



COMMUNITY BOARD 7/MANHATTAN
Minutes of Full Board Meeting

Community Board 7/Manhattan's Full Board met on Wednesday, November 04, 2015, at Mount Sinai Roosevelt Hospital, in the District. Chair Elizabeth R. Caputo called the meeting to order at 6:40 pm after the Secretary confirmed the existence of a quorum.

Minutes from previous full board meeting were **approved**: 31-0-3.

Chair's Report: Elizabeth R. Caputo

The Chair congratulated the former Executive Committee members, including Brian Jenks and Sue Robotti, and then welcomed new members of the Executive Committee Audrey Isaacs, Christopher Riano, and Jerry Cordova. She also welcomed the new Chairs of the Communications Committee, Linda Alexander and Su Robotti. The Communications Committee plans to help everyone work on outreach and education on behalf of CB7's hard work.

The Chair continued and thanked BCI for their recent B2B event, which was successful and well attended. The Chair wanted to thank the Chairs and the entire committee for their hard work.

Business Session

Land Use Committee, Richard Ashe and Page Cowley, Co-Chairpersons
Joint with Housing Committee, Nick Prigo, Chairperson

1. **Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA)** text amendment.
2. **Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH)** text amendment.

Richard Ashe was called to speak first, on behalf of the Land Use Committee. He asked those community members in attendance to speak.

Batya Lewton noted that this proposal is nothing but a giveaway to developers and has nothing to do with affordable housing.

Alexander Medwedew noted that he is in favor of the creation of mandatory inclusionary housing, and that we need new zoning laws in NYC. He argued that we must focus on affordable building, and that we must "not keep New York in a time warp." He compared NYC to many other cities in NJ.

The Land Use Committee then turned first to MIH. The Committee noted that there is currently no place in the city that actually is designated for MIH, but that the proposal is attempting to provide for additional mandatory affordable housing. The Committee also wants the percentage of offsite housing to be more than what would be mandated in onsite housing. The Committee outlined the majority of their concerns in their attached text amendment.

There was a question about the specific effects this would have within the district.

There was a question about ZQA being passed and, even if CB7 were not up zoned, how this change would impact the height of buildings via-a-vis the height and bulk of a building. An Amendment was proposed and seconded, but after debate was withdrawn. Debate continued regarding the durability of mandatory housing, as well as possible abuse of the system.



The Question was called.

*The Resolution to disapprove the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) text amendment, unless changes outlined in the resolution are made, was **ADOPTED**: 35-0-0-0.*

The Land Use Committee moved on to presenting on ZQA. There was discussion about a few minor items included in the attached details, including an increase in FAR for Senior Housing as well as additional details found within the attached text amendment.

Debate ensued, including issues about the permanence of the availability of senior housing and affordable housing.

An Amendment was proposed, to ensure that Senior Housing would be permanent under the ZQA, if not instead 50 years and not 30 years. It was accepted as a friendly Amendment.

A 2nd Amendment was proposed, to move lot coverage back to 80% instead of the noted 100% in the text amendment. It was seconded.

There was debate, and it was noted that the reason for ULURP was to allow for a review of said questions of possible variances. There was support and dissent regarding the amendment.

The Question was called on the Amendment.

*The Amendment was **ADOPTED**: 22 – 4 – 8 – 0.*

A 3rd Amendment was proposed, to change some ceiling heights in senior housing from 8 feet to 7 ½ feet. It was seconded.

*, the Amendment was **NOT ADOPTED**: 2 – 29 – 3 – 0*

The Question was called on the Resolution as Amended.

*The Resolution to disapprove the Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA) text amendment, unless changes outlined in the resolution are made, was **ADOPTED**: 33 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Community Session

Steve Harris – Resident of The Ansonia - argued that a Task Force be established in regards to Street Vendors, especially since they may raise the number of available permits.

Jennifer Zarr – New York Public Library – She noted that they have been able to add additional staff because of the increased budget. There will be a program at the St. Agnes branch, and on Dec. 1st there will be increased hours because of the increased budget.

Olive Freud – Committee for Environmentally Sound Development – She noted that, in regards to new zoning laws, there is nothing being done about “super-tall” buildings that will throw shadows onto the park. She strongly believes that these buildings are inappropriate, and there will be a march at Columbus Circle this Sunday at 10:30AM. She asked that everyone bring a black umbrella to symbolize shadows in the parks.



Lourdes Camacho – She noted that people who suffer from epilepsy should be watched prior to receiving a driver's license, especially given the deaths over the Halloween weekend.

Sheldon Fine – He noted a question about transparency, especially on parks and housing. He wanted to mention that new details are going to be public on the website, which he is very pleased about!

Alan Flacks – He spoke about Richard Godfrey, and wanted to note that the public should be allowed to speak for longer periods of time without the current limits. He also wanted to note that no one has heard from the NYC Fire Department regarding bike lanes and wants them to come to the next Transportation Committee meeting.

Manhattan Borough President's Report, Gale Brewer

MBP Gale Brewer wanted to bring attention to a public hearing at the Borough President level on MIH and ZQA. She also quickly noted that Bennerson Playground will finally be renovated, which is a big deal! She noted that there is a new Constituent Liaison in the office.

On Pay Phones, MBP Brewer wants to note that they are going to become very different in the city and location for the new phones is still under conversation, with Community Board involvement.

In less than two weeks Community Board applications will be up online, which will be due in January.

The NY Times is doing a story on the AMNH, noting that very little of the park will be taken for the new renovations about which MBP Brewer is pleased.

MBP Brewer noted that CB10 is having a Harlem LGBTQ Town Hall and she is very proud of them.

MBP Brewer is pushing LPC to move their backlog (with hearings forthcoming), and she wanted to offer congrats on the Appointment of Matthew Washington as DMBP.

Reports by Elected Officials:

Helen Rosenthal, City Council Member, 6th District

CM Rosenthal wanted to congratulate the new Executive Board members, and to thank the committees that discussed the MIH and ZQA texts that were before the Board. CM will work very hard to make some of the changes passed by CB7.

CM mentioned the AMNH, the new design is now up and is being reported on by the NYT. CM is pleased that it takes into account her concerns, and now there is minimal parkland that will be used (80% will be in current museum space). CM believes they worked very hard on the issue, and thanked AMNH for their new additions to the park in the plan as well as their tribute to the advancement of science. CM believes an open meeting will be happening very shortly, and she is very pleased they are having a single meeting for the entire community where CM will be in attendance.

C-M Mark Levine

CM Mark Levine discussed "Intro 214" and the right to counsel in housing court. CM wanted to strongly advocate in support of the bill. This is very important and he was strongly hoping for a "YES" vote.

CM wanted to note that \$6 million dollars was secured for the Bloomingdale Playground, which he was quite pleased about especially regarding accessible playgrounds.



CM is working on a bill regarding texting with 911, especially for domestic violence victims.

CM discussed 54A, which passed today. He noted the importance of equity within the parks system around the city. This will be the first time the Parks Department will now have to post online how they allocate resources on a “park-by-park” basis.

Reports by Elected Officials’ Representatives:

Cheirca DuBois, C-M Corey Johnson’s Office

Wanted to bring attention to a Town Hall on November 18th, at 7PM with a Community Resource fair starting at 5:30PM.

Gus Ipsen, A-M Linda Rosenthal’s Office

He wanted to note that AM wants to encourage a discussion with current residents regarding bike racks moved during the CitiBike installation. On Monday AM Rosenthal will be holding a town hall to update people on her work. Finally, AM is very pleased that her CARE Act was signed into law.

Liznel Aybar, A-M Daniel O’Donnell’s Office

Wanted to bring attention to October, which is National Bullying Prevention Month, and to note additional highlights within the monthly newsletter.

Brice Peyre, A-M Richard Gottfried’s Office

Noted that work of the office is the cover story on the Village Voice this month. In addition, AM is also looking at explosion of illegal hotels, and is focused on legislation to change the law.

Tara Klein, State Senator Brad Hoylman’s Office

Asked the Board to please note the office report, with highlights on environmental work and climate change.

David Baily, State Senator Adriano Espaillat’s Office

SS Espaillat is currently taking a close look at liquor license issues, especially in Inwood. SS is also putting a focus on the question of building height.

Farhana Hassan, State Senator Jose Serrano’s Office

Offsite constituent hours will include MFY on November 25th, for free legal services on housing.

Lindy Wisotsky, Congressman Jerrold Nadler’s Office

Rep. Nadler was named to the Women’s Health & Rights Committee.

Dan Campanelli, NYC Comptroller’s Office

Noted a report from his office focused on the “Making the Grade,” noting NYC went from a D to a D+ this year. He also wanted to note a focus on building crowding within NYC.

Business Session continued

Preservation Committee

Jay Adolf and Gabrielle Palitz, Co-Chairpersons

3. **378 West End Avenue, Collegiate** (aka 372-378 West End Avenue & 262 West 78th Street.)
Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for rooftop addition and restorative work.



The Preservation Committee wanted to present, and noted this has nothing to do with the Colligate School. They then invited the applicant to speak.

