

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING
New York City Loft Board Public Meeting

APRIL 18, 2024

The meeting began at 2:22 PM

Attendees: Elliott Barowitz, Public Member; Charles DeLaney, Tenants' Representative; Heather Roslund, Public Member; Samira Rajan, Public Member; Chief Peter Archer, Fire Department's ex officio; Guillermo Patino, Chairperson Designee.

INTRODUCTION:

Chairperson Patino welcomed those present to the April 18, 2024, public meeting of the New York City Loft Board. He then briefly summarized Section 282 of the New York State Multiple Dwelling Law, which establishes the New York City Loft Board, and described the general operation of the Board as consistent with Article 7-C of the New York State Multiple Dwelling Law.

VOTE ON MEETING MINUTES:

MARCH 21, 2024, Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Patino asked if there were any comments on or corrections to the March 21, 2024, minutes. Hearing none, Chairperson Patino then asked for a motion to accept the March 21, 2024, meeting minutes and for a second.

Ms. Rajan: moved to accept the March 21, 2024, meeting minutes, and **Ms. Roslund** seconded.

The vote

Members concurring:	Mr. Barowitz, Chief Archer, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Roslund, Ms. Rajan, Chairperson Patino
Members dissenting:	0
Members abstaining:	0
Members absent:	0
Members recused:	0

DISCUSSION ABOUT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO § 2-04, § 2-05 AND § 2-11.1

Before we begin discussing the substance of the proposed rule amendments, I will briefly describe the proposed amendments for the members of the public.

The proposal amends:

Section 2-04 – LB’s rules governing Minimum Housing Maintenance Standards

Section 2-05 – LB’s governing Building Registration and

Section 2-11.1 – LB’s Fine Schedule

In § 2-04, the proposal amends:

1. Subsection (a) to add the definitions of fire escape and fire stairway.
2. Subsection (b) to require that fire egress and the pathways be maintained in proper condition including that the pathway is clear and unobstructed.
3. Subsection (e)(2) to authorize additional violations if the conditions remain after 35 days after the first violation.
4. Subsection (e)(8) to include a penalty against owners who fail to properly maintain fire egress and pathways.

In § 2-05, the proposal amends section (g) to include a requirement that owners file an annual certification that fire escapes and/or fire stairways have been inspected for defects within the fourteen (14) days prior to the filing of the annual registration.

In § 2-11.1, the proposal amends section (b) to include a penalty for the failure to file the annual certification of the inspection of the fire egress.

The Board began its discussion.

Mr. Barowitz: I'm really surprised about the fire escapes because there seems to be hardly any left.

Ms. Roslund: What are you surprised about?

Mr. Barowitz: I'm surprised that now they decided to make sure that the fire escapes are there, and they'll paint it and they're in good condition. I mean, why not? But there's hardly any left in the city, as far as I can see. The first loft building I moved into, we had fire escapes. And the one I'm in now, there are no fire escapes, and I can't even remember seeing a fire escape anywhere in Soho or Noho.

Mr. Barowitz: It's interesting that you know, the whole business about a window in the bedroom, really had to do with tenement buildings. And there was an air shaft in those tenement buildings where you could have a bedroom, and that somehow persisted all the way into Loft Board restrictions that you needed to

have a window. Now, we seem to have amended that to a certain degree, because at a certain point, if there were windows in front and rear, there were bedrooms in the middle of the loft, you couldn't build the wall all the way up to the ceiling so that the window would be somehow partially open to the bedroom, which wouldn't make any sense.

Ms. Roslund: There are different window requirements. In the Multiple Dwelling Law, there are requirements for windows in every room mostly for light and air. You can have a kitchenette that does not have a window if it's mechanically ventilated. You can have a dining alcove that doesn't have a window if it's less than 50 sq ft or 70 sq ft and the openings between it and the next room is more than 84 sq ft. There are a number of rules, but the general rule of thumb is that every room in a multiple dwelling has to have a window. If a building that falls under the Loft Board jurisdiction, is considered an interim multiple dwelling with the intent of becoming a multiple dwelling, it needs to follow the Multiple Dwelling Law.

