycle legislation sponsor, Sen. Dilan. Committee member Su Robotti emphasized her positive experience with the pedal assist bicycles in Denmark. Currently, pedal assist bicycles are regarded as Class C motorcycles and require licenses. Committee will seek to obtain more information about pedal assist and electronic bicycles. Ken Coughlin was contacted by an 80-year-old man who was upset because he could not get insurance for an electronic bicycle.

Committee’s priorities for the FY17 NYC budget. Committee agrees to invite elected officials to November meeting. Ken Coughlin would like to add curb extensions. Mark Diller suggested that group review the original locations for the countdown timers. Andrew Albert suggested we include the new LED street lights in our priorities. The Committee will continue to review for another month.

New business. Susan Crawford, committee member, addressed the street re-design on 110<sup>th</sup> Street. She believes that it has not been improved, but rather has become less efficient since the lane widths have been reduced. She added that she was concerned that if a bicycle lane were installed on Amsterdam Avenue, it would have a deleterious impact on traffic flow and feels that is what has already happened on Columbus Avenue. Another community member, Ira Gershon, inquired on the status of the bike docks on 104<sup>th</sup> and Riverside Drive. Co-chairs said that no determination has been made yet.

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