Richard Cook – Architect – He noted that he always focuses on “Manahatta, 1609” and gave a history of Manhattan development going to 2007. He showed the site at 1609 and then a history of the site.

Rev. Michael Bos – Reverend of Colligate Church – He wanted to note that they themselves are community members that “exist for the most good for the most people.” He strongly wanted to advocate for the work the church is doing within the community.

The question was open to debate among the Board. There was a question about affordable housing in the project, and how the church is involved within the community on that concern. There was also a question about the balconies in the building, which included discussion regarding “bio-phylic” design intended to connect people to the outside and natural outdoors (“Life follows life.”) It was noted that there are no existing tenants. It was also noted that a builder has not be selected yet.

The question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted: 33 – 0 – 1 – 0.*

4. **260 West 78th Street, Collegiate** (Broadway – West End Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to demolish an existing no-style school building.

*, the resolution to **approve** was adopted. 32 – 0 – 1 – 0.*

Housing Committee

Nick Prigo, Chairperson

5. **Intro 214**, providing legal counsel for low-income tenants who are subject to eviction, ejection or foreclosure proceedings.

The Housing Committee presented on the question of legal counsel for tenants facing eviction. There are significant funds that are being dedicated to this effort, around \$60 million dollars. The Committee wants to ensure that this money continues to be dedicated to this matter, affording people this as a “civil right.”

There was debate about where the funding comes from, and it was noted the total cost in the short run is believed to be \$200 million, except that this is expected to be a net savings via the Office of Civil Justice.

The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 32 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Transportation Committee

Andrew Albert and Dan Zweig, Co-Chairpersons

6. Lincoln Square BID’s application to the Mayor’s Office of Street Activity Permits for the November 30 Winter’s Eve street closures.

After a short discussion, the Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 32 – 0 – 0 – 0*

7. **130 West 87th 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.



After a short discussion, the Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 33 – 0 – 0 – 0*

8. Reduction of pedestrian fatalities in MCD7.

After a short discussion, with a minor friendly Amendment of “first” to “highest,” “City” to “City and State,” and note that will be bullet points at the end for clarity, the Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted: 31 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Business & Consumer Issues Committee

Michele Parker and George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Co-Chairpersons

Application to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses:

9. **2309 - 2315 Broadway** (West 83rd Street) The Pickle People LLC, d/b/a To be Determined.

With minimal debate the Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 31 – 0 – 0 – 0*

10. Unenclosed Café Renewal Applications.

- **229 Columbus Avenue** (West 70th – 71st Streets.) Renewal application #1186113-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Flej, Inc., d/b/a Pomodoro, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 8 tables and 16 seats.
- **340 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 76th Street.) Renewal application #1413323-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Amsterdam Ale House, Inc., d/b/a Amsterdam Ale House, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 11 tables and 32 seats.
- **355 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 77th Street.) Renewal application #1246104-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by DLS Chicken Corp., Chirping Chicken, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 8 tables and 32 seats.
- **417 Amsterdam Avenue** (West 80th Street.) Renewal application # 0929109-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Gilli, Inc., d/b/a Gilli Restaurant, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 10 tables and 19 seats.
- **513 Columbus Avenue** (West 84th -85th Street.) Renewal application #1384479-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 513 Columbus, LLC, d/b/a Cotta, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 23 tables and 44 seats.
- **994 Columbus Avenue** (West 109th Street.) Renewal application #1454076-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by 994 Columbus Avenue, Corp., d/b/a Isola, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 9 tables and 22 seats.

The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted: 30 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Enclosed Café Renewal Applications:

11. **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.

12. **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.

The BCI presented and bundled the above two resolutions, with discussion on the application of 2290 Broadway regarding the footprint of the café, and included additional Board discussion on the applicability



of continuing to approve currently constructed enclosed cafes. BCI noted the importance of its work, including the holistic review of all café guidelines going forward.

The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted: 25 – 4 – 1 – 0.*

New Unenclosed Sidewalk Café Application:

13. **187 Columbus Avenue** (West 68th – 69th Streets.) New application #11625-2015-ASWC to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Jagr 187 Columbus, LLC, d/b/a Joe Coffee, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 6 tables and 10 seats.

There was debate about the design of this specific application. The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 29 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

14. Street Vending.

The Committee presented that there will be a Task Force Review across the Borough regarding street vendors, which CB7 wants to join. After some debate and clarification, it was noted that street vendors here included all street vendors and DM Ryan noted this started because the Council may want to lift the cap on the number of food vendors.

The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 30 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Parks & Environment Committee, Klari Neuwelt, Chairperson

15. **Department of Parks & Recreation’s plans for the renovation of Bennerson playground, West 64th Street, Amsterdam-West End Avenues.**

The Parks Committee wanted to briefly review the Bennerson Playground and its new design. This resolution specifically focuses on Phase II of the renovation, noting that both Phase I and Phase II will be constructed together. In addition, there was some debate regarding if the playground would be shut down during construction.

The Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 30 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Land Use Committee

Richard Asche and Page Cowley, Co-Chairpersons

16. **100 West 72nd Street, d/b/a Miccass Physical Therapy, PC and Momentum Fitness, LLC** (Columbus Avenue.) Application #188-15-BZ to the Boards of Standards and Appeals by Sheldon Lobel, P.C. for a special permit pursuant to ZR Section 73-36 to permit a physical culture establishment in the cellar level of the premises.

The Chair of CB7 presented on behalf of the Committee, and with minor debate, the Question was called.

*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 29 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

Steering Committee

Elizabeth Caputo, Chairperson

17. **CB7 Priorities for the FY2017 NYC Expense Budget.**

18. **CB7 Priorities for the FY2017 NYC Capital Budget.**

The Chair spoke on behalf of the Steering Committee, singling out the hard work of Mel Wymore, Mark Diller, and Jerry Cardova, and with numbers 17 and 18 bundled without objection, and the Question being called,



*The resolution to **approve** was adopted. 30 – 0 – 0 – 0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19PM.

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



Land Use Committee
Richard Asche and Page Cowley, Co-Chairpersons
Joint with Housing Committee
Nick Prigo, Chairperson
November 2, 2015 6:30PM

The meeting was called to order by Land Use co-chairs Richard Asche and Page Cowley and Housing chair Nick Prigo.

The meeting continued a discussion of the proposals known as Zoning for Quality and Affordable Housing and Mandatory Inclusionary Housing from the joint meeting on October 21, 2015.

Amendment to the distributed Agenda was made to have the representatives from the Department of City Planning respond to the LU & Housing Committee's questions submitted after the last meeting, and permit Committee members to follow up with further questions and then allow brief additional public comment before settling into the work of deliberating and drafting the two resolutions.

Eric Olson, Planner at the Department of City Planning and Frank Ruchala, Deputy Director, Zoning Division, at the Department of City Planning gave the responses in the form of a PowerPoint presentation.

I. The following questions were asked regarding Mandatory Inclusionary Housing:

A. What actions would trigger MIH?

- Action before DCP would require satisfaction of MIH
- 23-90 creates MIH program
- Triggers are: City-initiated re-zoning (e.g. recent R9-A rezoning in CB7 a few years ago):
 - Private applications for zoning map changes.
 - Private applications for special permits that create “substantial” new residential development.
- Developments that are as-of-right would remain so without triggering MIH.

B. Is this likely to occur within CB7’s district?

- No current proposal to rezone (up-zone only) the District, but could happen in future years.
- Q: Is it the case that proposal is more likely to apply in R6 through R8 or R9 that would seek to up-zone in the future?
- A: Not limited to that.
- Q: What are we voting on?
- A: Creating a new tool in MIH – vote would create the opportunity to employ that tool across a vast array of potential situations.
- Q: Does this make sense to your District?
- A: Voting on whether to create the requirement.
- A: Nothing in the text restricts the ability to propose MIH without such triggers, but not within the contemplation of DCP at this time (and there might be significant legal challenges were there to be such a proposal).
- Q: Need not only be a “mapped” rezoning.



- A: Correct
 - Q: Only apply MIH when it triggers? Is that a requirement?
 - A: Interesting point re text amendment being more specific when it should be applied.
 - Q: When doesn't ZQA trigger MIH?
 - A: Mandate references affordable housing in the communities where it is economically feasible, but uses East New York as an example.
-- believes ZQA is itself an up-zoning.
 - (Ethel) – really most applicable to either up-zoning R6-9 or from M zones to significant R zones.
- C. Why not apply this proposal Citywide without re-zonings?
- Concern that the program pass legal muster.
 - Do not want to restrict housing production in parts of the City where even a small amount of affordable housing would inhibit the creation of any affordable housing.
- D. Current Inclusionary Program – what happens?
- MIH does not change the current Inclusionary program in the Broadway corridor and elsewhere.
- E. AMI mix flexibility
- Proposal allows for averages of different AMIs – flexibility to accommodate a variety of levels of affordability.
 - Q: Would make sense to add more specifics on how to include a variety of averages?
 - Workforce option is not available in Manhattan CB1-8 – a without subsidy option for a higher AMI.
 - Workforce designed to work with 421-a, and 421-a not available in Manhattan.
-- would not be the only Manhattan board to raise this issue.
 - Q: How to affect benchmarks for income?
 - A: If want a Workforce option in CB7, should say so.
- F. Hardship
- In areas where MIH is mapped, there is a BSA special permit opportunity to waive or modify the affordability requirement.
 - Seen as a legal requirement – zoning requires BSA to have a legal relief valve.
 - Found in 73-624.
 - Not a typical BSA variance and criteria.
 - Very specific to MIH.
 - Q: Pared down from usual variance.
- G. Onsite/same zoning lot
- Variety of different options, e.g.
 - In same building with common street entrance.
 - On same lot in wholly separate building completely independent from ground to sky (not to stigmatize affordable tenants).