Mr. Barowitz: Yeah, but what I'm saying is, as long as you don't build the walls up to the ceiling.

Ms. Roslund: That doesn't fly in residential construction. That was a way that...

Mr. Barowitz: Not for new construction for sure.

Ms. Roslund: Banker Street is maybe a good example, where bedrooms had to go away in order for the apartments to become legal. We had that discussion a lot about the window rule, or that was a big part of the discussion when we were making the rules, rewriting the rules, updating the rules, because the question of can a building be legalized, be manipulated to become legal? Versus, is it already legal? Can you add a light shaft? Can you add a fire escape? Can you add, can you take off the last 10ft of the building? Can you add a second stair? Can you add a skylight? There are so many ways to address illegal conditions, and when I say illegal, I mean residentially illegal.

Ms. Cruz: I can tell you that participating in many of these Narrative Statements since 2022, fire escape repair has been an issue, which is why the staff decided that this was an important issue that we should bring to the board. Curtis, our inspector, voices concerns about our fire escapes. And I can tell you that a lot of times I get the response from owners that, "oh I'll fix it during legalization." I think that I've been able, and we have been able, to get most owners to comply and do the repairs necessary to the fire escapes immediately and not during legalization. But this gives us the hammer, to force repairs if there's a problem.

So, the idea is to get this through as fast as we can. So, does anyone have any questions or concerns about the proposed rule?

Mr. DeLaney: I'm very supportive of this proposal and would like to go through the pages because I have some comments. The landlords are not all at fault. There are also plenty of buildings where tenants have, flowerpots and stuff on their fire escapes. They really shouldn't be there because in an emergency, obviously, it should just be a fire escape, or a fire stair and it should be in good shape and it should not be obstructed by anything. So, I think it's very positive.

Ms. Cruz: It's very common to see it in the hallways. People store things, just random things. I've seen not just a bike, but more than the bike, pots, and utensils. I'm not quite sure why that is. Personal items should not be in the hallway. Those are trip hazards. Those are things that can cause problems.

Chief Archer: I love the discussion. To Mr. Borowitz, first, there are fewer fire escapes because as buildings are renovated and a second means of egress is added or sprinkler systems are added, you are not required to have a fire escape anymore. So, your observation is correct. These fire escapes, a lot of them are more than 150 years old. At this point, it's not really a maintenance issue, it becomes more of a replacement issue. They are antiques. They are still needed, at least in these older buildings. I'm supportive in cases where there's only one means of egress aside from the fire escape.

Mr. DeLaney: When the Halloween parade used to wind through more narrow streets, you'd look at these old five-story buildings and there'd be 40 people on each level of the fire escape standing out watching the parade. And I remember asking the first Department of Buildings representative of the Loft Board, Irving Minkin, does that present a danger? And he said, "well, let's just say it has been load tested. "

Mr. DeLaney: Can I just go through a few notes and comments? Starting on page 2, "Is there a deadline to submit comments?", we say "yes, you must submit comments by, insert the hearing date". I would like to suggest that do it one week after the hearing date, so people who might hear something or want to develop their thoughts more have time to do so. Page 3, second paragraph, last sentence, "including requirements that landlords of IMD building". I think that should be buildings.

Ms. Cruz: Are you referring to the paragraph starts the Loft Law?

Mr. DeLaney: Yes.

Mr. DeLaney: In the next paragraph, you have basic housing maintenance services. I would suggest adding the word maintenance here as well.

Ms. Cruz: Same sentence.

Mr. DeLaney: “Basic housing maintenance services during the conversion period”.

Ms. Cruz: Okay.

Mr. DeLaney: Getting to the actual rule on page 4, the definition of fire stairway. A fire stairway can be either exterior or interior, correct?

Chief Archer: That's true.

Mr. DeLaney: When we talk about lighting, is there a difference between the lighting requirements?

Chief Archer: I don't know. I have to get back to you.

Mr. DeLaney: Okay, thank you. Page 5(G), “If the owner or landlord of an IMD building intends to remove a fire escape, such owner or landlord must ensure that all building occupants have an existing and lawful means of egress”. Does that suggest removing and not replacing or removing to replace?

Ms. Cruz: Both.

Mr. DeLaney: Both?

Ms. Cruz: If you remove it, you have to replace it immediately.

Ms. Roslund: No, it could imply that you've added a second means within the building and you're removing the fire escape.

Ms. Cruz: Then you would have a second means of egress.

Chief Archer: You can also remove the fire escape if you are a sprinkler building. A sprinkler building, does not require in the hallways, does not require in stairways, does not require a secondary means to be egressed. So, if you fully sprinkler your building, you wouldn't need it anyway.

Ms. Roslund: Yeah, it sort of reads strangely because there are.

Mr. DeLaney: I didn't know that, but that's interesting.

Ms. Cruz: So how do you suggest we change that? Should we add or?

Chairman Patino: Maybe we add at the end, "Or otherwise complies with means of egress requirements," so that we capture the situation where the building owner can add sprinklers when they remove the fire escape.

Ms. Roslund: And that would imply that the new system would need to be functioning prior to removal, which could be one concern.

Mr. Barowitz: This sprinkler system that they go off produced a tremendous amount of work to cut down on the fire because it happened. Somebody did something causing a minor fire. The sprinkler system went off and half my place was flooded with the water coming down through ceilings, between the floor and ceilings. The fire department came, a lot of the water that was on the floor. So, they really do a terrific job.

Chief Archer: Maybe, it was a minor fire because the system went off. That's a common complaint we get.

Mr. DeLaney: So, we've got that reworded. In (H), "Awnings, and other installations that obstruct fire escapes and ladders are not permitted". Installation implies it's something that's installed.

Ms. Roslund: An awning is installed.

Mr. DeLaney: Right.

Mr. DeLaney: Right. But also, here I think it would be helpful to have a little more awnings or other installations or any other large objects. It doesn't have to be installed to be a problem.

Ms. Roslund: Well, would that be a separate category? A building owner, during the course of the renovation, can't add anything that obstructs the fire escape.

Chairman Patino: I think that covers that. Fire escapes must be clear and unobstructed. So, I think that would give Mr. Curtis the ability to write a violation.

Ms. Cruz: My thought process here was the commercial space on the ground floor may not install the awnings that would obstruct the fire escape ladder.

Ms. Roslund: Like when you get to the bottom.

Ms. Cruz: Yes.

Mr. DeLaney: I understand we want to move this rapidly so we can enforce it with the upcoming renewals. So rather than say, "No the language must be perfect before the hearing", if we tinker with it a little bit later, I'm just raising questions.

Ms. Cruz: Yes.

Mr. DeLaney: So, for 3(ii)(A) double-fire stairways must be kept clear and unobstructed. Does that need any more specificity?

Ms. Cruz: I think it's clear.

Mr. DeLaney: Okay. "The fire door leading to an indoor fire stairway must be a self-closing door", this is "C". So, that governs indoor stairways?

Ms. Cruz: Yes. I have a question about the thirty-day notice. I thought thirty-days is a long time, but I wanted to get feedback from the Board. Should the notice be shorter? Should I leave it until after the discussion at the hearing?

Ms. Roslund: I think I would leave everything until after the discussion.

Chief Archer: Can I ask? First is awnings, if you look around, there are holes in the awnings that they have which isn't really addressed here. I don't have a problem with those holes. You know, the way this reads, they wouldn't be able to have it on it.

Ms. Roslund: Well, it says it has to obstruct the fire escape ladder to be prohibited.

Ms. Cruz: I thought that covered it.

Chief Archer: The second concern is about an outdoor dining structures. These structures could obstruct the drop ladder and obstruct the counterweight. Lastly I want to raise a concern about electrical wiring.

Ms. Roslund: Wiring related to telephone, cables, TV cables, and Verizon may be a problem.

Chief Archer: Well, I think that the outdoor dining structures and the lighting, that's a big problem. I see it all the time. They have conduit running adjacent to it and tied to it.

Ms. Roslund: Are you talking about a sidewalk café or dining sheds?