- If two buildings on the same lot, must open to the same street.
- Offsite – in same community District or ½ mile.
- Q: half-mile is an issue in CB7 because there is a dearth of alternate sites.
- A: if cannot find another site within ½ mile or District, must build on-site.
- A: Payment in lieu option – but only for very small projects.
- Q: Who administers the fund?
- A: HPD

H. Will the off-site requirement be different than on-site?

- Same requirement regardless of site.
- Same as under current voluntary program (older program allowed different amounts on- vs off-site.)

I. Applicability of MIH to Other Uses

- In lieu of housing, could a school or other need be addressed?
- Proposal only addresses Inclusionary Housing.
- Other agencies would employ other tools to address other needs.
- ULURP conversations would continue.

II. The following questions were asked regarding ZQA

A. Alternate envelope

- Requires the affordable housing to be on-site.

B. Why does zoning need to change?

- Inability to fit all FAR into Contextual envelope is perceived as an impediment.
- Seen less success in developers taking advantage of affordable housing / inclusionary housing where the contextual envelope inhibits.
- (Ethel) - “Envelope Conundrum” study made the point that some components of Contextual zoning prevented the use of all of the otherwise available FAR.
- Thus diminished the use of the inclusionary program.
- Also affects the quality of buildings.
- Looked at contextual zoning districts and analyzed whether could use 100% of FAR given either “packing the bulk” methods or “best practices” for construction.
- Q: Are we trading height for higher ground floors and courtyards?
- A: Some smaller changes (5 feet) for improvements on ground floor.
- A: Larger changes to height dependent on Inclusionary Housing.
- Q: proposing changes re sky exposure and street wall
- A: yes – will review in presentation.
- Different max height in an Inclusionary Housing program building – CB7 District already dense (R9-A or R10-A).

C. R9-A and R10-A on narrow streets:



- Same FAR on narrow and wide streets.
- But narrow street's envelope is smaller.
- Narrow streets less able to use additional FAR.
- So would allow same envelope/height on narrow street with Inclusionary program as wide street (e.g. West 96th, West 86th, West 79th etc.).
- R9-A re senior housing – no flexibility.

D. Narrow lots (less than 45' wide) – Sliver Law:

- Limits height to the width of the adjacent street.
- Affordable housing providers pointed out that already cannot build all FAR permitted, let alone use the Inclusionary Housing program.
- Proposal eliminates the Sliver Law restriction and allows the developer to build up to the otherwise applicable Contextual height.

E. Increases in FAR

- No increase for market FAR
- Senior affordable housing – higher FAR for senior than typical residential. Applicable only to non-profit residences for elderly.
- Currently applicable only in lower density districts (e.g. R-3 through R7B).
- Proposal adds higher FAR for many but not all higher density districts.
- Applicable to both Community Facility and Residential.

III. The following questions were asked regarding ZQA Quality:

A. Raised ground floors – necessary for residential as well as commercial?

- Promotes retail for commercial.
- Moves residential windows off the street level.
- Proposal limited to 15' floor-to-floor heights, not the 20'+ needed for big box retail.
- Q: encourages retail where it does not now exist.
- Q: Not intended to create rear lot encroachment.
- Residential units at grade level – giving flexibility to raise the ground floor and add it to the top – no relief if the developer does not raise the ground floor (and limits the number of floors inside).
- Residences would be raised – would not need to raise the entrance so can still accommodate ADA-compliance.
- So would have at-grade lobby and then a ramp or elevator to the first floor apartments.
- Q: Concern that elevating the first floor residential would result in a blank wall at the eye level.
- This is changing design as well as zoning.

B. R8 on Narrow Street:

- Not a contextual district. Could be non-contextual building or a contextual envelope as alternatives.



- Applicable to West 86th to West 97th.
- Results in developers eschewing R8 contextual option.
- Want to make sure that the R8 contextual zoning Quality Housing option actually works.
- Citywide will make R8 area more useful.
- Observation that in the area mentioned, mostly built out, no new construction since the 1980s.
- That area is also part of an Historic District.

C. Historic Districts

- LPC review would not change.

D. Street Walls

- Looking for street walls on narrow streets to be more in line with contextual requirements.
 - e.g. side streets with room for planting by setting back off the street wall.
- Wide streets – buildings line up with the “wrong” point – example of aligning with a bay window rather than the main plane of the front façade.
- Also provides for courts on front facades.
- Q: why would developer want a courtyard rather than maximize FAR.
- A: Trade-off to permit a developer to incorporate better practices if they were inclined to do so.
- A: existing rules restricted better practices.

E. Lot mergers

- Proposal Restricts the number of floors based on 10’ floor-to-floor heights.
- Q: How would this affect the buildings on West 99th and Broadway.
- A: Those were built in an R8 non-contextual.
 - odd situation where R8 had no height limit, R10 did.

F. Application to CB7 District

- Brings aspects of enhanced commercial districts re lobbies etc. into other special districts.
- Depth, transparency, lobby width included in our enhanced commercial district became the model for the rest of the City.

G. Irregular Lots

- Rare on the UWS since most is within the grid.
- Relief for unusual condition
- Q: BSA already allows?
- A: Problem is that BSA rules require uniqueness, and these conditions may be found broadly in the area and still require relief.

H. Unit size – average sizes:

- Proposal allows the same average unit sizes in medium- and high-density residence districts.



- Allows smaller average unit sizes for higher density.
- Eliminates minimum.
- Q: Will that result in affordable units being micro-units.
- A: Inclusionary requires the same percentage distribution of unit sizes as found in the corresponding market rate units.

I. Discretionary Review

- DCP tries to make zoning as-of-right.
- Use discretionary review only where needed.

IV. Public Comments and Questions.

Jewel Weiss – West 96th Street

- Project on block combining 3 townhouses into a larger development.
- Does not understand how this preserves quality.
- A: zoning on that street is unchanged – proposal does not change the FAR, just the shape of the building so that it does not need to be flat.

Olive Freud

- Cap on height? Will zoning have cap on height?
- Will zoning affect shadows on public parks?
- A: Proposal does not address areas where taller buildings are already permitted.
- A: Not a part of this proposal, but those questions could be part of other initiatives.

Lisa DiCaprio

- Replacement of existing affordable units?
- A: Existing 421-a would require putting back any affordable units in addition to required percentage.
- Never seen a situation where a building employed 421-a

Sean Khoursandi

- How does this proposal interact with new rules re proposal re bank for religious TDRs?
- Will maximum numbers of floors still be the absolute maximum?
- A: Would need to go through full ULURP on a local site specific basis.
- A: Conversation in East Midtown very different than UWS.

Susan Nial (provided a written statement for the Committee members)

- Concern that proposals are moving targets.
- Proposal is about zoning, not planning. No planning re transportation, city services etc.
- Really being pushed by developers, not affordable housing advocates.

Susan Simon.

- Trying to understand impact on Historic Districts.
- Concern that predatory developers will select buildings, push out rent regulated tenants, and change the character of the Historic Districts.
- We have contextual zones as well as historic districts for a reason.



V. Committee Comments and Discussion.

Q: Will affordable housing be permanent, and the thresholds remain the same?

A: Permanent – and inclusionary requirements run with the land, and enforced by HPD.

Discussion regarding MIH

Nick:

Suggested his Committee would draft the resolution for the MIH

- The process will be to state your concerns and issues and then indicate your vote as one of four vote categories: "yes," "no," "yes but," "no unless."
- Believes we should vote “no unless” in this case.
- No unless rationale:
 - Does not want BSA to be the relief valve on MIH – would recommend HPD or another agency.
 - References to funds for monetizing affordable housing, but needs more specific rules.
 - Off-site is problematic as an option. Off-site – no guarantee that someone will pay for proper maintenance.
 - Workforce option – interested in asking for Workforce Option in our District
 - but not the option proposed
 - should get more units than proposed – must be more than 30% of units (same number of units but higher rents).

Audrey:

- Originally enthusiastic, but unlikely these triggers will be activated in a District such as ours.
- Wasting the opportunity here in CB7’s District.
- No unless

Jeanette:

- Concern that origin of the proposal was a study that concluded that affordable housing is only feasible in higher density areas.
- Would want to see support for the concept that eliminating these regulations would lead to more affordable housing.
- Demolishing affordable units should trigger the requirement to build under Inclusionary Housing.
- No Unless

Shelly:

- Aspects that are worth including.
- E.g. different levels of income.
- Yes, but

Mark:

- Must include text to ensure floor becomes the ceiling – must ensure there is still leverage to seek other services (schools, fire etc.).