Chief Archer: I am talking about both.

Ms. Roslund: The sheds are in the street.

Chief Archer: The sheds are in the street and sometimes on the sidewalk.

Chief Archer: There's wiring that will run on the street.

Ms. Roslund: Yes.

Chief Archer: I think it should probably be addressed. If you're going to write this proposed rule, I suggest putting something in there.

Ms. Roslund: What is your concern?

Chief Archer: So, a lot of times, as Mr. Delaney mentioned, there will be overcrowding, especially during an emergency on the fire escape. And using that vertical drop ladder just isn't going to cut it.

Chief Archer: Portable ladders are used very often because they're more secure, they're bigger, they can hold more weight. In fact, the next time you see a fire in a building with a fire escape, you'll notice the ladders against the building, usually to the right and to the left.

Ms. Roslund: So, I have some outdoor lights, and I've strung them from my fire escape to my outdoor seating thing. Why is that a problem for the FDNY?

Chief Archer: I can't maneuver the ladder, especially in the dark, past your wires. It becomes an obstruction. It's impossible to break the wires with your hands. The lights will get caught up in the ladder. There are people on the fire escape. It's a big problem. The ladders are generally carried not horizontally, but vertically. As we put them up, they get caught up in the wires. Especially if there are two of them, you get the thing tangled up and it's not a good situation.

Chief Archer: It's a movement issue, putting them in place.

Mr. DeLaney: In terms of the 30-day notice to the tenant, should it be shorter?

Ms. Cruz: Yes. I wasn't sure if that was too long.

Mr. DeLaney: Yes, fires don't wait 30 days.

Ms. Cruz: Ten days?

Mr. DeLaney: Yes, ten days.

Mr. DeLaney: When we say days now, remind me, is it business days or not business days?

Ms. Cruz: Calendar days.

Mr. DeLaney: Calendar days. On page 6, reading the existing rule of (i), there are two places where we say "A second copy of the notice may be sent by regular mail", and "A copy of the notice of violation may also be sent by regular mail to the tenant of the tenants." Why did we make that may, rather than shall?

Ms. Cruz: The Mayor's Office.

Ms. Cruz: We could say must.

Mr. DeLaney: I would like to change that to must, in both instances.

Ms. Cruz: So, we're saying "A copy of the notice must also be sent by regular mail", that sentence or the sentence before?

Mr. DeLaney: Both.

Ms. Cruz: Okay.

Mr. Barowitz: We can also say, "should".

Ms. Cruz: Okay, we will try to do that.

Mr. DeLaney: I don't think "you should" is allowed.

Mr. DeLaney: And then in (iii), the Loft Board may issue a second violation if the condition has not been corrected within 35 days of the mailing date. I would like to see that be shorter as well.

Mr. Barowitz: Can we really change that? Can we change that if we wanted to, from 35 to less than 15 or 20 or 25?

Ms. Cruz: Which paragraph are you talking about?

Mr. DeLaney: (iii), a second violation.

Ms. Cruz: Okay.

Chairman Patino: In Section 3, the proposed rule provides 30 days to remove personal property stored in the pathway for fire egress. I think if we shorten this timeframe, then we also have to shorten the removal timeframe.

Mr. DeLaney: I'm in favor of shorter timeframes.

Mr. Barowitz: Can we make it a shorter timeframe legally?

Mr. Barowitz: What number should we put in there?

Mr. DeLaney: Then, in 4, the Loft Board requested an inspection report by a registered design professional. Do we define that term?

Ms. Cruz: No, I don't think so. It could be an engineer. I think that's what a structural engineer.

Mr. DeLaney: You don't want an interior designer.

Chairman Patino: Should it be an architect?

Ms. Roslund: That wouldn't be registered.

Ms. Roslund: Maybe it should be licensed.

Ms. Cruz: Licensed, not registered?

Mr. Barowitz: Licensed.

Ms. Roslund: Ah. Let me think about that.

Ms. Roslund: Just make a note, that we should talk more about that. We had the same conversation when we were doing rulemaking a few years ago when we were updating the rules. This was something that we talked about at length, about what constitutes a professional, a design professional, an engineer, licensed, or registered. We did have this conversation.