- Incorporate 421-a
- No unless

Matt:

- Should require review after implemented to assess whether it is achieving the construction of new units.
- No unless

Robert:

- Would like to see concrete safeguards – more guarantees to ensure that what is intended to be affordable remains so.
- Takes issue with the assumption that affordable housing is not feasible absent subsidy or relief per these programs and incentives.
- Would like to see language to encourage financing for other models for affordable housing.
- More of a “yes but” than a “no unless.”

Genora:

- Need to hear more benefit for the community.
- No unless.

Madelyn:

- Agrees with Nick
- No unless

Richard:

- Should endorse the concept of MIH.
- Should point out that while as drafted there is no geographic limit or triggering mechanism, but nothing to prevent CB7 from doing a 197
- Suspicion that this is politically motivated, and wants to remove that cloud.
- Problems with the specifics:
- Problem with the hardship provisions – we have real opportunity to address BSA’s way of computing or calculating hardship.
- Here, hardship easier to prove than under typical variance.
- Way in which BSA analyzes hardship does not comport with actual expenses and revenues. Example of the chasm between reality and formula at 361 cpw.
- Cannot allow BSA to be the arbiter of hardship.
- Not confident that having a wholly separate building is any better than a separate entrance.
- Off-site – developer should be held to a higher percentage. (does not oppose the concept of off-site, but should not be more profitable for the developer).
- Should increasing percentage the distribution of Voluntary Inclusionary units to match.
- No unless

Ethel

- Believe that the goal of MIH is worth supporting.



- Understands the motivation to lump these two initiatives into the same ULURP, but can create problems.
- Not clear what all of the implications of each program would be on the other.
- Real planning would necessitate a review period in the implementation of MIH – question of how the program will be implemented.
- Build those criteria into the text now.

- Appreciate the trade-off between affordable housing and the questions of character of buildings re height, density and configurations.
- Raises the question of different treatment for wide and narrow streets.
- Question of allowing additional height on a narrow street – adding 30’ for the chance to obtain Inclusionary.
 - should have lower possible heights on narrow streets.
- Could support “no unless” even though wants to be seen strongly supporting MIH.
- Yes, but

Shelly:

- Should strongly support the program and concept, and call out specific aspects to be supported, while enumerating the points to be addressed.

Richard:

- Should allow a Community Board to impose MIH even in the absence of an upzoning or private applications.

Ethel:

- Effectively that would mean attaching MIH to as-of-right zoning.

Richard:

- ULURP to follow – just wants the right.

Page:

- Impressed by the site knowledge and neighborhood details in our district.
- In spite of all good efforts, imposing MIH we need to understand the full ramifications of what we need.
- CB7’s plan should start with a current needs analysis and then leverage from there.
- Concern that voting for MIH will equate design with the Citywide affordable housing issues with the result that our neighborhoods will lose their inherent character and develop unfortunate uniformity.
- The premise to create better architecture is good, but the framework suggested is too restrictive and prescriptive. Need to stick to zoning and provide regulations that provide options for building use and programming needs to encourage unique buildings that fit better into the individual neighborhood streetscape.

Resolution results:

Yes 0



| | |
|-----------|---|
| No | 0 |
| Yes but | 3 |
| No unless | 8 |

Final Resolution:

No unless: VOTE: 8-3-0-0

Discussion regarding ZQA

Richard:

Suggested his Committee would draft the resolution for the ZQA

Richard's commentary for the basis of a resolution:

- Does not favor re height increases on narrow streets
- No height increases in Historic Districts
- No senior housing height increases on narrow streets
- Favor Loosening requirements on street walls and setbacks
- Does not favor raising level of the lobby.
- Does not favor relaxing rear yard requirements.
- Need greater control over ZLTs.
- Oppose elimination the Sliver.
- Essentially No unless

Page:

- Agrees with Richard, except still to prescriptive re increasing ground floor as key to height increases.
- May be other opportunities to achieve quality housing goals.
- Should allow for a variety of floors one of which is 15' to suit the program and building us. The taller floor should not or does not always need to be at the ground floor.
- Should not limit worthy possibilities of roof terraces, gardens, cafeterias, game rooms/meeting rooms, library, generalcommunal space at the upper or top of a building to take advantage of views etc., as well as possibility of achieving sustainability through architectural details - exterior appendages (fins/louvers or other sustainable building and design practices..
- May be other design impacts that would be foreclosed.
- No unless.

Shelly:

- Agree with Richard except as to senior housing on narrow streets.
- Senior housing is essential.
- Manhattan is 20% seniors – that is growing.
- Senior housing is a pre-eminent issue for poor and middle income residents.
- Need counterbalances concerns about narrow street height changes.
- Yes but



Jeannette:

- Agrees with Page re zoning being too prescriptive. More flexibility is better.
- Re senior housing, too much is based on concessions to developers to achieve our goals.
- Height differences of 10-30 feet are significant. Should be a big deal.
- Not convinced that give-away will result in more affordable or senior housing.
- Trying to put too much into one rezoning.
- Not enough data to support removal of parking Citywide re affordable tenants.

Richard:

- Coming to a consensus that the case has not been made for the cure offered as being both necessary and sufficient.

Audrey:

- Should treat MIH the same way Voluntary is handled.
- No need to create an as-of-right solution.
- No unless.

Nick:

- No but
- Not wild about units smaller than 400 SF
- To qualify senior affordable housing under ZQA MUST be permanent, not 30 years.
- Loosening the envelope AND reduce the FAR – get better buildings and eliminate the pressure on the other side.

Page:

- Introduce variety, but should be more flexible. Example of adding height on a floor other than the ground floor.

Richard:

- Should use more special permits.
- Special permit whose criteria include superior architectural quality.

Robert:

- Endorses Page’s position.

Preliminary vote regarding opposing increased height for senior housing on narrow streets

Results: 5-2-0-0

2nd Preliminary vote to oppose abolishing/relaxing the Sliver Law

Results: 7-0-0-0

3rd Preliminary vote to allow 15’ but don’t prescribe where it is best located/employed.

Results: 7-0-0-0

4th Preliminary vote to verify 400 SF unit rule relaxation is the average not the minimum.

Results: 7-0-0-0



Resolution Results:

| | |
|-----------|------|
| Yes | 0 |
| No | 0 |
| Yes but | 3 |
| No unless | 3-4* |

Final Resolution:

No unless: VOTE: 4-3-0-0

*Owing to the dwindling participation and late hour, Richard was given the task of compiling a results that took into account participates comments that would ultimately result in a No unless majority vote.

Present: Richard Ashe, Page Cowley, Sheldon Fine, Jeanette Rausch, Roberta Semer and Ethel Sheffer.
Housing Committee: Nick Prigo, Robert Espier, Matthew Holtzman, Madelyn Innocent, Audrey Isaacs, Genora Johnson and Jeanette Rausch. **Board Members:** Mark Diller, Klari Neuwelt and Madge Rosenberg.



Youth, Education & Libraries Committee Meeting Minutes
Eric Shuffler and Blanche Lawton, Co-Chairpersons
November 19, 2015

The Youth, Education & Libraries Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, November 19, 2015, at the District Office, 250 West 87th Street in the District. The meeting was called to order by co-chairs Eric Shuffler and Blanche Lawton at 6:35 pm. Future meeting relating to construction adjacent to schools:

- Plan for a meeting at PS 75, which is the latest school facing construction that is anticipated to have material effect on the ability of the schools to serve the children.
- Tina actively pursuing panelists including medical experts who testified in connection with Mark Levine's Intro 420 regarding the deleterious health effects of construction noise on children, staff and school populations.
- School Construction Authority testified in opposition to Intro 420.
- Committee to write to all stakeholders and constituents (including electeds) to the meeting.

Update on School Rezoning:

- On-going discussion at CEC3 relating to the persistent waiting list for in-zone K students at PS 199. For September 2015, the in-zone waiting list was near 100 students.
- PS 191 has been the subject of a "persistently dangerous school" designation on a State Education Department list.
- One of the consequences of the PDS designation is that parents zoned or assigned to that school have the right to seek an alternate placement elsewhere in the system.
- Conversation about rezoning to address the overcrowding / waiting list at PS 199, which quickly morphed into a discussion about equity and diversity.
- DoE presented a draft proposal that would have significantly reduced the size of the PS 199 zone, rezoning many blocks to PS 191.
- Discussion at CEC3 rezoning committee meetings included contemplation of a "superzone" either for 191 and PS 342 or 191 and 199 or all three.
- PS 342 is the school to be built at Riverside Center (West 61st and WEA). The rezoning discussions DoE has abandoned the rezoning proposal due to a lack of consensus on their draft plan and their unwillingness to consider interim solutions being discussed by the CEC3 rezoning committee.
- PS 191's SLT has welcomed the idea of a superzone or a pairing wherein 191 would host grades pre-K through 2 and another school would host grades 3-5.
- PS 199's SLT voted to remain a K-5.
- CB7 and others trying to assess the ability to open PS 342 as of September 2017 instead of the currently anticipated September 2018.
- The developer's schedule is to deliver the building in July 2016, at which point SCA would then fit out the school and build out the space.
- The expectation is that the developer could not accelerate the July 2016 timetable.
- The best option would be for CB7 (possibly jointly with CEC3) to write to the SCA seeking expedited opening of PS 342.



Peggy Salwen – St. Agnes Library:

- NYPL's, BPL's and QPL's operating budgets have been increased by \$43MM for FY 2016. The largest single-year increase in history. Of that, \$19MM is allocated to NYPL.
- One of the positive consequences is that NYPL has begun hiring qualified librarians (especially children's and teen librarians) and increasing the hours of existing staff. Recently, NYPL has been hiring college graduates without an MLS or other library degree.
- Riverside Branch hired a librarian for teens, who is adding resume-writing and craft programming geared for teens.
- Upcoming program at Riverside will focus on using Duct Tape for unusual purposes. Aim is to participate in a competition run by the duct tape manufacturer with prizes including college scholarships.
- Riverside, St. Agnes and Bloomingdale are all now able to extend their hours of operation.
- Bloomingdale branch library also hired a librarian specifically for teens. Also participating in programming that includes the duct tape competition.
- Jahira is expected to return to Bloomingdale from maternity leave in January 2016.
- St. Agnes recently added a children's librarians. Programming includes "Read to Stella" – reading to a therapy dog. Great for kids who have trouble reading aloud, as well as kids with fears of animals.
- St. Agnes does not have a unique programming space for children – space shared with programming for older children, teens and adults.
- Read to Stella is done on the main floor in the children's collection.
- St. Agnes will have extended hours starting in January 2016.
- A new information assistant will soon also join the St. Agnes staff – he is expected to work with adult literacy and teen outreach programs and technology.
- St. Agnes's tech center consists of only 10 computers, and the adult programming has first call on the computers.
- Library usage – St. Agnes circulation has increased overall. Adult circulation has decreased, but children's circulation has increased significantly in the past 1-2 years.
- St. Agnes has among the highest children's circulation of any branch in the NYPL. Credit active outreach.

Presentation by Sandy Higgins – Center Manager at the Gertrude Ederle Recreation Center (Department of Parks & Recreation):

- Very complete offerings for seniors (at a \$25 annual membership level).
- Attended the YEL meeting at PS 191 - inspired by work underway.
- Ederle Center has 8-10 week sessions; looking for opportunities to serve needs at 191 and at 199.
- Chorus at 191 could be a way to attract children to the Center.
- WESS uses the Center for the gym program at the Ederle Center.
- Rich offerings for children and teens at the Center.
- Interested in partnering with CB7 to get the word out, especially relating to new program offerings (e.g. in-pool kayaking with the Manhattan Community Boathouse).
- Also interest in learning what needs remain unmet in the area to consider how the Center might be a part of meeting those needs.

Presentation on Youth Collective – Blanche Lawton:

- Agencies and CBOs have been active in coordinating.



- Groups that have been active include the Lincoln Square Neighborhood Center/Goddard-Riverside Community Center; Westside YMCA; Franciscan Community Center; Children's Aid Society.
- Job Fair – aimed at teens. Both careers and jobs.
- Forum for service providers – like a fair where teens and children can visit tables devoted to the offerings by the participating agencies.
- CB7 will seek to be a co-sponsor. Possibility to host the forum at Ederle Center – to be explored with Sandy Higgins.
- Youth Collective contemplating issuing a newsletter to highlight the various offerings from each of the constituent CBOs and agencies.
- Blanche has approached the Frank McCourt HS to serve as the writers and editors for the newsletter.
- Each of the CBOs and agencies has brochures and blurbs for their respective offerings - newsletter would select among them.

Ideas for meetings in 2016:

- Possibility for CB7 to sponsor or help host a basketball tournament.
- Follow-up meeting to discuss alternatives to gang-related activity. Seeking a role for CB7 beyond advocating for budget financing for Beacon and Cornerstone youth programs through DYCD.
- Follow-up on mapping the availability of after-school programming and services, and attempting to understand from where those participating are drawn. Coordinate with the new Youth Collective. Goddard-Riverside made an effort to assess what populations were being served.
- Interest in coding and programming – meeting could explore what programs exist and whether there is a role for CB7 in spreading the word or otherwise facilitating outreach and use of those programs. Example of “Black Girls Code” program downtown; and “Thought Works” – which is connected to social justice issues with an intersection with coding, apps and social media.
-- Possible connection with Ederle Center, which has a computer resource room and available computers (actively used already, so scheduling would be important).
- Possibility of facilitating or sponsoring either/both a Job Fair or a College Fair for HS students – especially those who may not be heading to college. Not a commonly offered resource at public high schools.

Adjourn at 8:00 pm.

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



**Preservation Committee Meeting Minutes
Gabby Palitz and Jay Adolf, Co-Chairpersons
November 12, 2015**

The Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, November 12, 2015, at the District Office, 250 West 87th Street in the District. The meeting was called to order by co-chairs Gabby Palitz and Jay Adolf at 6:30 pm. Preservation Committee members Meisha Hunter Burkett, Miki Fiegel, Peter Sampton and Mark Diller also participated.

The following matters were discussed and actions taken:

55 CPW (West 66th). Application to reconstruct a penthouse modified in non-compliance with prior LPC approval, construct a trellis, install mechanical equipment and replace a window/door.

Presentation by:

Erin Rulli, Higgins Quasebarth, preservation consultants

D'Ann Tollett and Andrew Oyen, Ferguson & Shamamian, architects.

- 20 story apartment building built in 1929-30 by architects Schwartz & Gross (featured in the "Ghostbusters" movie).
- Application to replace an existing rooftop addition, replace a single casement window on the 19th floor with a French doors in keeping with other windows throughout the building.
- A greenhouse was located on the 20th floor prior to the time of designation.
- Per 2009 LPC approval, greenhouse was to be modified. Instead it was removed and a new greenhouse was installed - by the previous owner.
- Existing structure consists of a lean-to and a flat-roofed structure forming an "L" shape.
- The proposal is to replace the flat-roofed enclosed structure with a pergola with an open louvered superstructure, and to replace the lean-to with an enclosed conservatory space that has a triangular glass pediment above the doorway.
- New overall footprint is slightly smaller than the existing structure, and would be set back approximately 3 feet farther from the parapet.
- The proposed structure would have a pitched roof on both the conservatory space and the pergola. The maximum height of the pitch corresponds to the top height of the existing pitched roof over the lean-to. By changing the pergola roof to a pitch from the existing flat roof, the front edge of the pergola would be 2 feet lower (9'4" lowered to 7'4") than the existing flat roof.
- The leading edge of the pergola pitched roof would be set back 13 feet from the parapet; the slightly higher maximum height of the pitched roof over the pergola would be 21 feet from the parapet.
- Materials are dark bronze aluminum – complies with the building standard for windows on the main facades.
- The proposal reintroduces a glass pediment above the door to the conservatory. The design is based on photos of the original greenhouse (which has since been removed).



- Window on the 19th floor – the existing condition is center-pivot casement window which is being replaced due to leaks.
- Proposal to replace with French door casements without enlarging the existing opening.
- French doors are proposed to emulate similar conditions elsewhere on the main façade, and facilitate the use of the opening to gain access to a terrace outside the window.

- Proposal also includes new mechanicals enclosed by using brick to match the light buff bricks used on this section of the tower. Will include a lattice with plantings to separate the spaces on the roof (mechanical from terrace).
- The new mechanicals would be visible only from courtyard on the West 65th Street secondary façade.

- The proposal would also replace an existing (leaking) skylight.
- New skylight raises the stair bulkhead over which it sits in the conservatory by 2', but is not visible from the public way.

- Conducted visibility study using mock-up. Greatest visibility is from the Sheep Meadow well within Central Park – portions visible include the pitched roof of the pergola and the front (east) edge of the conservatory.
- At the point of maximum visibility, the front edge of the pergola roof aligns with the existing railing above the parapet, making it even harder to read as a distinct element.

- Q: Proposed 19th floor window does not match the transom effects on windows to the north.
- A: There is a master plan for windows in the building, but this window functions as a door and thus is not a part of the master plan.
- A: the space behind the window/door has a raised floor, and a transom would inhibit its functionality.

Community Comment:

Antonia Quinteri – Managing Agent for 10 West 66th – adjacent.

- Sidewalk shed on their property.
- 55 CPW has not honored obligations concerning maintenance and removal and care of the sidewalk shed.
- Objects to any further sidewalk sheds.
A: No sidewalk shed is anticipated to be needed for any aspect of the proposed work.

Steven Newman – 10 West 66th.

- Q: Anticipated construction times
- A: Completion would be summer 2016 (March to Summer 2016).

- Q: Metal-clad bulkhead will remain – just new skylight.
- A: Confirmed.

Committee Discussion:

Peter:

- Pediment above the conservatory door – inconsistent with the rest of the proposed design.



- No relation to the other features of the buildings.
- A: modeled on the prior greenhouse with projecting entrance.