Mr. Barowitz: You can put both in there.

Mr. Barowitz: We can put both licensed and or registered.

Ms. Roslund: So, what Martha asked, so we're talking about, Chuck asked as a registered design professional defined in the rule, defined in the rules.

Ms. Cruz: No, I don't think so.

Ms. Roslund: She doesn't think so. And then we briefly said, should it be something like licensed or is there a different way to make it more descriptive? And I said, we had this conversation three years ago, or that when we were doing rulemaking. An extensive conversation about this exact thing. So, we should probably refer to what we decided then, rather than having the conversation again.

Mr. DeLaney: I mean, I guess the other question is, who's qualified to do this? Architects, professional engineers? Are there fire protection companies that are qualified? Is there a license?

Ms. Roslund: I was thinking earlier that there are companies that test how thick, how deep the rust goes. Like, there are different kinds of safety tests to certify the structural stability of an existing fire escape. That's probably not something that is, that's not a test that would be performed by an architect or an engineer, necessarily. It would be a specialist, like an environmental testing specialist that probes, electronically probes the steel. It is similar to an x-ray through the paint. So that they can see what the underlying conditions are of the fire escape and the structural issue is how it's attached to the building. It could be that the steel is not failing but the brick, the grout or the bolts are pulling away from the wall. There are several ways that fire escapes can fail.

Chief Archer: I have spent a lot of time on fire escapes. In my opinion, an engineer is fine, because the engineer, if they're certifying this, they're putting their license on the line. He's going to take a real good look at it. With all due respect to architects, I'd rather it just be a structural engineer.

Ms. Roslund: I would hire a structural engineer.

Chief Archer: So, there you go.

Mr. DeLaney: You're not going to certify a fire escape.

Ms. Roslund: I would not.

Chief Archer: So, you would hire a structural engineer and he can use whatever means he wants. This x-ray technology is where somebody goes up and puts his rays on the fire escape. It doesn't really matter. But the engineer is putting his license on the line when he says this thing's good or this thing is not good. The engineer is putting their license on the line and a legitimate engineer is not going to certify some fire escape that's about to fall off the wall.

Ms. Cruz: So, does licensed or registered capture that?

Chief Archer: I would just say a professional. I would just say a professional engineer. To be a professional engineer or professional instructional engineer. Right? Ms. Roslund, what do you think? Since you're hiring one anyway?

Ms. Roslund: So, this was the conclusion. I think that we could look at what we agreed to in the main body of the rules so that there's no contradictory language.

Mr. DeLaney: Last couple of comments on the range of fines, fair to maintain fire regression. Why did you pick 5000? Why couldn't it be higher?

Ms. Cruz: It could be higher.

Mr. DeLaney: I'm talking about the five thousand at the top of page 7. I would make them both 10,000.

Ms. Storey: You mean, 10,000, 17,500, 5000.

Ms. Storey: We're thinking 10,000, 17,500, 5,000 on the top.

Mr. DeLaney: No, I'm not doing it.

Ms. Roslund: We're at, "The Failure to Maintain Fire Egress."

Mr. DeLaney: I would suggest it be higher, but I leave it to you guys. Middle of the page, number 2, the "Annual Certification Requirements Regarding Fire Egress, (i), "Each annual renewal of registration

package”, I think it should be, “Each annual renewal of the registration package.” Then we get to page 8, where I did have a note with regards to 5,000, 10,000, and 17,500, isn't this time to revisit the failure to register fines? Regarding the “Violation to Comply with the Annual Certification”, I would make an argument for that to be higher as well.

Chief Archer: Is a building owner then required to hire this engineer every year?

Ms. Cruz: No.

Chief Archer: When you say inspection, who's doing the inspection?

Ms. Cruz: It could be the super.

Chief Archer: It could be the super.

Ms. Roslund: But it's only for the time that the building is under the jurisdiction of the Loft Law?

Ms. Cruz: Yes.

Ms. Roslund: For the most part, these rules and regulations exist in other laws.