Calendared 11/24/15

Resolution to approve:

VOTE: 6-0-0-0

430 Amsterdam Avenue (West 80-81 Streets). – Jake’s Dilemma. Proposal to add a full-depth rear yard addition.

Presentation by:

Edward Shalat, architect.

- Proposal to add a rear extension at the cellar and first floor levels in the rear courtyard.
- Not visible except through a narrow alley on West 81st Street.
- Mock-up barely visible above the gate across the alley. Gate to alley is 7’ high.
- Alley is a means of egress for the building.
- Restaurant currently has venting and mechanical equipment in the courtyard.
- Proposed addition is full-depth at the first floor, but would cantilever over a covered alleyway formed by the lot line wall and the proposed ground/cellar extension, which would infill the rear yard but leave a narrow gap between the proposed extension and the lot line wall.
- Alleyway would continue to provide fire egress.
- DoB has approved the egress scheme.
- Existing fire escape from upper floors will now land on the roof of the proposed extension, with a ladder on the south side of the proposed extension that will lead to the ground level alleyway and thence to the street.
- Materials: cellar/ground floor will be brick to match existing; first floor (full-depth) will be stucco (insulated wall with stucco finish).
- Roof of the first floor will have a parapet – will not block existing second floor windows in the existing building.
- Existing neighboring buildings to the west will now see the stucco undifferentiated wall. The proposed new wall will be appx 5-6 feet from the neighboring buildings. (Side yard for neighboring building; rear yard for the subject building.)
- Adjacent windows are in a dumbbell configuration.
- Rear addition will be wider than the building to which it is attached at the rear (as wide as the widest section of the building) – the existing building's rear façade narrows from full-width to a center extension.
- Q: Sound insulation for the restaurant's operations – should provide details and emphasize as a requirement.



- Q: Any consideration given to an addition of less than full depth on both cellar and first floor?
- A: No.
- Q: brick at the ground floor – why stucco above?
- A: stucco to reduce the weight of the cantilevered extension.

No Community Speakers.

Committee Discussion:

Peter:

- Stucco addition is not properly thought out.
- Should be able to provide details including color.
- Some material other than stucco (e.g. concrete panels) would be better and more durable. Stucco does not wear well in New York City.
- Not visible, so no issue going forward with the basic plan.

Gabby:

- Q: Consideration of material other than stucco.
- A: LPC approved; did not look beyond that choice.

Miki:

- Stucco a poor choice of materials.
- Lack sufficient information on the context and impact.

Gabby:

- Strongly recommend a sturdier material. Concern about method of construction and materials.
- Concern for neighbors losing windows on adjacent side yards.
- Needs strong soundproofing.
- If pulled the massing back to be less than full depth, it would go a long way toward solving the design and related problems.

MND:

- Concern for undifferentiated massing. Blank wall at a crucial juncture in the donut to the west.
- Concern for overlap and prominent positioning in the donut viz existing windows.
- Concern for full-depth extension. Especially without context.
- No information about the extent of the overlap with the building to the west and/or any donut remnant. Presentation should include complete details.
- Blank wall will anchor the donut. Context and character in the donut is part of our charge.

Meisha:

- Concern re acoustic baffling for restaurant operation and mechanicals.
- Bothered by the cantilever.
- Concern for lack of context in the presentation.
- If weight is an issue, a veneer might be a better choice.

Resolution to disapprove:



- Concern about materials (stucco) – both durability and color.
- Lack of information about the context within the block and donut.
- Concerns about soundproofing.

VOTE: 6-0-0-0

Calendared 11/24/15

35 West 82nd Street (Columbus – CPW). Application to install aluminum railings above the eastern parapet.

Presentation by:
Silvia Schlaen – architect

- Replacing the existing roofing system.
- Parapet heights are lower than Code requirements.
- Proposing railings to increase the height to conform the Code.
- Visible portion of the proposal relates only to the east side of the building. Railings will encircle the east, north and west portions of the parapet, but only the eastern portion will be visible.
- Visible from West 82nd and CPW (but not closer in).
- Railing will be installed on the inboard side of the existing parapet – will maintain the existing coping of the parapet.
- Color: sandstone to approximate the color of the building.
- Intention is for the lighter color to effectively disappear.

MND:

- Concern only that the lighter color would be more legible against the dark roof elements than a darker color.

Peter:

- Light color also may be more reflective.

Community Comment – none.

Not yet calendared.

Resolution to approve with a recommendation to explore alternative colors (including black or terra cotta to match the coping) that would make the railing disappear to the extent possible.

VOTE: 6-0-0-0.

7 West 87th Street (Columbus Avenue – CPW). Application to alter a basement level entrance.

Presentation by:
Joseph Farahnik - consulting engineer (no architect involved)



- Application to widen and reconfigure the main entrance to a series of townhouses.
- Existing entrance consists of two aluminum doors separated by a masonry column that sit in a below-grade access-way.
- Current main door and the companion door on the other side of the column are the same height, but the main door has a transom above (side door does not).
- Proposed doors will be the same height as the side door (and the operable part of the main door without the transom).
- Proposed new door system will be three panels with a single main glass door flanked by inoperable clear glass blank panels. The doors would be aluminum painted dark bronze with full-height glass panels – reminiscent of storefront doors at commercial establishments on the nearby avenues.
- New doors will have a steel header spreading across the door openings.
- Proposal includes replacing the existing awning and installing it (centered) over the new main door.
- Current awning conceals exterior lighting.
- Insufficient clearance to make either flanking fixed panels operable.
- Overall new door system will be 9' wide.

Peter:

- Should use a double-door configuration to mirror the interior doors at the rear of the vestibule.

Meisha:

- Might be a better entrance if sliding doors were used.

Public Comment – none.

Gabby:

- Q: Why not use wood frame doors that are designed from a residential brownstone vocabulary rather than aluminum doors used on commercial premises on avenues?
- Storefront materials would raise security issues.
- A: Project was conceived by owner as replicating the existing (non-historic) door system.

Peter:

- Should use the historic door fabric.
- Concern that there are architectural issues in addition to the engineering issues.
- Need to ensure that canopy system is appropriate in relation to the building above.

Meisha:

- Not convinced that the historic preservation argument is satisfactory and appropriate.
- Understands the functionality – issue is appropriateness.

Miki:

- Concern for the utilitarian nature of the proposal.
- Does not relate to the neighborhood.
- Canopy is the most visible aspect of the entranceway and is not a part of this application.

MND:



- Agree with concerns about door.
- Concern about canopy – especially a box canopy more common on commercial establishments on an avenue. Concern is heightened because the presentation did not include details as to materials and color and configuration of the canopy.

Resolution to disapprove:

- Should reconsider proposal, and begin the inquiry by looking at wood and other historic door materials found on brownstone doorways in the neighborhood.
- Glass and wood possibly incorporating metal grille work if security is an issue.
- Lighting to be recessed with recessed conduits.

Not yet calendared

VOTE 6-0-0-0

574 Columbus Avenue / 100 West 88th Street (d/b/a Bella Luna Restaurant). Application to replace existing storefront windows with French doors.

Presentation by Victor Dabreu – architect

- Proposal is to remove existing storefront infill and replace with a more unified system.
- Applicant is an existing restaurant on the NW corner of Columbus Avenue at West 88th Street – to relocate to the SW corner in a space currently occupied by a deli.
- Renovation will include two distinct existing storefronts with very different treatments. One storefront will be the new restaurant; the other will be renovated to conform but will be let out by the landlord.
- There is an existing cast iron column between the existing storefronts.
- Proposed storefront with knee-high recessed panels at the bottom in black aluminum with concentric beveled square design. New aluminum windows above with large glass panels.
- Proposal to use accordion-like pairs of French doors as operable windows.
- As the corner storefront turns the corner, the same window system will include 3 bays around the corner to the side street, and will leave intact the existing rusticated brick and semi-circular window surrounds further down the side street façade.
- Proposal includes installing two sets of four French doors in front of the new restaurant.
- Two larger bays on either side of the entrance to the second storefront to the south.
- Transoms proposed above the windows on the avenue and side street.
- Existing condition on the second (southern) storefront includes a recessed entrance with a stone step and curved glass surrounding the recess to the door.
- Existing violations concern awnings that will now be removed.
- Security gates will be removed. No new security gates/grilles are contemplated.
- Will incorporate security cameras on exterior (to be added to the drawings).
- Signage – will be adhesive signage inside the window.



- Does not want to create an awning over the outdoor café (as is used at current Bella Luna location) – if needed, will use umbrellas. Too much maintenance.
- Lighting – goose-neck sign-band lights to have concealed conduits.

Meisha

- No information about planned signage on the sign band – could have a style selected with the name of the new tenant to be added.
- A: No sign planned on the sign band, just the window.
- French doors to give access to the outdoor café.
- Should explore to see there were original transoms that could add light and context to the proposal.

Gabby:

- Existing brick detail on the side street could create a header detail to wrap around the front.
- Could explore widening the side street windows west of the storefront infill to add light.
- The existing sign band, especially on the side street façade, is unusually large/tall – could create an opportunity to add more light and break up an ungainly appearance if it could be converted to a window.
- Concern that drawings may need to be adjusted to reflect changes in grade along the facades.

Peter:

- If the proposed French doors on the northern store were made uniform in width and extended to the cast iron column, could make the two sets of four bays the same width.

Gabby:

- Recommendation that applicant get permits to do probes behind existing cladding and awnings to ascertain underlying conditions – will enable more accurate planning and facilitate better design.

Jay:

- Detailing of the masonry and sign band around the corner.
- Exploring whether there is brick detailing behind the awning.
- Explore whether the sign band could be opened up to create additional sources of light.
- Could approve with recommendations regarding further explorations.

MND:

- Opportunity to improve the design is welcome, but should not delay the approval of the existing design. Recommend approval and encourage the applicant to further refine and improve based on the results of tests and borings.

Resolution to approve with applicant's understanding and agreement to:

- Continue the existing brick corbeling detail around the front façade.
- Continue to explore with probes and report back on conditions found.
- Perform probes to determine whether there are additional opportunities to open up the space to additional natural light and air above the existing windows and in the sign bands.
- Strong recommendation that they repaint the side street façade a less challenging color.



VOTE: 5-0-1-0

320 West 88th Street (WEA - RSD). Application to construct rear yard and rooftop additions.

Presentation by David Turner – architect.

- Late 1800s row house. One of grouping of three. [additional rowhouses in the same side of the donut are intact]
- Front façade work consists of replacing existing railing with railing that has wider openings.
- Height of proposed metal railing is 2’0” lowered from existing 2’8” – total height of the railing would be 2’6”.
- Spacing of railings would be 4-5’ wide. Would not satisfy current Code.
- Front façade replacement windows: wood painted black. Manufacturer likely to be Marvin.
- Front façade will be cleaned.

Rooftop Addition:

- Existing attic to be extended 24’ to the south/rear, and will be set back from the rear façade.
- Rear façade of proposed rooftop addition would have two sections, 2/3 would be set back 15’, and 1/3 would be set back 9’.
- Rear façade would be clad in stucco in a light color – beige (has not yet picked a color).
- Windows on the rooftop addition would be aluminum-clad wood. Two paired sliding windows and a door leading to the terrace behind the proposed addition.
- Minimal (4’) bulkhead on top of the addition for an elevator - elevator motor would be incorporated into the cab.
- A/C on the upper roof, most likely aligned near the elevator bulkhead.
- Unclear whether chimneys will need to be raised.

Rear Yard Addition

- Existing L extension.
- Proposal to create a full-width extension pulled back to a consistent 30’ depth. Pulling back from L extension façade of approximately 3-4’.
- Rear extension is not visible from any public way.
- Claims that existing rear yard L extensions have been modified. Mostly adding height to existing extensions.
- No details about whether modifications to the altered L extension was pre- or post-designation.
- Q: Donut still has a consistent rhythm of paired L extensions.
- A: Yes.
- Proposal when pulled back will not be in line with its sister L extension.
- Existing rear L façade has conduits on façade.
- Existing L extension has corbel brick detail at the roof line – proposal is to emulate that effect at the top of the proposed full-width addition.



- Top floor will have wood replacement punched openings.
- Windows on the basement and second floors would be folding with accordion folds in groups of 4 panels so that the window could be opened full width.
- Parlor floor windows will be in the same configuration as the basement, but would be fixed as there is a double-height space behind.
- Basement and parlor windows would be 9' tall; second floor windows will be 7'.
- Window systems on the ground and parlor floors would be separated by an aluminum horizontal panel.
- Window systems would be surrounded by existing brick piers that are 2' wide, and topped with replicated brick detail.
- Q: Spacing of windows between third and fourth floors appears wider / taller than actual.

Meisha:

- Concerns about width of vertical posts on proposed new railing on the front stair to the stoop – unlikely to be approved by DoB.
- Laudable to restore non-historic effect with an historic one, but safety and design concerns are paramount.
- Concerned by lack of accuracy in drawings and lack of clarity on the design and material details.
- Concerned by departure from a consistent and intact rear donut – would create an anomaly.
- Rooftop addition may be acceptable given its lack of visibility, but concerned about unidentified mechanicals and issue of chimneys.

Public Comment:

Diane Zeitland – 322 West 88th.

- Owns the apartment behind the dormer next door.
- Concern that roof access that will be compromised.
- Concern with mechanicals.
A: Mechanicals will be on the roof above her terrace.

Sonya Orenstein – 322 West 88th

- Lives in the rear on the parlor floor.
- Can see the scope of the donut – very limited alterations – donut intact.

Josette Amato – West End Preservation Society

- Concern about windows – nothing on the back façade relates to its other components.
- Effect is as if there were three separate additions added at three different times.

Committee Discussion:

Jay:

- Except for one apartment building mid-block, the donut is fairly intact, and the rhythm of L extensions is consistent.
- Should be more protective of intact donuts.

MND:

- Concern with the rear façade fenestration patterns.



- Relationship of punched windows to windows below is at best unclear and appear not to relate to precedent or neighboring buildings.
- Concern with use of a third fenestration vocabulary on the rooftop addition.
- Stucco on rear and sides of rooftop addition is not appropriate.
- Significant concern with non-Code compliant front railing even if DoB and LPC were to approve.

Peter:

- Existing punched windows on lower floors of the existing L extension have a delicate arch shape. Would be more appropriate to replicate it or use it as a model or inspiration for the new fenestration.

Miki:

- Concern with the full-width extension in an intact donut.
- Need purposeful and thoughtful fenestration pattern - understands need for light.

Gabby:

- Full-width extension disrupts an intact donut.
- Concern with various inaccuracies in the presentation.
- Concern with differing window patterns.
- Windows below are driven purely by the interior. Whole two-story is inappropriate.

Resolution to disapprove the proposed rear yard addition.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

Resolution to approve the rooftop addition as minimally appropriate with recommendation with windows that are more consistent with other rooftop facades in the donut.

VOTE: 3-2-0-0.

Calendared 11/24/15.

878 WEA (West 103rd Street). Application for replacement front doors and a canvas awning.

Presentation by:

Jeff Lydon, architect, and Scott Adams, co-op president.

- Rosario Candela was the original architect – ca. 1924.
- Current front doors are aluminum storefront-like doors without framing – no brick mold.
- Changes inspired by redecorating and a desire to make the building ADA-compliant.
- Proposal is to make referential steel doors with glass panels that build on examples of other Candela buildings.
- Surveyed all 30 Candela buildings in the area.
- Most similar buildings found in survey were 755 WEA and 240 WEA – had similar modest design and similar-sized door openings.
- Both have wrought iron doors with glass behind, with medallions and stars in the iron work.



- Problem is that most doors in Candela buildings have double-doors, but with a 5' wide opening one cannot install an ADA-compliant door.
 - Proposing a single door with flanking narrow glass panels, with matching iron detail on each.
 - LPC Staff strongly recommended a tall kick plate at the base of the main door.
 - Brick mold (wood) is taken from another Candela building on Fifth Avenue with carved detail.
 - Will use Dorma hinges that can move a heavy door with modest force.
-
- Also intending to replace existing canvas awning, but will eliminate the canvas ceiling under the awning and instead use an awning with an arch that will reveal the semi-circular panel above the door. Underside of awning will be canvas in the curve so as to hide the conduits while revealing the panels above the doorway.

Public Comment:

Hope DeRogatis – Lives in the building.

- Appreciates the ramp inside the vestibule.
- Excited that the building will become ADA compliant.
- Hopes the Board will look for ways to have the door self-opening in the future.

Other Board members present and support the project.

Committee Discussion:

Peter:

- Elegant design.
- In the door itself – the elliptical design is at eye-level. Query whether it would prevent visibility into/out of the door.
- A: proposing one fewer ring on the proposed medallion, which is both too busy a design and more transparent. Still negotiating with LPC on that point.

Resolution to approve with a recommendation that the medallion height and dimension be adjusted as needed to maximize visibility.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.

949 WEA (West 106-107 Streets). Application to replace the cornice.

Presentation by:

Joseph Levine, architect.

- Cornice has been spalling and is in poor condition.
 - Project consists of cornice and parapet replacement on the front façade.
 - Existing terra cotta cornice is supported by metal brackets and rods that are embedded into the brick parapet.
 - Cornice projects 42" at its maximum.
-
- Structural steel armature has been corroding over time.
 - Examples of deteriorated metal holding up massive amounts of the cornice.



- As the steel corrodes, it expands, putting pressure on the masonry, causing terra cotta cladding to crack and spall. Attempts to repair the cracks have been unsuccessful.
- Rusting of steel horizontal units is also causing masonry parapet to bow and spall on the inboard side.
- Must expose and replace the steel and rebuild the parapet.
- Proposal is to cast an exact replica of the cornice out of fiberglass.
- Fiberglass would be lighter, thus easier to support and maintain.
- Examples of fiberglass vs original terra cotta details provided. Weight drastically different – design and details are a perfect match. [Sample of existing and replacement detail provided – weight difference is significant.]
- Will be supported by new/replacement steel framing.
- Color of fiberglass is a gel coat embedded in the material, so would not chip or need maintenance.
- Fabricated by Architectural Fiberglass (Charles Whitman).
- Because fiberglass is so much lighter, the segments of the replacement cornice will be larger, thus requiring fewer joints. As a result, the cornice will read much more as a single panel rather than smaller units.