Ms. Cruz: Yes.

Ms. Roslund: These laws should apply to the IMD buildings too.

Ms. Roslund: Would these rules go into effect even before the legalization work? So, I'm thinking, a building, for instance, a window leading to a fire escape must be in good working order. So, the building is registered, units are registered, and tenants are registered. At what point does this window need to work? At what point does this rule about the operable window apply if the building owner can't begin work until after filing the Alt 1, and the narrative statement process?

Ms. Cruz: This rule makes these conditions a housing maintenance issue, not a legalization issue.

Ms. Roslund: Okay.

Ms. Cruz: It's like heat.

Ms. Roslund: Okay.

Ms. Roslund: It doesn't work.

Ms. Cruz: You fix it.

Ms. Roslund: Right away.

Ms. Cruz: Right away.

Ms. Cruz: We had exactly that situation in a building, where there was almost a vacate, because the window wouldn't open. That owner acted very quickly and was able to repair it within hours, and DOB did not issue the vacate. We had exactly that situation.

Chairman Patino: Just to make sure we're all on the same page, we agreed to make some modifications to this version of the rule today and then revisit certain items.

- Page 3, second paragraph, where to clarify in the last sentence, "IMD buildings", and then we're going to add "maintenance" after basic housing. So, it will read, "IMD buildings provide basic housing maintenance services during the conversion period".
- On page 5(G), we agree to add language to the effect of "or otherwise comply with means of egress requirements". To clarify, "a building owner can otherwise comply with means of egress requirements and possibly remove a fire escape"; for example, in the event that they sprinkler the building. We also agreed to explore certain items that we're not going to make changes to address right now. Things as dining structure obstructions, and electrical wiring obstructions; which might impact the fire department's ability to evacuate a building during an emergency.
- Under item 3, "Personal property stored in the pathway for fire egress", we agreed to revisit the timelines, possibly shortening the 30-day notice requirements. Then along those same lines, addressing under (2), inspections and notices of violation.
- Item 4, for adjusting the timelines as well. Exploring the timelines for notice and then for the removal of items, and then when the Loft Board can issue a subsequent violation. We're not making changes at this point in my understanding. Is that correct?

Chairman Patino: Are we going to make changes before we send this to the law department for review?

Ms. Cruz: I noted that we were going to.

Chairman Patino: Okay, so we make changes. I think we agreed to 10 for the initial notice.

Ms. Cruz: 10, okay.

Chairman Patino: But then I think we must also address how long an owner has to remove items, and then how long before the Loft Board can issue a subsequent violation, that's currently 35 days in this requirement.

Ms. Cruz: Yeah, that's okay. I'm going to make the change.

Chairman Patino:

- On page 6, under item 2, "Inspections and Notices of Violation", we agreed to change "may" to "must" in two instances, regarding how notices of violations are sent to the owners or the tenants. And then we also agreed to take another look at the term "Registered Design Professional", to determine whether that can be clarified.
- On page 7, under "Annual Certification Requirements Regarding Fire Egress", we're adding the word "the" after each "Annual Renewal of the Registration Package", so we'll make that change. And then we also agree to revisit the penalty amount as well.

Ms. Cruz: In the future?

Chairman Patino: In the future. Right. There are some items that we agreed to make changes to address based on our conversation today before we send it to the Law Department and the Mayor's Office for preliminary approval. Is there a motion for the staff to request:

- (A) Preliminary approval from the Law Department and the Mayor's Office, and then
- (B) Go ahead and publish the proposed rule after we receive that preliminary approval for public comment?

Chief Archer: moved to accept the Fire Egress Proposal, and **Mr. DeLaney** seconded.

The vote

Members concurring: Mr. Barowitz, Chief Archer, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Roslund, Ms. Rajan, Chairperson Patino

Members dissenting: 0

Members abstaining: 0
Members absent: 0
Members recused: 0

REPORT OF THE EXECUIVE DIRECTOR – Martha Cruz

1. Personnel

The posting for the attorney position is now online. I encourage anyone interested to apply.