Josette Amato – WEPS

- Very much appreciate the effort to replace in kind rather than denude.

Resolution to approve with special commendation for such superlative exploration.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Adjourned at 10:55 pm

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

Absent: Louisa Craddock.



Business & Consumer Issues Committee
Michele Parker and George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Co-Chairpersons
November 23, 2015

Meeting call to order at 7:35pm

1. **473 Columbus Avenue** (West 82nd - 83rd Streets.) Renewal application #1008999-DCA to the Department of

Consumer Affairs by Club America, Inc., d/b/a Assaggio, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 7 tables and 14 seats.

Leo Amancio was present for the applicant.

After due deliberation, the Renewal Application was Approved:

8-0-0-0; non-committee members 2-0-0-0.

2. **2450 Broadway** (West 90th -91st Street) Renewal application #0940252-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Carmine's Broadway Feast Inc., d/b/a Carmine's for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 7 tables and 22 seats.

Nana Yao was present for the applicant

The applicant was asked to post notices once more. The applicant did not provide a list of postings and was asked to provide the list before the next general meeting on December 1.

After due deliberation, the Renewal Application was Approved

8-0-0-0; non committee members 2-0-0-0

3. **368 Columbus Avenue** (West 77th - 78th Streets.) Renewal application #1392090-DCA/ ULURP# N110358ECM to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Ixhel Corporation, d/b/a Café Frida, for a four-year consent to operate an enclosed sidewalk café with 10 tables and 28 seats.

Rosalba Arzate was present for the applicant.

Brian Jenks – how long it has been in operation at 3688 Columbus Avenue? 15 years.

After due deliberation, the Renewal Application was Approved

8-0-0-0; non-committee members 1-1-0-0

4. **80 Riverside Drive** (West 80th Street.) Application to the SLA for a two-year liquor license by Cosmopolitan Broadcasting Corporation, d/b/a Riverside Tower Hotel.

Martin Mehler, attorney, and Joe Kleinmann, architect, were present for the applicant.

Martin Mehler - Students from the Culinary Institute will come and work at the restaurant. Changes were made based on requests made at last meeting, e.g., no bar in the premises. Regulations allow for a restaurant to be operated in the premises. There will not be a cabaret or sidewalk café on the premises. The applicant is willing to abide by any resolution stipulated by CB7.

Joe Kleinmann - 2 consultants worked on zoning issues. This location has always had a restaurant in the past. Zoning regulations permit a restaurant as accessory use. Accessory use is defined as use for the benefits of owner, employees, occupants, visitors, and the public. Mr. Lewis wants to provide a high quality restaurant for all. Transient hotel defined as permitted to use restaurants as accessory use. Clearly the public can use the restaurant. The bar was only intended to be use as a waiting area for customers to wait for their tables. There will be 42 seats, a number that can be adjusted.



Martin Mehler – we want to reach an accommodation with CB7 and the community to have restaurant open with liquor license and are willing to abide by any CB7 recommendations or resolutions.

Joe Kleinmann – we are professionally making sure that everything is legal.

Community comments:

Mason Haupt, the official representative of community resident who resides at 326 W 80th Street was disappointed that the owner, Mr. Lewis, was not present at the meeting. There has not always been a restaurant continuously operating at this location. The community is willing to agree to liquor license approval if operator abides by the 25 stipulations presented by the community (list provided by Mr. Haupt). Attorney for the community residents said that he was unsuccessful in arranging a meeting with Mr. Lewis.

Helene Rosenthal –of west 80th street opposed to restaurant operation, is concerned with the growing crowds outside the hotel and with the handling of the hotel's garbage. It is not in the spirit of the area to have a restaurant at this location.

Alex Iosiledich – 317 W 80th Street – Has anybody here stayed at the hotel? Website described the hotel as a budget hotel, how does this jive with an upscale restaurant? How will the restaurant be successful?

Lynn Beller - 90 Riverside Drive – residents of the building oppose the proposed restaurant. She is concerned with a liquor license on this location. Expects that the hotel will not be successful and is concerned as to what happens when it fails. She believes this is an inappropriate location for a liquor license.

Michele Parker – there was a café in this location before.

Lynn Beller – the café was never successful and was barely attended.

Mitch Frank – 425 West End Avenue - this is a designated historic district and uniquely residential. So, allowing a restaurant will change character of neighborhood and contrary to a historic district. Where will people wait for their tables given the smallness of the site, out on the street?

Sara Saubayre - 315 West 80th Street – the café was always empty. She is Concerned about the hotel's garbage attracting more rats. There is already a rat problem in the neighborhood, especially rats coming from Riverside Park. The sidewalk in front of the hotel is too small for the current garbage needs. The hotel patrons block the sidewalk impeding the residents' foot traffic.

Martin Flusser – 324 West 80th Street – concerned with the hotel's management. His biggest complaint is that there are not enough management personnel on the premises. He is also concern that existing problems that are not addressed because of lack of management will be made worst with a restaurant in the premises. The hotel is poorly run and does not have a good relation with its neighbors.

Fred Stoole - 81 Riverside Drive – the restaurant will destroy the entire neighborhood forcing it to change for the worst. The previous café was for the exclusive use of the hotel's residents and Columbia students.

Susan Harris – 90 Riverside Drive – cannot imagine having to smell a restaurant all day; it is disgusting.



Marianne Cassaty- 90 Riverside Drive - can't imagine how the hotel was allowed to operate in its current location. The restaurant does not conform to the neighborhood.

Mason Haupt – the residents are expressing real life concerns. They love where they live and don't want the changes the restaurant brings to the neighborhood. The 25 presented stipulations were formulated from different BCI meetings and community suggestions. The stipulations need to be long lasting in case the restaurant fails. Mr. Lewis absence shows disrespect for community. The restaurant's impact in this residential neighborhood will be negatively significant. The community is willing to discuss the stipulations. There are over 130 signed petitions from the neighborhood opposed to the application and they want a strict adherence to their 25 stipulations. To protect the neighborhood the stipulations must be strong.

Martin Mehler – the applicant agrees to most of the 25 stipulations.

Mason Haupt – will like to clarify which stipulations the applicant is not willing to abide by.

Brian Jenks – to save time we should not keep discussing the stipulations because it is almost sure that the applicant and community residents cannot come to “willing” agreement and there will be an increasing burden on the BCI committee to monitor the stipulations on a permanent on-going basis and did not see this as enforceable and requested not approving the resolution and we should get the opinion of other BCI members. To clarify, it feels that residents are opposed to a restaurant operating at this location. The community does not want the commercial activity that the restaurant will attract.

Linda Alexander – we are hearing that the hotel is not a good neighbor already, especially because the management is not good enough.

Su Robotti – thinks that the restaurant is a good idea but will support the community sentiment. She sees no reason to approve the application.

Paul Fischer – feels that the menu presented before BCI was not a real menu and used only to encourage approve. A budget hotel cannot support a high end restaurant. He will vote to reject the application.

Christian Cordova – feels he is missing the point of contention. It seems that the community wants the application rejected solely because they don't want a restaurant in their neighborhood. He is inclined to vote for approval of the application.

George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero – feels that the hotel is trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. He feels uncomfortable about setting a precedent in this instance.

After due deliberation, the Renewal Application was Disapproved

Vote for Disapproval:

8-0-0-0; non committee members 1-0-0-0

CM Helen Rosenthal – knows the area well, the neighborhood has been experiencing many issuing impacting the neighborhood, including the siting of the Citibike (although she favors this form of transportation and thinks that the café idea was ok but the idea of a liquor license in this location makes no sense. She will write letter to SLA in support of CB7's decision. This is not the right neighborhood for a liquor license.



5. New Business

Steve Harris – 2109 Broadway – talked about the NYC BID resolution on street vendors. CB8 has a working Vendor task force and encourages CB7 to have a similar task force to provide a forum for the community to have a voice. Co-Chair, Michele Parker, stated we would participate with the existing task forces on this issue.

CM Helen Rosenthal – the police are giving out summonses to ease the street vendor problem. The police department has street vendor guide. The City Council is in the process of rewriting the guidebook. The may raise the cap of number of street vendor licensees. The police department has increased enforcement of street vendor guidelines. She will send a letter to the City Council about CB7 district street vendor needs.

Brian Jenks – let's add this to the BCI December of January agenda.

CM Helen Rosenthal – she will invite Captain Falcon from precinct 20 to attend the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Present: Michele Parker, George Zeppenfeldt-Cestero, Linda Alexander, Christian Cordova, Paul Fischer, Brian Jenks, Christopher Riano and Suzanne Robotti. **Board Members:** Mark N. Diller and Ken Coughlin. **On-Leave:** Marc Glazer. **Absent:** Matthew Holtzman and Anne Raphael.