2. Legislation

There's pending legislation to amend the Loft Law. I shared with you the proposed legislation to amend Section 286, called, titled "Tenant Protection". The proposal seeks to amend paragraph 2, to include language that states that, "The tenant is entitled to continued occupancy after the finding of coverage".

The second proposed change in the legislation is to create a new paragraph 14 in Section 286. The proposed language establishes that "There is no single factor that is dispositive and protected occupancy determinations, including any statements made in federal, state, or city tax returns".

ENFORCEMENT AND LEGALIZATION REPORTS – Renee Storey

LEGALIZATION REPORT:

(1) Narrative Statement Conferences

- a. 10 Narrative Statement Conferences.
- b. 2 Narrative Statement Conferences have been scheduled for April - July.
- c. 7 Requests for Narrative Statement Conference are pending.

(2) Certification Requests

- a. 3 Certifications issued.

We continue to appreciate the help of all professionals throughout this process.

THE CASES:

Appeal and Reconsideration Calendar:

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
1.	Various Tenants	11-27 Arion Place, Brooklyn	R-0391
<i>The Loft Board denied the reconsideration application.</i>			

Florence Oyegue presented the case.

Mr. Barowitz: moved to accept the case, and **Ms. Roslund** seconded.

The vote

Members concurring: Mr. Barowitz, Chief Archer, Ms. Roslund, Ms. Rajan, Chairperson Patino
Members dissenting: Mr. Delaney
Members abstaining: 0
Members absent: 0
Members recused: 0

Summary Calendar:

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
2.	Jacob Belli and Marco DiAddezio	77-83 Roebling Street, Brooklyn	PO-0206
<i>The Loft Board deemed the protected occupancy application withdrawn with prejudice.</i>			
3.	Wen Huang	151 Kent Avenue, Brooklyn	PO-0229
<i>The Loft Board deemed the protected occupancy application settled.</i>			
4.	Krishjan Moore-Snell	338 Moffat Street, Brooklyn	PO-0230
<i>The Loft Board deemed the protected occupancy application withdrawn without prejudice.</i>			
5.	Irena Musial	187 Duane Street, New York	TN-0235
<i>The Loft Board deemed the noncompliance application withdrawn without prejudice. The Loft Board further noted that it is not bound by the terms of the March 8, 2024 stipulation between the parties. The Loft Board reserved its right to begin enforcement proceedings at any time against the owner for its failure to meet its code compliance obligation(s) under the MDL and Title 29 of the Rules of the City of New York.</i>			
6.	Stephan Cesarini, et al.	163 North 6 Street, Brooklyn	TR-1365
<i>The Loft Board deemed the application withdrawn without prejudice.</i>			

Chairperson Patino asked for a motion to accept these cases, and for a second.

Ms. Rajan moved to accept this case, and **Chief Archer** seconded.

The vote

Members concurring: Mr. Barowitz, Chief Archer, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Roslund, Ms. Rajan, Chairperson Patino
Members dissenting: 0
Members abstaining: 0

Members absent: 0
Members recused: 0

Master Calendar:

	Applicant(s)	Address	Docket No.
7.	Jennifer Stearns	429 South 5 Street, Brooklyn	PO-0093
<i>The Loft Board dismissed the protected occupancy application for lack of standing.</i>			

Kimberly Ira presented the case.

Chairperson Patino asked if there any comments on this case?

Chairperson Patino asked for a motion to accept this case, and for a second.

Chief Archer moved to accept this case, and **Ms. Barowitz** seconded.

The vote

Members concurring: Mr. Barowitz, Chief Archer, Ms. Rajan, Mr. Delaney, Chairperson Patino
Members dissenting: 0
Members abstaining: 0
Members absent: 0
Members recused: Ms. Roslund

Chairman Patino: Thank you. This will conclude our April 18, 2024, public meeting. Before you depart, I'd like to take a minute to publicly thank Kimberly Ira for the legal internship that ends next week. Thank you, for your interest in the work with the Loft Board, and we appreciate your time and hard work. We wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors.

Our next public meeting is scheduled for May 16, 2024. Thank you.